

# National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

WINTER 2009

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE: THE VALUE OF MARKETING PROBATION

Probation agencies across the country are immersed in ongoing budget discussions. Staff cuts, layoffs, "rolling furloughs," travel restrictions, and service reductions are becoming increasingly commonplace as states and counties attempt to address massive revenue deficits. What appears to be a negative fiscal environment is actually a golden opportunity for us to maintain and, yes, increase our resources.

Too often during challenging fiscal times, managers become totally defensive in their desire to preserve existing staff and resources. While we must conserve in as many areas as possible, probation executives miss the boat if we choke the motor on important initiatives that can subsequently reduce costs for the entire criminal justice system.

The value of probation must be demonstrated by setting and achieving performance goals. Increasing the percentage of successful completion rates for those under supervision requires strategic planning, regular communications with and feedback to staff, and enhancing partnerships with community agencies.

Here is one performance-based example of promoting probation as the solution to the alternative of expensive incarceration practices. In Pennsylvania, at the state level, the price tag for a new state prison is \$150 million and another \$50 million per year to maintain the facility. By achieving and maintaining an annual technical violator recommitment reduction of twenty



percent through the use of corrective, evidence-based sanctioning practices, our agency produced an approximate \$15 million annual cost avoidance savings in prison bed space. Thus, a \$10 million agency budget increase can be given consideration because the state will end up \$5 million "ahead," and be able to delay further prison construction. The cost avoidance savings obtained by diverting certain cases from incarceration is significant whether you are delaying prison construction or, on a smaller scale, saving valuable dollars per day related to jail bed space.

After developing a sound performance based plan, make sure to meet with the budget decision makers and fully explain the details. Similarly, provide information briefings to any other internal or external individuals or groups that can positively impact the funding of your operations.

This proactive, common sense approach to marketing the value of probation may seem obvious to seasoned executives, however, many new probation chiefs lack experience in strategic planning, budget preparation and management, and the use of performance measurements. Regardless of your executive experience, there is no better time to promote probation as a solution to problems, both small (individual cases) and large (systemic costs).

**John Tuttle**  
President

## CONTENTS

President's Message: The Value of Marketing Probation, <i>John Tuttle</i> .....	1
Embracing Failure: Lessons for Correctional Managers, <i>Greg Berman and Aubrey Fox</i> .....	2
Working with Gang Involved Youth: The Toronto Breaking the Cycle Project, <i>Donald G. Evans</i> .....	8
Probation Officer Charlie Benedict: An Inspiration, <i>Tamara Race</i> .....	12
Probation in Texas through the Eyes of a Polish Probation Officer, <i>Sylvia Stachowiak</i> .....	13
Nominations for Awards Solicited, <i>Christie Davidson</i> .....	15
From the Bookshelf, <i>Dan Richard Beto and Donald G. Evans</i> .....	16
News from the Field .....	18

## EMBRACING FAILURE: LESSONS FOR CORRECTIONAL MANAGERS

by

Greg Berman and Aubrey Fox

---

What do we learn when we talk about failure? Two years ago, with the support of the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance, we set out to answer that question. Our goal: to encourage a healthy dialogue about the failures of justice reformers, in an effort to shift the perception of failure from a wholly negative force to a necessary companion and contributor to success.

In the over 40 interviews we've conducted on the topic with practitioners, policymakers, and researchers, several common themes have emerged. Almost every experienced public official has a failure story to share, but these stories often go untold because people fear the professional consequences of admitting to failure publicly. This theme was illustrated most succinctly by Tim Murray, the Executive Director of the Pretrial Justice Institute and a former court administrator in Dade County, Florida, where he created the nation's first drug court. "I think failure is both promising and interesting because it is such a common experience among criminal justice practitioners who try to innovate in the face of obstacles and problems, yet it's a secret that's never spoken out loud," Murray said.

The problem, according to Murray, is that there are real consequences when we fail to talk about failure. "Failure comes with lessons learned" said Murray, "yet those lessons are held pretty selfishly because there's no platform for them to be shared." Courts and other criminal justice agencies face enormous difficulties in learning from failure or promoting successful reforms. As Ronald Corbett, the Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, put it, "Until recently, we didn't have a vocabulary for discussing success or failure."

One result of this lack of definition is that promising programs are sometimes treated as failures and abandoned prematurely. As University of Wisconsin Law School Professor Michael Scott said, "Very seldom do police chiefs say, 'We had a great idea that just didn't work. We're going back to the drawing board to do it differently.' That's what a scientist would say without batting an eye, but a police chief often doesn't feel that he or she has that kind of latitude." Seattle Police Chief R. Gil Kerlikowske concurs, pointing to the unique pressure that criminal justice agencies are under to deliver results. "I don't see anyone out there saying, 'We tried this, it didn't really work out, but here's what we learned,'" he said.

Scott and Kerlikowske's observations can also be applied to court administrators. Corbett sees the challenge for court administrators as identifying "little platoons" of innovators who often work under the radar screen. "Any good administrator," he said, "has to roam around the system and look for good people doing good things." To Hennepin County, Minnesota Judge Kevin Burke, encouraging innovation and experimentation is more than just the right thing to do: it can help a court or criminal justice agency's bottom line. "When there are scarce public dollars," he said, "policymakers end up rewarding people who are dynamic."

Even good people doing good things can fall into failure traps, however. For example, in order to gain support for their

programs, reformers at times promise results that they cannot reasonably expect to achieve. When programs fail to reach these inflated goals, they set themselves up for failure. The importance of setting modest expectations was underscored by noted criminologist Joan Petersilia, who remarked on the "long history of over-promising and under-delivering that has contributed to the constant pendulum swings in punishment practices." As she puts it, "There's nothing in our history of over 100 years of reform that says that we know how to reduce recidivism by more than 15 or 20 percent." She went on, "my sense is that we have not been publicly forthcoming because we've assumed that we would not win public support with modest results."

Another failure trap relates to how reforms are implemented. Some widely-held beliefs about the keys to success – such as the need to "get everyone at the table" or a blind faith in charismatic leadership – have in fact created blind spots that cause people to blunder again and again into failure. For example, many would-be reformers get mired in the intricacies of interagency rivalries and internal politics. "I've found that large interdepartmental change rarely happens," said Ron Corbett.

Some justice agencies have responded by seeking out hard-charging, charismatic leaders to save the day, only to find that this particular kind of leadership style can cause its own set of problems. "When I think of various leaders I've known in policing across the country who have been successful, they tend to be rational, reasonable and calm leaders, rather than head knockers or explosive personalities," said Michael Scott. One problem is that the wrong type of leadership style can inhibit a healthy dialogue about failure. "If you're the type of person who takes a person's head off for making a mistake, it's not going to take very long for word to get out," said R. Gil Kerlikowske. "You have to be willing to understand and tolerate failure, and even take the heat instead of pointing fingers if it's not really that person's fault."

The most dangerous failure trap, however, may involve the failure to risk failure. "We have to fight against the tendency to always choose a traditional approach to problems," said Judge Kevin Burke. He added: "A more common source of failure in criminal justice is an unwillingness to try anything different."

What follows are brief edited transcripts of a handful of interviews with current and former court administrators and judges, as well as other practitioners and experts in the field.

**Tim Murray**

Tim Murray is the Executive Director of the Pretrial Justice Institute, the first Director of the U.S. Department of Justice's Drug Court Program Office and one of the principal architects of the nation's first drug court in Miami, Florida.

**Q: Why should we talk about failure?**

A: I think failure is both promising and interesting because it is such common experience among criminal justice practitioners who try to innovate in the face of obstacles and problems yet it's

a secret that's never spoken out loud. Failure comes with lessons learned, yet those lessons are held pretty selfishly because there's no platform for them to be shared.

**Q: Why is failure so hard to talk about openly?**

A: Put simply, when you're in a position to design and administer programs, you're not being paid to fail. You tend not to report failure, and it results in trying to find success where often there is none. There's a reluctance to go forward and say, we totally failed with this effort, but we learned some valuable lessons. Unfortunately, failure doesn't resonate at any level. People avoid the stigma of being associated with failure by saying everything is successful. One of the perversions in last 30 or 40 years of federal funding of criminal justice innovations is that it has fallen prey to the idea that experimentation always leads to success. It's as though we are telling criminal justice practitioners, you can only do what is successful, you're only allowed to be successful, but you're not allowed to experiment to separate what is successful from what is a failure.

**Q: How do you encourage people to share stories about failure?**

A: I think you have to create a professional culture that allows failure to occur. There shouldn't be a stigma when a well designed, well intentioned initiative doesn't achieve the outcomes it sets out to achieve. Unless you can shine light on these failures, you're going to spend all your time and effort calling failure success, and I think that's what happened over the last few decades. The good news is that the lessons of failure are enormously beneficial to those in line to make the same mistakes or reach the same dead end.

**Q: Does leadership also play a role?**

A: Absolutely. One important factor is for leaders to be realistic about what constitutes success. Early on in drug courts, Janet Reno as a local prosecutor in Miami told me she wanted it to take longer for people in drug courts to be rearrested. In some quarters, that definition of success would be seen as anything but. In hindsight, it was a very realistic definition for a chief law enforcement agent in a community being ravaged by drug abuse.

**Q: What's your personal approach to failure?**

A: I have always believed that there was a lot of capital to be gained by admitting failure and showcasing it. Admittedly, that belief has been driven by my fear that if I did not admit my own failings, others would do it for me. For example, in the earliest days of drug courts, I helped funnel street prostitutes into drug treatment even though they weren't technically drug court eligible. Every single one of them absconded. It was shocking. I felt obligated to go to the drug court coordinating committee and tell them, I really screwed that up. In the process, though, we learned a ton – many of the women had children, and didn't want to go into residential treatment and be separated from their kids. Until then, we didn't pay much attention to their needs.

**Q: Are you saying that there are some advantages to admitting failure?**

A: I call it calculated candor. It makes you stronger than someone who denies failure or runs away from it. You also gain respect for your integrity, and as someone willing to take some risks. Of course, you also need some success to point to on the other side

of the ledger. Another advantage is that when you admit failure, your claims of success have a lot more legitimacy.

**Ronald Corbett**

Dr. Ronald Corbett is Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and the former Second Deputy Commissioner of the Massachusetts Probation Department.

**Q: Is admitting failure a particular problem in criminal justice?**

A: Yes, very much so. Until recently, we didn't have a vocabulary for discussing success or failure. I remember over a decade ago asking a room full of probation administrators if they knew what their recidivism rates were. Not many hands went up. Then I asked if they knew the number of community service hours performed the previous year. Many administrators could tell you the number of hours that had been assigned, but not the number that had been completed. Success at that time was defined as staying out of the news and not being an embarrassment to their bosses.

**Q: What's changed?**

A: I give Bill Bratton, the former police chief of New York City in the 1990s, a lot of credit for this. He rolled into the city and said, we're going to reduce felony crime by 20 percent. People thought he was nuts. Bratton knew it was very hard to fudge violent crime stats, particularly homicide stats. I see more and more governmental entities holding themselves accountable for meeting measurable outcomes, following Bratton.

**Q: What measurable outcomes do you collect at the Supreme Court of Massachusetts?**

A: Three or four years ago we established a set of performance standards for the court system, which we publish regularly. They include time to disposition, number of court appearances per case, litigant perceptions of the fairness of the court process as well as attorney perceptions. We also put a process in place to address the outliers, not by punishing them but by giving them assistance.

**Q: What lessons have you learned from failure?**

A: I think the most important lesson I've learned is that we underestimate the difficulty of changing the status quo. I was involved in an intensive probation supervision program in the 1980s where we completely underestimated the problem of program fidelity. One of the research partners on the project later wrote an article about the program, which he titled "Bending Granite." It takes a lot more pre-planning to create the right conditions on the ground for a new program. What made us think that a ship moving in a direction could be changed easily?

**Q: So how do we make change?**

A: There's a cliché out there about the importance of bringing everybody to the table. On the surface, it makes sense, but like a lot of models we carry around in our mind about how to bring about innovation, it can be false and misleading. People think that because you have a good idea, it will be embraced and implemented easily. I've found that large interagency and interdepartmental change rarely happens. Instead it is little platoons of people that make change happen.



## Executive Exchange

---

**Q: Can you give me an example of a successful “little platoon”?**

A: Operation Night Light in Boston is a perfect example. It started when a few probation officers started asking if they could ride along with police officers and make home visits to high-risk juvenile probationers. It’s a great example of naturally occurring innovation. When I learned about it, I saw my role as staying out of the way except as a cheerleader and a connector. I leveraged my authority as the then-deputy commissioner of probation to give these officers a platform in the press and the agency. The program spread like wildfire. Any good administrator has to roam around the system and look for good people doing good things. We ended up with a great program model with a lot of street credibility, and all I had to do was get the room, the coffee and the donuts to make it happen.

**Kevin Burke**

Kevin Burke is a Judge in the Hennepin County (MN) District Court and a national leader on judicial innovation and problem-solving courts.

**Q: Do you think criminal justice agencies are too reluctant to risk failure?**

A: Yes, definitely. The judiciary is an inherently conservative organization, which makes risk-taking difficult. There’s also a fear that many public sector organizations have of getting nailed in the newspaper for trying something new. We need to create a court culture that rewards risk. For example, our court at one time gave out an award for the best idea that didn’t work. Our goal was to encourage experimentation and change, which is an important part of creating a culture of organizational excellence.

**Q: Can you give me an example of something you’ve tried that failed?**

A: A decade ago, our court experimented with a fast track system for gun cases. These cases were taking too long to be resolved. My theory was that gun cases were akin to drug cases in that the most important issue was the legality of the search. If the search was legal, in all likelihood the case would end with a resolution. So the goal was to speed the process by which we determined the legality of the search. I got a judge all fired up to try this new approach, but it ended up being a bust. Public defenders objected vehemently that they wouldn’t have enough time to develop a relationship with their client. We also had problems getting the police to put together their reports in a timely fashion. Finally, my hypothesis about the search driving the resolution of the case turned out to be exaggerated: there were a lot of defendants who said, “I don’t care if the search is good, I’m going to take my chances on a trial.” Having said that, I’m nervous about calling that experiment a failure. I think a much more common source of failure in criminal justice is an unwillingness to try anything different. One of my favorite books is called “If It Ain’t Broke, Break It,” by Robert Kriegel. We have to fight against the tendency to always choose a traditional approach to problems.

**Q: Why is it important to risk failure?**

A: There are a lot of state courts that have critical budget problems. Courts that are perceived as being dynamic end up attracting funding and better personnel. I went to Baltimore last year, where the criminal justice system is in tough shape, and tried

to convince them that they should set a goal of creating the best criminal justice system on the East Coast. When there are scarce public dollars, policymakers end up rewarding people who are dynamic. And you can attract better talent that way. Just as medical students go to John Hopkins for a residency, you should have lawyers, police officers and probation officers going to Baltimore or to your court. If you are not well run and dynamic, more often than not your court will be told to do more with less. Predictably what ends up is courts can only do less with less.

**Q: You started a large and ambitious drug court in Hennepin County over a decade ago. What prompted you to create it?**

A: Drugs drive a lot of what is bad in the criminal justice system and the urban core of our nation. In 1995, Minneapolis had 4500 people arrested on a felony drug charge. Of that total, only 1600 were presented to the county attorney and only 1200 ultimately charged. In many instances, it took months before a case was brought to court, and by that time, it was often hard to find the defendant. Only about 100 people ended up in state prison. What we said was, let’s look at the 4,400 people where there was an arrest but nothing ultimately happened. To my mind, this was just a lousy criminal justice system. Our idea was, let’s try to get these people into treatment as quickly as possible. Instead of delay, we wanted someone who was arrested in the evening to be charged by the next afternoon and off to treatment that day, especially because we know from the research the importance of immediacy. Also, unlike most drug courts, which tend to have very restrictive screening criteria, anyone arrested on a felony drug charge was eligible, regardless of their criminal history or their charge. The drug court was successful for several years although it has been radically downsized recently. We affected a lot more people than those drug courts that did not go to scale.

**Q: What happened?**

A: We had a lot of early support politically. Over time, all the players changed. I moved on, a new Mayor was elected, a new prosecutor, new chief public defender. They weren’t supportive of the drug court. It was a perfect storm. In the first few years, we did a good job of managing our public relations, but it got harder over time.

**Q: Can you give me an example?**

A: A few years ago, a very conservative columnist who writes for the local paper wrote a series of columns about one particular defendant in drug court. Her source was a police officer, a known critic of drug court, who told her about a guy who had been arrested on 5 felony drug sale charges but only served 40 days in jail. After some detective work, I figured out that this was a guy who had arrested on a single felony (drug possession, not sale), not five, along with several misdemeanors, and had served 400 days in jail, not 40. So the columnist had her facts wrong. I got the newspaper to run a small retraction that nobody ever read.

**Q: How do you think the drug court performed?**

A: We didn’t get everything right. We had three goals. One was to reduce drug use, which I think we did successfully. We were able to get a lot of people into drug treatment. We struggled with our other two goals, which included getting people employed and making sure our participants were responsible parents in terms of paying child support and taking care of their kids.

**Q: I noticed you didn't include reducing recidivism in that list of goals. Why not?**

A: It's a little harder to measure that. For example, if the police hire 100 new officers, your recidivism rate goes up. If the police have their budget cut, the rate goes down. My thought at the time we started the drug court was that meeting our three goals would have been a pretty good start. If we had achieved those goals, my belief was we would have ended up reducing recidivism.

**Q: So was the drug court ultimately a failure?**

A: I would argue that it wasn't. The drug court run in Minneapolis was longer than most Broadway shows. Do you think *The Producers* was a failure? Maybe what the criminal justice system needs are more successful plays that eventually close, as opposed to mediocre ones that just go on and on.

### Joan Petersilia

Joan Petersilia is Professor of Criminology, Law and Society at the University of California, Irvine, former president of the American Society of Criminology, and Co-Director of the Center for Evidence-Based Corrections at the University of California-Irvine.

**Q: You've been involved in criminal justice reform efforts for the last 30 years. Have these efforts been a success or a failure?**

A: I have seen both at different times. I think the question we've been asking for the last thirty years has remained the same: is it possible to create community-based sanctions and programs that compete philosophically and operationally with institutional corrections (jails and prisons). I was involved with the intermediate sanctions movement in the 1970s and 1980s, where we were very excited about the potential of community sanctions as alternatives to prison. But in a way, we lost that argument as prison populations continued to soar. Now, as a nation, we've shifted to looking at what happens when someone is released from prison — the prisoner reentry movement. To me, it is still basically the same practical and philosophical issues, involving the same arguments and almost exactly the same people. Seen over a longer 30-year period, I don't think we've failed, because the energy and momentum around the re-entry movement comes in part from our moderate success at changing the conversation about corrections in the 1980s. On the other hand, I think it's reasonable to ask how well we have succeeded at reducing America's reliance on incarceration, despite our good intentions.

**Q: Why is it that criminal justice reform efforts tend to follow a cycle where initial optimism is followed by disillusionment and the abandonment of reform efforts?**

A: There's a long history of over-promising and under-delivering that has contributed to the constant pendulum swings in punishment practices. There's nothing in our history of over 100 years of reform that says that we know how to reduce recidivism by more than 15 or 20 percent. And to achieve those rather modest outcomes, you have to get everything right — the right staff, delivering the right program, at the right time in the offender's life, and in a supportive community environment. We just have to be more honest about that, and my sense is that we have not been publicly forthcoming because we've assumed that we would not win public support with modest results. I was naive about

the impact that intermediate sanctions would have on prison commitments, and have become much more realistic about what success we can have, and what the financial costs will be. It isn't that we *can't* deliver effective programs, but we usually don't do the implementation groundwork nor fund them sufficiently. The field is littered with broken promises in this regard, and I am trying not to make that mistake around reentry programs. In California, I make it a habit to tell elected officials and correctional practitioners that in the short term, it's not possible to deliver good programs and save money at the same time. I feel that I've been able to sell more modest expectations in California, but I'm not sure if that works in other states. It takes a lot of education and working closely with decisionmakers, but it is worth it.

**Q: What do you see as the legacy of Robert Martinson's famous 1974 declaration that "nothing works" to rehabilitate criminals?**

A: From a policy perspective, it was negative, because it pulled the rug out from under those who wanted to provide rehabilitative programming to offenders. But from a scientific perspective, it was incredibly positive. It made people focus on evaluation and performance measures — to collect and analyze more rigorous data and implement randomized experiments. I don't think the science of criminology and criminal justice evaluation would be where it is today without Martinson's very negative rehabilitation program assessment. The data now supports the mantra that "some things work for some people, some of the time, in some settings." It's not as catchy as "nothing works" or "everything works," but it is a truer and more nuanced understanding of rehabilitation and perhaps we owe that to Martinson.

**Q: Martinson was also very good at promoting his work. Is there a lesson in there for researchers?**

A: Very much so. Martinson was an interesting guy. He was only a research assistant on the original New York project, but he was a frustrated actor, had a very engaging personality, and eventually became the study's public face, appearing on *60 Minutes* and making presentations around the country. He is the reason I think that the "story had legs." I am a strong believer that no good research should go sit on the shelves, and we must spend a lot of time translating research findings and presenting policy implications for decisionmakers. I spend a lot of my time doing that and it is probably the most rewarding part of my career.

**Q: How do you see the re-entry movement going in the next decade or so?**

A: Conditions on the ground are changing. The re-entry movement took hold as crime rates were declining and economy was strong. Now we face a different situation. I can imagine the public being less generous with funding, which doesn't bode well for expanding reentry services. On the other hand, the budget woes that states are going through can provide an important impetus for change. If California wasn't facing a \$15 billion budget deficit, there's no way we would have been able to introduce some of the reforms we've recently considered. Finally, I'm optimistic about how the reentry movement has been framed. The focus is not only on rehabilitation, which is important. But reentry doesn't just prioritize the offender's need for services, it also prioritizes public safety. As such, it has a much larger political and community constituency. Ultimately, though, I don't have a crystal ball. We could have another decade of improved corrections programs

## Executive Exchange

---

and policies, or we could see the pendulum swing back to more bare-bones prison and parole policies.

**Q: One common fear among reformers is that a single high-profile case could halt reform efforts. How do you get around that?**

A: It's a very important issue. In California, we are planning to roll out a new technical violation matrix. We know that at some point, there's going to be someone who commits a new crime who we earlier had decided not to put back in jail. You can't be caught like a deer in the headlights when that happens. I had a conversation about this with Governor Schwarzenegger. He has the political presence required to deliver the message in a tough situation that on balance, this is a better system. In the event that something terrible happens, the message has to come from him if we want to stay the course.

### R. Gil Kerlikowske

R. Gil Kerlikowske is a 35-year law enforcement veteran and was appointed as the Chief of Police for the Seattle Police Department on August 14, 2000.

**Q: How common is failure in policing?**

A: The old joke is that in policing, there are no failures. If you know of a failure, please let me know! To be serious, you're absolutely correct that a number of pilot projects in policing don't achieve the success they were meant to achieve. But it's hard to know if something is a failure because so many programs aren't evaluated. It's risky. I know a big city chief who bluntly told a researcher who wanted to study a program, "You can only bring me bad news." Of course, the reality is it's rare that a program is a complete and utter failure.

**Q: How hard is it for a police chief to admit failure publicly?**

A: Always the greatest danger is that you'll spend money on a new project, it won't achieve the success intended and then you'll be in front of the city council or in the local newspaper trying to explain what happened. I don't see anyone out there saying, "We tried this, it didn't really work out, but here's what we learned." The old days of random experiments are gone. I can't see in this day and age some of the classic policing experiments repeated where you have an experimental and a control group, like the Minneapolis spousal abuse project or the Kansas City preventive patrol project. On the other hand, police chiefs have gotten more sophisticated about research and innovation. No group in criminal justice is studied more often and partnered with more than the police.

**Q: How do you balance openness about failures with political self-protection?**

A: In my first few months on the job, we had a big demonstration on the anniversary of the World Trade Organization conference. We put together a smart plan that dealt with the demonstrations effectively while making only a small number of arrests. But we found out a few weeks later that we went considerably over budget, mostly because in the last few days before the demonstration, police officers were adding extra officers — and extra overtime — to make sure they had enough people in place. My finance people prepared a complicated four page letter for me to present to the city council explaining the cost overruns. I said to

them, why can't we just send them a short letter explaining what happened in plain English? The reaction we got from the Council was amazing. They said "ok, we accept your explanation." They didn't even ask for a hearing. We've tried to live that way for the entire time I've been in Seattle.

**Q: What leadership style works best for police chiefs?**

A: I don't think there's a particular style. If you look at the genre of leadership books, it's all over the map. Five years ago, the military was this incredible leadership model to follow. Before that, it was Jack Welch at GE. Our shelves are loaded with this stuff. I've seen incredible police chiefs with very different leadership styles. Bill Bratton was a transformative leader but also New York is so unique. It's an outlier by any standard. Take Jerry Sanders in San Diego, by contrast. He is about as different as humanly possible from Bratton, but they were both successful at bringing down crime.

**Q: How would you describe your leadership style?**

A: I don't lose my temper that often. If you are a screamer or a shouter, after a while people don't know why you've lost your temper. When I get angry, people know that I'm really upset. If you're the type of person who takes a person's head off for making a mistake, it's not going to take very long for word to get out. You have to be willing to understand and tolerate failure, and even take the heat instead of pointing fingers if it's not really that person's fault.

**Q: Do you feel that police chiefs have a lot of room to experiment?**

A: This job is very difficult and success and failure has a lot to do with luck and timing. You have to go into the job with the right kind of attitude — a lot of people don't understand the pressures we deal with. I was fortunate to work for two mayors, but I always tell them, if things aren't going right, please tell me. Other chiefs I know are dealing with really tough situations. Take a look at the chief in Washington, D.C. She's introducing a program to deal with a terrible public safety problem in the city. It may or may not have an effect, but she's getting criticism from all sides. No one is saying, "Gee, at least this is a well thought out program that's done with the best of intentions."

### Michael Scott

Michael S. Scott is a professor at the University of Wisconsin Law School, specializing in research and teaching in policing, and the director of the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing. Scott was formerly Chief of Police in Lauderhill, Florida, served in various civilian administrative positions in the St. Louis Metropolitan, Ft. Pierce, Florida, and New York City police departments, and was a police officer in the Madison, Wisconsin, Police Department.

**Q: How common is failure in policing?**

A: Failure is built into policing because typically, formal policing is only needed when other forms of social control have failed. But even when policing is done well, it doesn't necessarily mean that the problem is solved for all time. The problem could return at some future time or in some other form, and new problems arise all the time.



**Q: Can you give me an example?**

A: A prime example is the Boston youth gun violence project, which at the time it was conducted was widely deemed an unqualified success. Several years later, homicide rates among young people in Boston went back up and there were grumblings around the country that the Boston project was a failure. Part of the reason that success in that initiative wasn't sustained over the long term is that many people didn't fully understand why it worked in the first place. It's a little like the old Hindu fable of seven blind men and the elephant — each person comes away with a different version of reality. Some people give credit to the prosecutors, others give it to police working hand in hand with probation officials, and yet others say it was the black clergy and gang outreach workers who made it work. It undoubtedly was all these things and more working in combination, but that's a complex story to tell.

**Q: Why is that important?**

A: In police agencies, we have not developed rigorous standards for defining and measuring success or failure. In their absence, we resort to very personalized and ad hoc measures. We decree all sorts of initiatives successes or failures without benefit of rigorous evaluation. Unfortunately, it's fairly easy to abandon a good idea or start a bad idea in policing. Policing is done in a very public way, and the public doesn't typically reward failure. Commonly, police officials define success on their own terms, which often means that if an initiative sounds innovative and it was implemented as planned, it is deemed a success even in the absence of careful assessment of the impact the initiative had on the problem it was intended to address. Very seldom do police chiefs say, "We had a great idea that just didn't work. We're going back to the drawing board to do it differently." That's what a scientist would say without batting an eye, but a police chief often doesn't feel that he or she has that kind of latitude. It feels like a very career-threatening thing to say. Ironically, in other contexts, police are very accustomed to being held to their proof. They must demonstrate probable cause to justify arrests and prosecution is based on proof beyond a reasonable doubt. But somehow those rather rigorous standards of proof don't seem to get applied to broader questions of the effectiveness, efficiency, or fairness of police strategies and tactics.

**Q: What role does leadership play in encouraging people to be more open about failure?**

A: I wish police chiefs would come to trust their own professional instincts about management instead of just trying to emulate the corporate world or the military. This isn't to say that police can't learn from other fields, but policing is sufficiently unique that it demands its own management principles and leadership styles. Police leaders don't have the same kind of confidence in their own leadership style, so they are very sensitive to the latest faddish management style. What happens is that some people in policing become iconic leaders, and elected officials when hiring police chiefs say, "We want a chief like that." When I think of various leaders I've known in policing across the country who have been successful, they tend to be rational, reasonable and calm leaders, rather than head knockers or explosive personalities. They believe the path to their own and to their organizations' success is in encouraging their subordinates to become competent leaders themselves. What you see all too often are bombastic leaders who suck up all the credit for themselves, who try to lead

through criticism rather than encouragement and are threatened by competent subordinates.

**Q: Could the calm rational leader become an iconic style?**

A: It's harder to make an icon out of these people, precisely because they don't attract a lot of attention. They don't seek out publicity about themselves and people don't instantly recognize what they do as leadership. But I hope the police field gets smarter about the leadership styles it celebrates. In general, there's too much attention being paid to what type of personality a person has, as opposed to what approach they will take to addressing particular problems.

**Greg Berman** is the Director of the Center for Court Innovation and co-author of *Good Courts: The Case for Problem-Solving Justice* (The New Press).

**Aubrey Fox** is the Director of Bronx Community Solutions, an effort to reduce incarceration in the Bronx, and a regular contributor to the *Gotham Gazette* and *Newsday*. They are working on a book examining the role failure plays in criminal justice policy.

This article originally appeared as "Embracing Failure: Lessons for Court Managers" in Vol. 23, No. 4, of *Court Manager*, the quarterly publication of the National Association of Court Management.

**NAPE LISTSERV AND WEBSITE**

Members of the National Association of Probation Executives should feel free to use the NAPE Listserv to pose questions or share information about relevant topics in the administration of community corrections agencies. Members wishing to send out information on this exclusive service may address emails to [nape\\_members@shsu.edu](mailto:nape_members@shsu.edu).

At present there are over 200 members registered on the NAPE Listserv. Members who are not receiving this service but wish to should send an email to [probation.executives@gmail.com](mailto:probation.executives@gmail.com), indicating a desire to be added to the NAPE Listserv. In addition, members who would like to update their email addresses, or add a second email address, should feel free to do so.

In keeping with the Association's policy not to accept advertisements in its publications, the NAPE Listserv will not, as reasonably possible, be used to promote products or services.

If you have not done so recently, please visit the NAPE website at [www.napehome.org](http://www.napehome.org).

# WORKING WITH GANG INVOLVED YOUTH: THE TORONTO BREAKING THE CYCLE PROJECT

by

Donald G. Evans

---

The emergence of urban youth street gangs represents a reemergence of a social pathology in our communities that indicates serious social problems and issues. These challenges are faced by probation and community social service agencies as they struggle to deal with disaffected and alienated youth who have turned to gangs as a means of support and meaning in their lives. This constitutes a major challenge for the safety of these youth as well as the general safety of the community. The major issue needing attention is the increased use of weapons and the lethal impact this use has on homicide rates among young African-Canadian males.

### Problem Identified

According to our national and local police agencies there are 216 known gangs in the Province of Ontario and the City of Toronto is the locale for 73 of these identified criminal gangs. These gangs account, according to police sources, for over 2,000 confirmed and unconfirmed members. Toronto's gangs are involved in a number of serious criminal activities including homicide. It is estimated that over half of the city's 65 homicides in 2003 were gang related. In 2005 there were 52 gun-related deaths and most of them attributed to gang activity. A survey of Toronto high school students conducted in 2000 found that 75% of students believed that youth gang activity was either a serious (23%) or a very serious problem (52%). Of course, this activity led to intense media attention and with coverage of a number of violent incidents there was an increase in the public's perception that violence was on the increase. The results of this increase in the number of gangs and of the attendant violent incidents coupled with the media coverage heighten the concern of the public and gave rise to demands for action from the politicians.

### Proposed Solutions

Three main approaches are being used to address the youth gang problem. The first approach relates to the work of law enforcement to employ suppression tactics by targeting hardcore gang members that are responsible for the majority of the criminal activity. Encouraging the development and implementation of intervention strategies is the second approach and these strategies seek to target fringe members that may be interested in leaving the gang environment. The final approach relates to prevention efforts that target pre-gang involvement. Experience indicates that prevention is the most effective strategy in the long run and that intervention is the next most effective with suppression being the least effective. This awareness has led to the development of partnerships between law enforcement, the courts, probation, and non-governmental agencies to work together in dealing with the outbreak of gangs.

Since 2004 the Canadian Training Institute (CTI) has been involved in an intervention project geared to assisting gang involved youth to discard their gang affiliations and to embark on

paths leading to employment or further education. The project has been centered in Toronto, Ontario, and specifically targeted areas in the west and east ends of the city. To date CTI has managed ten projects geared to assisting gang involved youth to exit gangs and become involved in more proactive and prosocial activities. During the past number of years this area has experienced rising crime rates and especially a dramatic increase in gun violence, leading to a number of deaths of young black men. The majority of these crimes have been committed by gang involved youth. Research indicates that gang membership is one of the strongest predictors of antisocial behavior and also suggests that gang members are generally more involved in antisocial behavior than non-gang members. There also seems to be a strong correlation between gang affiliation and violent acts as well as general antisocial behavior. Given this information, it was deemed wise to attempt to develop and design a program that would concentrate on facilitating gang involved youth in their efforts to exit or disaffiliate from gang activity. The result of CTI's work was the implementation of the youth ambassador's leadership and employment project. This project is part of CTI's "breaking the cycle of youth violence" approach.

### Program Objectives

The Ambassador Leadership Project sought to address the conditions leading to aggressive, anti-social behaviors and criminal conduct of specific gang involved youth. The project also made an effort to deal with barriers to employment or education. The following four specific objectives were set for the project:

- Enhance the resiliency of the youth selected for the project through an asset based cognitive behavioral and conceptual skills development approach;
- Provide case management to support each youth enrolled in the project with individual support, referrals and follow-up, crisis and family intervention when necessary, and facilitation of group activities;
- Create a peer support network, including training peer mediators and mentors for participants in the project; and
- Training the youth as ambassadors/peer educators who will conduct primary prevention education in schools, conferences, the media, and the community at large.

Each program is 28 weeks in duration and has a limit of 25 youth in each of the project periods. Youth who participate in the program are paid a stipend to attend with a bonus for successful completion. The program is divided into five main components:

### Intake and Assessment

Upon receipt of an appropriate referral from probation officers, parole officers, family or relatives, or other social service agen-



cies, a contact with the youth is arranged and an appointment is made to assess intent, target group eligibility, and complete an application form. Youth (either males or females) between the ages of 15-29 who are currently unemployed or not attending school, have a history of gang involvement, and agree to commit to the goals of the project are eligible to participate. An extensive social and criminal history is undertaken. This is augmented by a number of assessment instruments that are administered over the course of the program and include the Youth Level of Supervision Inventory, the Employment Readiness Scale, and the Trauma Symptom Inventory. When the youth are accepted into the program, they are enrolled in the ten day intensive training program which is the first stage of the project.

### Intensive Training

The curriculum for this stage of the program covers nine specific topics, as follows:

- General orientation that includes a discussion of group norms, and learning how to build a learning community. This session focuses on how staff and the youth will work together and involves building trust between the participants and the group leaders.
- Unlearning violence, sexism, homophobia, and racism are a section geared to raising the awareness and developing understanding of why people hurt each other and what can be done to change this behavior.
- Understanding and managing personal anger and aggression is another topic covered.
- A session of pro-social communication skills is taught.
- Working on self-esteem skills encourages and enables the youth to become capable of managing the life challenges they are facing and will continue to face is part of the instructional content of the curriculum.
- A session on building healthy relationships and one on setting goals is built into the curriculum.
- The final portion of this intensive program deals with making a difference in the youth's local community and leads to the next stage of the project, namely getting involved in working toward change through volunteerism, public speaking, letter writing, etc. The program closes with a personal evaluation of what the youth have learned and includes a personal mission/goal statement. A certificate of achievement is awarded upon successful completion of this stage of the program.

Graduates of the intensive session move on to the next stage, the ambassador program, this is the longest part of the program.

### Job Readiness and Leadership Development

This is the youth ambassador section of the project and includes four major components: personal development training, skills practice and integration, developing and following up on community contacts and other outreach activities, and providing community presentations. Part of the training in this stage also deals with job readiness skill development.

The outreach part of the ambassador program has the participating youth working with staff of the project on making presentations in schools and to community groups on the following topics:

- The impact of socialization on violence.
- The romance and myths of gang membership.
- The personal stories of the youths.
- How to respond to bullying.

### Case Management Process

The crucial element in this project is the case management process. The case manager builds on the identified strengths and initial set of goals agreed upon at the initial assessment. This process includes weekly face-to-face meetings with each youth and reviews their progress. The case management process also includes crisis management and problem solving when required. Many of the youth have encountered various issues and problems such as housing needs, threats of violence, family disputes, etc. The case manager works with a number of community resources in meeting these needs and involving the youth in learning problem-solving skills.

### Ambassador Activity

By the end of the project the youth ambassadors had participated in a number of skill development programs that contributed to an increase in self esteem and self efficacy. These programs included:

- Leadership skills in conflict resolution;
- Emotions and anger management;
- Problem-solving skill development;
- Crisis intervention;
- First aid and CPR training; and
- Introduction to computers and software applications.

A number of the youth, as a result of participating in this project, returned to school to finish their education while others sought and, in most cases, were successful in finding employment before the project ended.

All of the youth participated in the outreach activities geared to educating younger youth and the community on the importance of personal skill development and the alternatives to violence. The majority of the audiences reached were students in elementary or middle schools. Sensationalism and details that might breach confidential or considered potentially dangerous information were screened out of the presentations. Audiences related very well to the messages about anti-bullying, self-esteem, zero violence messages, and the value of staying in school that were delivered by the now ex-gang involved youth.

An activity that was expected of the youth ambassadors through their public presentations was to increase public awareness of high-risk youth issues and encourage local agencies to support efforts aimed at minimizing high-risk behaviors and supporting troubled youth to reach a positive, pro-social lifestyle. Some of the youth who were involved in both print and electronic media interviews participated in an open house that allowed them to meet potential employers and/or corporate supporters for the program.

All of these activities reinforced the leadership development aspect of this project, and the self-confidence that each individual developed would be helpful in their future activities whether it was employment or a return to school. The project is concluded with a public graduation ceremony held at a local community

## Executive Exchange

---

college with family, friends, project workers, police, and local politicians in attendance.

### Partnership Development

Given the complexity of the issues facing youth who wish to exit from gangs it is obvious or should be obvious that no one agency can provide all the support and material assistance needed. In the developing of the Breaking the Cycle program CTI reached out to a number of community agencies and engaged them in providing assistance. The first step was to convene an advisory committee composed of local leaders and agency representatives who would help to guide the project and to establish the project as a local program. Close working relationships with the Toronto Police were developed and an officer from that service serves on the advisory committee and is a liaison for the project. Representatives from the Ontario Probation Service are also involved as well as the Correctional Service of Canada, Humber College, the YMCA, and a local neighborhood center.

### Lessons Learned

To date the project has seen about 80% of the participants complete the program. Follow-up efforts are being attempted in order to ascertain the longer term benefits of the project. Funding is the main hurdle in providing aftercare contacts and evaluative activity. Three critical categories of lessons learned to date by the project workers relate to what we have learned about our targeted population, employment barriers, and what interventions appear to work best.

#### Characteristics of the Population Served:

- Untrusting, attempting to figure out if and where they fit in;
- Can't figure out how to get what they want;
- Living in the moment;
- High degree of fatalism;
- Feel they are voiceless;
- High levels of trauma, both physical and sexual violence (the majority witnessed violence in their daily lives);
- Access to weapons; and
- Inadequate life style as evidenced by poor nutrition, hygiene, and sleep patterns.

#### Barriers to Employment

- Lack of basic life and social skills;
- Low educational attainment;
- Poor workforce preparation;
- Low expectations by self and others;
- Negative peer influences and negative perceptions by community and employers;
- Inadequate reading and writing skills;
- Inadequate self-regulation skills and a history of violence;
- Criminal records and involvement with the criminal justice system; and
- Substance abuse.

#### What Seems to Work:

- Building relationships with the youth;
- Creating safe environment;
- Validating who they are;
- Access and availability on a 24/7 basis; and
- Using a multi-partnered approach that includes the faith communities, businesses, mentors, schools, social service agencies, fire and police service partnerships, parents, probation and parole, and politicians at all levels of government.

This project also demonstrates the value of comprehensive approaches to dealing with complex social problems such as attempts to extricate gang involved youth from the cycle of violence, criminality and poverty.

### Conclusion

CTI sees the development of local social capital as an important outcome of the effort to reduce violence and gang-related activity in the targeted community. Social capital consists of networks, norms, relationships, values, and, in most cases, informal social control mechanisms that shape the quality of a community's social interactions. It can be seen in the quality of the relationships between family members, across groups, and among different social classes. Social capital is important because it contributes to a number of beneficial results, including efficient labor markets, improved school achievement, reduced levels of crime, and improved health. In other words, communities become safer and healthier when there is enhanced social capital available. The overall community impact that is envisioned for this project and future projects includes:

- Reduced gang membership and involvement;
- Increased participation in the labor force by youths in the project;
- Increased positive contribution in the quality of the community by the youths in the project;
- Increased participation of members of the community in constructing positive solutions to community issues;
- Improved image and economic development in the targeted community; and
- Educating and informing at-risk youth about gang exiting strategies and tactics.

As this project continues, it is our hope that there will be an increased capacity of our agency partners in the provision of services to high-risk youths who have been difficult to serve. Our expectations also include the development of a pool of motivated youths who can serve as ambassadors in reaching out to other difficult to serve youths. Sometime this year we hope to see the project evaluated and trust that the information from the evaluation will allow us to fine-tune our approach to this specific intervention that will see more youth leaving gangs and becoming involved in more prosocial activities and completing their education and finding meaningful employment.

References

Bureau of Justice Assistance (1997). *Urban Street Gang Enforcement*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Chettleburgh, Michael C. (2007). *Young Thugs: Inside the Dangerous World of Canadian Street Gangs*, Harper Collins.

Evans, D. G. and John Sawdon (2004). "The Development of a Gang Exit Strategy: The Youth Ambassador's Leadership and Employment Project," *Corrections Today*, October.

Evans, D. G. (2006). "A Community Gang Exit Strategy," *Executive Exchange*, Spring.

Lorine, John (2008). "Stray Bullets," *Toronto Life*, August.

Sharp, Claire, Judith Aldridge, and Juanjo Medina (2006). "Delinquent Youth Groups and Offending Behaviour: Findings from the 2004 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey," *Home Office Online Report*, 14/06.

Taylor, Terrance, J. D. Peterson, Finn-Aage Esbensen, and A. Freng (2007). "Gang Membership as a Risk Factor for Adolescent Violent Victimization," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 44:351.

Tita, George, and Greg Ridgeway (2007). "The Impact of Gang Formation on Local Patterns of Crime," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 44:208.

Ulrich, Morry S. (2003). *Youth Violence: A Literature Review from Risk to Resiliency Utilizing a Developmental Perspective*. Toronto: Canadian Training Institute.

Watkins, Adam M. (2008). "Effects of Community, School, and Student Factors on School-Based Weapon Carrying," *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 6:386.

White, Rob (2008). "Disputed Definitions and Fluid Identities: The Limitations of Social Profiling in Relation to Ethnic Youth Gangs," *Youth Justice*, 8:149.

**Donald G. Evans** is President of the Board of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario.

**INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE**

*Executive Exchange*, the quarterly journal of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), publishes articles, reports, book and periodical reviews, commentaries, and news items of interest to community corrections administrators. The contents of the articles or other materials contained in *Executive Exchange* do not reflect the endorsements, official attitudes, or positions of the Association, the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, or the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University unless so stated.

The contents of this issue are copyrighted. Articles may be reproduced without charge as long as permission is obtained from the editor and credit is given to both the author and *Executive Exchange*.

Submissions for publication consideration should be formatted for letter size paper, double-spaced, with at least one inch margins. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a photograph for possible inclusion. Submissions

may be sent electronically to [probation.executives@gmail.com](mailto:probation.executives@gmail.com) or by conventional mail to:

Dan Richard Beto  
 Editor, *Executive Exchange*  
 National Association of Probation Executives  
 P. O. Box 3993  
 Bryan, Texas 77805-3993

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* may be directed to Dan Richard Beto at (979) 822-1273 or to Christie Davidson at (936) 294-3757.

*Executive Exchange* does not accept advertisements.

The Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University serves as the secretariat for the National Association of Probation Executives.



## PROBATION OFFICER CHARLIE BENEDICT: AN INSPIRATION

by

Tamara Race

On January 14, 2009, the following tribute to Charlie Benedict, a probation officer for the Plymouth District Court in Massachusetts, appeared in *The Patriot Ledger* of Quincy, Massachusetts. As reflected in the article, Charles R. Benedict (October 14, 1950 – January 11, 2009) did not let his disabilities negatively impact his life and he served as an inspiration to many. We are grateful to Tamara Race for writing this wonderful tribute, and to the *Patriot Ledger* for allowing us to reprint it. Editor

Charlie Benedict died Sunday after living an extraordinary life that inspired and humbled all who knew him.

Benedict, 58, of Plymouth, had been a Plymouth District Court probation officer for the past 34 years.

He was the thin, crippled man, bent over a walker, inching his way up the stairs at the old courthouse, grateful to be alive and anxious to get to work helping others.

"He's the most courageous man I've ever met in my life," Probation Chief Thomas Morris said of his longtime friend. "Most people in his shoes would be bitter about having their life taken from them, but Charlie thanked God for saving his. He is one man definitely going to heaven."

Benedict, not feeling well, worked late last Thursday, fearing he would miss work Friday. His wife called Morris with the sad news on Sunday.

Morris is the last person working at the courthouse who remembers Charlie Benedict as a handsome, athletic young man anxious to begin work as a probation officer.

Just six months after getting the job, Benedict was stricken with a rare form of viral encephalitis. It nearly killed him.

Benedict defied the odds by surviving and recovering fully, but he began regressing six months later.

The regression eventually subsided, but it left Benedict physically disabled.

For 22 years, he labored without complaint, inspiring his co-workers and probationers alike.

He kept a quote from Helen Keller in his desk drawer: "So much has been given to me; I have no time to ponder that which has been denied."



It was a quote he lived by.

But disaster struck Benedict a second time. In 1996, a treatment aimed at loosening a frozen Achilles tendon backfired and robbed him of his speech and muscle control and left him bent at a 90-degree angle.

"And so I became disabled for the second time in my life," Benedict wrote about the experience. "Living in my third body. There's no way to describe how we felt about that."

But Benedict fought back, counting his blessings and saying he only felt down, tired or defeated when he forgot to be grateful.

His many blessings included his wife, Ann, two sons and several grandchildren.

"We didn't make exceptions for him," Morris said. "He was a great probation officer. He carried his weight."

"He was the heart and soul of this department," Assistant Probation Chief Janice Boyle said. "There isn't a dry eye in the place."

Benedict received the 2001 Trial Court Employee Excellence Award.

He enjoyed gardening and biking, but mostly he enjoyed spending time with his family.

A Funeral Mass was held at St. Peters Church in Plymouth, Massachusetts, on Friday, January 16, 2009, at 10:00 a.m. Memorial donations may be made to the Charles Benedict Scholarship Fund at Archbishop Williams High School, 80 Independence Avenue, Braintree, Massachusetts 02184.

## PROBATION IN TEXAS THROUGH THE EYES OF A POLISH PROBATION OFFICER

by

Sylwia Stachowiak

For ten days in October 2008 Sylwia Stachowiak, a probation officer for the courts in Poznan, Poland, was in Texas as part of the Probation Officer Exchange Program between the National Association of Probation Executives and the Probation Officer Association of Wielkopolska. During that time, she was able to spend time with a number of probation professionals, visit three probation departments, and soak up some Texas culture. These are her observations about the exchange, written initially for her supervisors in Poland.

In Walker County, Texas, there is the city of Huntsville, where the Community Supervision and Corrections Department (adult probation department) is located. The Department's jurisdiction extends over Grimes, Leon, Madison, and Walker Counties. In October 2008, I spent a few days in the Department learning about the work of Texas Community Supervision Officers. Chris Kowalski, a Project Coordinator with the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, became the guide of my journey through Texas. With angelic patience and Texan humor, Chris told me about the work of Community Supervision Officers in Texas and also about culture, politics, customs, and life.

Director David Baker personally explained to me the organizational structure and the operations of the Judicial District Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Huntsville. I learned about the specifics of probation and supervision methods while accompanying individual Community Supervision Officers in their daily work. The Department provides its services to courts, prepares pre-sentence investigation reports, and supervises persons referred to supervision and correction facilities. In criminal proceedings community supervision is an alternative to incarceration.

Every person referred by the court to the department first undergoes an assessment process. The assessment covers, among others, professional skills, employment, financial status, family relationships, mental and emotional condition, sexual behaviors, substance abuse, health, social behaviors, and criminal record.

The object of the process is to determine the level of risk, which can be low, medium, or high. The higher the risk the greater the frequency of contacts between the Community Supervision Officer and the offender. For example, if an offender is assigned to the high risk category, the person must come to the Department and meet with the Community Supervision Officer two or three times a week. Conversely, persons rated low-risk meet with the Community Supervision Officer less frequently, i.e., once in two months. In addition, every six months, Community Supervision Officers review the initial risk assessment of every offender and with every change align the supervision process and methods accordingly.

The risk assessment and individual needs of the offender determine what actions should be taken. Probation departments have a number of programs for offenders. The needs of "high-risk" individuals are addressed by the so called "Intensive Probation Programs" covering assistance and therapeutic programs. Apart from group meetings on specific topics, individual counselling is also available.

An offender placed in such a program must report during meetings with the Community Supervision Officer his/her participation in the program. Offenders under supervision are ordered by the court to pay monthly fees for supervision activities. All data about supervised offenders are stored in an integrated computer system. Every Community Supervision Officer has access to the system and is responsible for updating information in regard to progress of the re-adaptation process.

Community Supervision Officers who work with substance abuse offenders perform tests determining the content of chemical substance in the body. Such tests are carried out on a control basis and after a few days, the lab results for all psycho-active substances in the body are available. In specific cases the Community Supervision Officer can also consult the lab about the impact of chemical compounds on the body and obtain reliable information.

There are various substance abuse programs available in the Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Huntsville. For offenders with alcohol and drug abuse there are outpatient programs. They are called Intensive Alcohol and Drug Abuse programs where meetings take place two or three times a week.

Similarly, for persons who committed sexual offenses there are special sexual offence programs. In addition, those persons are also ordered by the court to report every year to a law enforcement agency and to deliver their most recent photo, which it is then put on the Internet for public viewing.

For domestic violence offenders the Department offers a "changes class." Group meetings are educational in nature, give the participants information about abuse, and address destructive behaviors. When necessary, persons placed in supervision facilities, who usually have emotional difficulties, can participate in individual counselling.

Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) offenders are given special bracelets and devices are installed in their cars to measure alcohol content in the blood. Additionally, they must complete an educational program for persons with alcoholic problems, where the participants are told about the consequences of drunk driving.

In the Department there are also assistance programs for victims who were injured or who had a family member injured or killed by a drunk driver. Such programs provide the victims of DWI accidents with mental and financial support.

The most common intervention in regard to persons placed on community supervision is community service for the benefit of various institutions and agencies, mainly libraries, parks, senior centers, etc.

## Executive Exchange

---

In the city of Conroe, near Huntsville, Texas, together with Chris Kowalski and Mel Brown, a former Chief Probation Officer, I visited the Montgomery County Department of Community Supervision and Corrections. It operates a facility for substance abuse offenders, including both drugs and alcohol. Persons are placed in the facility based on a court decision. The Residents of the Corrections facility participate in the Booster Program aimed at developing interpersonal skills based on group meetings. The program has its structure and principles of operation. It is quite complex and addresses a lot of areas, including cognitive and behavioral aspects.

Workshops are interactive and focused on working with emotions, mainly anger and improvement of close personal relationships. They also provide the participants with mood improvement techniques. The participants analyze their offences and take part in the rehabilitation process.

Classes concentrate on changes in the area of self-fulfillment and self-improvement. Workshop participants are educated on substance abuse. In the facility there are also communication trainings where participants develop their social skills. The residents of the Corrections facilities can improve their qualifications and achieve new skills. They also have access to cultural and religious goods, and thus have many possibilities of spending their free time. In the facility there are also educational classes on HIV and health. The stay in the facility may last from one to nine months. The Community Supervision Officer working in such a corrections facility is responsible for submitting reports to the court on the participants' progress in the program.

In Bryan, Texas, there is the Brazos County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, which I visited together with Chris Kowalski and Dan Richard Beto, former Chief Probation Officer and a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE). The Director of the department, Arlene Parchman, personally presented to me the structure of the Department and outlined the role of the Community Supervision Officer. Community Supervision Officers in the department are responsible for submitting pre-sentence investigation reports to the court. The reports contain, among others, information on the committed offence, background of the offender, and sentence recommendations. During the supervision process, Community Supervision Officers test offenders for substance abuse. There are various programs offered by the department: Alcohol Abuse Educational Program, groups for DWI offenders, reporting groups; Intensive Probation Programs: drug abuse programs, programs for mentally ill offenders, programs for sexual offenders, cognitive and behavioral programs. Probationers can also avail of individual consultation with a psychologist. In the department there are also 8-week educational programs for women covering addictions, interpersonal relationships, abuse (emotional, sexual and physical), skills development, stress management, parenting, etc. Another program offered by the department focuses on the support of victims through identification and contact with the victim, advising the victim about the status of the offender. The Domestic Violence Program is delivered by licensed specialists and takes the form of group meetings.

Probation departments in Texas have a wide continuum of probation programs and services. Community Supervision Officers provide the court with alternative options in regard to individual persons and report on the offender's conduct during the supervision process and on the delivery of obligations imposed by the court.

The encounter with various cultures was an excellent opportunity to get involved in a multi-dimensional discourse, which places man at the center. Language barriers or cultural differences were not an obstacle to those considerations.

As a psychologist and probation officer, I think that the cognitive and behavioral programs delivered by our Texas colleagues are a very interesting idea. One of the elements involved is working with mood swings, emotions and feelings of happiness. It is a process aimed at improving the mental well-being of offenders. To a great extent, in our work we deal with persons with low self-esteem, with substance abuse inclinations, who lead an unstable life. Capitalizing on the experience of other probation systems, the Polish system could also implement classes focused on changes through group work concentrating on insight-based self-analysis. The objective of such classes is to raise self-awareness, develop inter- and intra-personal skills, which consequently leads to personal development and greater activity. The possibility of interactive group work additionally contributes to a better understanding of oneself and others.

In my opinion, the wide array of programs and services provided by the probation system in Texas addresses well social and individual needs as well as the high crime rate recorded in Texas.

The time spent in Texas was not only work but also social meetings and cultural attractions. Together with Chris Kowalski, his wife, and little daughter we went sightseeing in San Antonio. The tour included the famous Riverwalk. I also spent a wonderful time in Seaworld with Chris Kowalski's family. During the visit to the Wild West and the city of Fredericksburg, I had long discussions with Paul Kosierowski, a member of the NAPE International Committee, about the intricacies of a Community Supervision Officer's work. Moreover, together with Paul I visited the Alamo and the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park. Chris Kowalski also took me to the capital city of Texas and the Capitol in Austin.

On the last day of my visit to Texas I was invited to the house of the Beto family and I spent a great time with Dan Beto and his wife talking about our experiences from international trips. Together with Dan Beto we visited the George Bush Library and Museum, an authentic Texas Beer Joint, and then we had a wonderful dinner in the lovely company of Donna Beto.

I wish to thank the organizers of the probation officers' exchange: Chairman of Wielkopolska Probation Association (Wielkopolskie Stowarzyszenie Resocjalizacji), Piotr Burczyk; Chief Probation Officer in Poznan, Irena Szostak; Chairman of the NAPE International Committee, Dan Beto; Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, Doug Dretke; Director of the Walker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, David Baker; former Chief Probation Officer, Mel Brown; Director of the Brazos County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, Arlene Parchman; and also Cathy Schweitzer, Hope Cano Baker, Michael Cannain, Jeani Wilson, Katrina Dewalt, Tia Schweitzer, Cristie Heil, and Shelia Hugo. I would also like to thank wholeheartedly Paul Kosierowski. Last but not least, I wish to express my gratitude to Chris Kowalski and his wife for creating a wonderful, friendly, and kind atmosphere during my stay in Texas.

**Sylwia Stachowiak** is a probation officer serving the courts in Poznan, Poland.



## NOMINATIONS FOR AWARDS SOLICITED

By

Christie Davidson

Each year at the Annual Awards Breakfast the National Association of Probation Executives recognizes individuals who have contributed to the probation profession. Members of the Awards Committee — chaired by Robert L. Bingham and comprised of other active past Presidents — are soliciting nominations for the following awards, to be presented this August in Anaheim, California.

### **Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award**

This award is given annually by the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University to an outstanding probation executive selected by the NAPE Awards Committee. Criteria for this prestigious award include the following:

- Manager of a public agency providing probation services;
- Member of the National Association of Probation Executives;
- Contributed to local, state, regional, or national professional organizations;
- Demonstrated sustained exemplary performance as a manager in pursuit of the goals of the profession;
- Implemented new and innovative policy, procedure, program, or technology with high potential to enhance the standards and practice of probation which is transferable; and
- Has achieved outstanding recognition during the year or has outstanding achievements over time.

### **George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership**

The National Association of Probation Executives and the Community Corrections Improvement Association of Iowa jointly present this award to an administrator, manager, or supervisor who has demonstrated exceptional leadership under challenging conditions which provide value added activity or service to the organization or community they serve. Additional criteria for this award include:

- Nomination must come from a NAPE represented department and must be approved by the director or board of directors for that agency; and
- Nominee must have achieved an outstanding accomplishment during the year or championed a specific cause over a period of time.

### **Arthur Neu Award for Exceptional Policy Development**

The National Association of Probation Executives and the Community Corrections Improvement Association of Iowa jointly present this award to an elected official who has demonstrated exceptional understanding and support for probation practices

and has provided value added activity or service to the profession in their official capacity. Additional criteria for this award include:

- Nomination must be submitted by a NAPE represented department and must be approved by the director or board of directors of that agency; and
- Nominee must have achieved an outstanding accomplishment during the year or championed a specific cause over a period of time.

### **William Faches Award for Exceptional Community Service**

This award is presented jointly by the National Association of Probation Executives and the Community Corrections Improvement Association of Iowa to a volunteer, member of a board of directors or advisory board, or a person who has demonstrated exceptional community service to their organization or community. Additional criteria for this award include:

- Nomination must come from a NAPE represented department and must be approved by the director or board of directors of the agency; and
- Nominee must have achieved an outstanding accomplishment during the year or championed a specific cause over a period of time.

### **Nominating Process**

In nominating persons for any of these awards, in addition to the nominating letter, please provide a detailed biographical sketch of the nominee or a recent vita. Supporting documents, such as news articles, are also welcomed.

Nominations should be sent to Christie Davidson at the following address:

Christie Davidson, Executive Director  
National Association of Probation Executives  
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center  
Sam Houston State University  
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296

Nominations may also be sent via email to davidson@shsu.edu or by facsimile to (936) 294-1671.

All award nominations must be received by the NAPE Secretariat by April 25, 2009.

### FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Book reviews found in this issue of *Executive Exchange* have been contributed by Dan Richard Beto, Editor of *Executive Exchange*, and Donald G. Evans, President of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario.

*Executive Exchange* welcomes reviews of books and periodicals dealing with community corrections, the criminal justice system, research and evaluations of correctional programs, and management and leadership issues.

#### ASSESSING YOUR ORGANIZATION

A review of *The Five Most Important Questions You Will Ever Ask About Your Organization* by Peter Drucker, et al. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008, 119 pp., \$14.95.

Peter F. Drucker (1909-2005) will be well remembered for the impact he had on management theory and leadership development. During the last decade and a half of his life he gave considerable leadership to the development of the social sector (non-profit) approaches to management. Two particular efforts stand out — one, the creation of the Leader to Leader Institute and, the other, the encouragement of a targeted publication regime that stressed leadership practices and organizational effectiveness.

In 1993 Drucker had prepared the handbook — *The Five Most Important Questions You Will Ever Ask About Your Organization* — in which he enunciated the simple appearing but difficult questions leaders should ask in assessing their organizations. These complex and compelling questions are:

- What is our mission?
- Who is our customer?
- What does the customer value?
- What are our results?
- What is our plan?

Fifteen years later the Leader to Leader Institute has reissued the self-assessment guide with comment and annotations by current leaders in management theory and practice. Letting Drucker speak for himself on each of the five questions, then one of the new generation of thought leaders comments on Drucker's chapter. For example in the first chapter, Drucker discusses the question "what is our mission" and Jim Collins of *Good to Great* fame comments. The other respondents are Philip Kotler, Jim Kouzes, Judith Rodin, and V. Kasturi Rangan — each in their turn responding to one of the questions discussed by Drucker.

Frances Hesselbein, President and CEO of the Leader to Leader Institute, contributes a forward, giving background to the re-issuing of this book and also providing a closing chapter on "Transformational Leadership." This is a nicely laid out book and readily accessible to the busy leader / manager. In the opening chapter, Drucker addresses the necessity of self-assessment for non-profit organizations. In summary he notes that: "We have to have discipline rooted in our mission. We have to manage our limited resources of people and money for maximum effectiveness. And we have to think through very clearly what results are for our organization."

For Drucker self-assessment leads to action and is meaningless without it! Again he stresses the notion that "self-assessment is the first action requirement of leadership: the constant reshaping,

constant refocusing, never really satisfied." For him, self-assessment can convert good intentions into action immediately.

The following five chapters deal with the five basic questions and are tightly written but nicely phrased and easy to grasp the message that is being emphasized. The concluding chapter by Hesselbein focuses on transformational leadership. For her, transformation means moving from where you are to where you want to be in the uncertain future that lies before you. She notes that organizations usually pass through eight milestones on their journey of transformation. These milestones are:

- Scanning the environment;
- Revisiting the mission;
- Banning the hierarchy;
- Challenging the sacred cows;
- Employing powerful language;
- Dispensing leadership across the organization;
- Leading from the front; and
- Assessing performance.

In the appendix of this little but informative book is Drucker's self-assessment process with suggested questions to explore, definition of terms, and suggested resources for follow-up. Drucker's closing words sum the process up:

The five questions appear simple, but they are not. Give them time to sink in; wrestle over them. Properly carried through, self-assessment develops skill, competence, and commitment. Active and attentive participation is an opportunity to enhance your vision and to shape the future.

This is a book that belongs in the arsenal of today's leaders and would be especially useful if conscientiously applied. The strategies suggested in this volume provide direction to making an organization more effective.

Donald G. Evans

#### A COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF EUROPEAN PROBATION

Review of *Probation in Europe*, edited by Anton M. van Kalmthouth and Ioan Durnescu. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers, 2008, pp. 1180, \$90.00 (paper).

Late last year the European Organization for Probation, commonly known as CEP, produced *Probation in Europe*, a comparative overview of probation in 32 European member states.

This comprehensively thorough volume is edited by Anton M. van Kalmthout, Professor of Criminal Law at Tilburg University in The Netherlands, and Ioan Durnescu, a lecturer in the Faculty of Sociology and Social Work at the University of Bucharest in Romania. In the first chapter they provide a detailed description of the development of probation in Europe and lay out a format on how the country specific information will be conveyed. Too, they identify the similarities and differences in the various probation systems.

Following the editors' instructive introductory chapter are 32 additional chapters, each devoted to a different country. Countries covered in this publication include, in alphabetical order, the following: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Catalonia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, England and Wales, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Scotland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. Each chapter is written by someone who is knowledgeable about probation in the country being examined.

Particularly helpful is the manner in which the country specific material is uniformly presented. More specifically, each chapter, with some necessary deviation, follows the same general outline, which allows for easy comparison. The primary sections are as following:

- 1 Historic Development of the Probation Service
  - 1.1 The start of the probation services in (specific country)
  - 1.2 Important developments
  - 1.3 Probation activities in a nutshell
- 2 Legislative Basis and Mission
  - 2.1 Legislative basis
  - 2.2 Mission and mission statement
  - 2.3 Crime prevention
  - 2.4 Victim protection
- 3 The Organization of Probation Services
  - 3.1 Main characteristics
  - 3.2 Internal organization
- 4 Probation in Different Phases of the Criminal Process
  - 4.1 General
  - 4.2. The pre-trial phase
  - 4.3 Trial and enforcement phase
  - 4.4 Post-release phase
  - 4.5 Care and aftercare outside the criminal justice system

- 5 Finances, Registration, Evaluation, and Outside Opinion
  - 5.1 Finances
  - 5.2 Accounting
  - 5.3 Registration systems and evaluation procedures
  - 5.4 Societal support and clients' views

- 6 Probation Clients' Rights
  - 6.1 General
  - 6.2 Complaints procedures

## 7 New Developments

## 8 Important Publications

## 9 Contact Details

Annex (usually contains some workload statistical data)

While all the material is relevant to gaining a better understanding of probation in the European states, particularly interesting are the sections dealing with "New Developments." Contained in these sections are some of the more recent initiatives and programs being crafted and applied in the various countries. Taken together, one can develop a pretty good picture of the focus and direction of probation in the 32 European states. In addition, the "Important Publications" section identifies books and articles that have influenced probation services in a given country. Finally, the "Contact Details" section is informative in that it provides addresses for probation organizations and, in many cases, the websites for relevant agencies and organizations. Persons wishing to learn more about a particular country's probation system will find this section very helpful.

The book is concluded with three appendices. The first appendix — "Probation Documents" — is not all that interesting. Appendix II contains a glossary of words and phrases that proves to be of assistance to the reader. The final appendix provides the names, affiliation, and contact information for all the authors who helped produce this valuable reference work.

Van Kalmthout, Dornescu, and the host of other authors responsible for producing *Probation in Europe* are to be commended for their scholarship and for making a significant contribution to the body of knowledge of probation. Persons interested in international community corrections issues and the development of probation systems will find this book a necessary addition to their libraries.

**Dan Richard Beto**



---

## NEWS FROM THE FIELD

---

### MACMILLAN NAMED CHIEF IN ISANTI COUNTY, MINNESOTA

Tim MacMillan, who has recorded more than 15 years of experience in the field of community corrections, has been named Director of Isanti County Probation Department in Cambridge, Minnesota. He previously worked in Nevada, Nicollet County, and has spent the past nine years in Scott County. MacMillan replaces NAPE member J. Hancuch, who resigned in mid-August to accept a position with Sherburne County as its Court Services Director.

MacMillan, a native of Duluth, attended the University of Wisconsin-Superior, where he majored in political science and criminal justice.

### SAN MATEO COUNTY PROBATION CHIEF RETIRES

San Mateo County Chief Probation Officer **Loren Buddress** retired on January 2, 2009, after nearly 18 years of combined total service to San Mateo County.

"The judges of the Superior Court wish Loren all the best in his retirement," Presiding Judge **Robert Foiles** said. "Loren served as an adult probation officer for six years early in his career and then returned to San Mateo County to become Chief. He has many proud accomplishments here."

In a statement announcing his retirement to the Superior Court and Board of Supervisors, Buddress said he has had a very special opportunity. "For decades our County has had the wisdom to support juvenile and adult treatment programs that have proven to reduce crime, delinquency, recidivism, and community victimization," Buddress said. "The citizens of our County are extraordinarily lucky to have your leadership and support of programs that make San Mateo County a positive, healthy, green, and safe place to live and raise families."

During his tenure, San Mateo County built the innovative Youth Services Center to replace an outdated juvenile hall. The Youth Services Center aims to improve the lives of youth and families by providing support services and the skills necessary to succeed in society.

Throughout his career, Buddress has been a strong supporter of evidence-based treatment programs that have proven to reduce crime, delinquency, recidivism and community victimization. He assisted in bringing these practices to the Probation Department here and the state-wide probation system.

Because of his strong interest in treatment and rehabilitation, the then-State Senate Pro Tem **Don Perata** appointed Buddress to the California Rehabilitation Oversight Board, responsible for monitoring the rehabilitation efforts of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's prison and parole programs.

He also has been re-elected, since 2002, by his 13 Bay Region Probation Chiefs to be their representative on the statewide Chief Probation Officers of California Executive Committee, where he also served as the state-wide Chair of their Legislative Committee.

Buddress has a bachelor's and master's degree in sociology. After spending his early career working for San Mateo County

in probation and other capacities, he entered the Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System, where he worked for 21 years, the last 11 years as the Chief Probation Officer for the Northern District of California in San Francisco. He then returned to San Mateo County as Chief Probation Officer, overseeing a \$72 million annual budget and 462 employees.

"Working here as Chief for almost nine years has been an honor," Buddress said. "It has also been a unique opportunity to serve the Board, the Court, our County, and the community."

**Calvin Remington**, who retired in January 2007 after leading the Ventura County Probation Department for a decade, took over for Buddress in an interim capacity. Remington will hold the position until a permanent replacement can be found through a nationwide search. He will not be a candidate for the permanent job, officials said.

Judge Foiles said Remington is "well-regarded in the profession and is recognized as a probation leader in the state."

"We look forward to Cal Remington's expert assessment of our operations here in San Mateo County," Foiles said in a statement. "His experience will be a great help to us as we transition to a new chief probation officer."

Remington, the California Chief Probation Officer of the Year in 2006, started his career as a parole agent in 1970 and worked his way up the ranks in Ventura County to become chief in 1997.

### BJS RELEASES REPORTS ON 2007 CORRECTIONAL POPULATION

More than 7.3 million men and women were under correctional supervision in the nation's prisons or jails or on probation or parole at yearend 2007, the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) announced on December 11, 2008. About 3.2 percent of the U.S. adult population, or one in every 31 adults, was incarcerated or under community supervision at the end of 2007. This percentage has remained stable since reaching more than 3 percent in 1999.

About 70 percent (5.1 million) of the adults under correctional supervision at yearend 2007 were supervised in the community (either on probation or parole), and 30 percent (2.3 million) were incarcerated in the nation's prisons or jails. Offenders held in custody in state or federal prisons or local jails increased by 1.5 percent since yearend 2006. The population under community supervision (either on probation or parole) increased 2.1 percent.

State and federal correctional authorities had jurisdiction or legal authority over nearly 1.6 million prisoners, an increase of 1.8 percent since yearend 2006. Though the number of prisoners increased, the rate of growth, compared to the average annual growth from 2000 to 2006, slowed by 0.2 percent. The imprisonment rate continued to increase, reaching 506 persons per 100,000 U.S. residents.

During 2007, the federal prison population experienced the largest absolute increase of 6,572 prisoners, followed by Florida (5,250), Kentucky (2,457), and Arizona (1,945). Combined, these increases resulted in 59 percent of the overall change in the U.S. prison population.

Federal prisons operated at 136 percent of capacity in 2007. State prisons operated between 96 percent of highest capacity and 113

percent of lowest capacity, compared to between 100 percent and 115 percent in 2000. This trend indicates that prison populations are increasing at the same rate of capacity.

More than eight in 10 offenders supervised in the community at yearend 2007 were on probation (4,293,163), while less than two in 10 offenders were on parole (824,365). About one in every 45 adults in the U.S. was on probation or parole at the end of the year.

The total community supervision population grew by 103,100 offenders during 2007. While the parole population (up 3.2 percent) increased at a faster pace than probation (up 1.8 percent) in 2007, probation accounted for three-quarters (77,800) of the growth in offenders under community supervision.

Entries to probation supervision (2.4 million) exceeded exits from supervision (2.3 million) in 2007. Similarly, entries to parole supervision (555,900) also exceeded exits from parole (531,400) during 2007. A total of 1,180,469 parolees were at risk of being re-incarcerated in 2007, which included those under parole supervision on January 1 or who entered parole during the year. Of these parolees, about 16 percent were re-incarcerated in 2007.

The report, *Prisoners in 2007* (NCJ-224280), was written by BJS statisticians Heather C. West and William J. Sabol, Ph.D., and *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2007 — Statistical Tables* (NCJ-224707) was prepared by BJS statisticians Lauren E. Glaze and Thomas P. Bonczar. Following publication, *Prisoners in 2007* can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/p07.htm>; in addition, *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2007 — Statistical Tables* can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ppus07st.htm>.

For additional information about the Bureau of Justice Statistics' statistical reports and programs, please visit the BJS Web site at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs>.

## REENTRY PARTNERSHIPS PUBLICATION

With support by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the U.S. Department of Labor's Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, the Council of State Governments Justice Center has released *Reentry Partnerships: A Guide for States & Faith-Based and Community Organizations*. The guide, written by Jamie Yoon and Jessica Nickel, offers practical recommendations for how state government officials and community-based service providers can better use limited resources to help the more than 700,000 individuals released from U.S. prisons and the nearly nine million who leave jails each year to successfully and safely rejoin neighborhoods and families. *Reentry Partnerships: A Guide for States & Faith Based and Community Organizations* is available at [http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/pdf/CSG\\_Reentry\\_Partnership.pdf](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/pdf/CSG_Reentry_Partnership.pdf).

## PROPOSED CHANGES IN PENNSYLVANIA CORRECTIONAL POLICY: VIOLENT OFFENDERS TARGETED

As his first act of 2009, Pennsylvania Governor **Edward G. Rendell** asked the General Assembly to protect Pennsylvania communities by strengthening the state's criminal sentencing statutes so repeat violent offenders are not paroled.

The Governor's call came as he also announced new measures that will expand the state's efforts to identify and supervise these offenders so that they are less likely to victimize anyone else.

"In 2008, four Pennsylvanians were brutally murdered by five men who had served state time for violent crimes and were out on parole," said Governor Rendell. "These murders cry out for changes in how we sentence and supervise repeat violent offenders, so today, I am asking the General Assembly to end parole for repeat violent offenders. These murders were clear indications that repeat violent offenders must serve more time in prison and that repeated violent acts must be met with even tougher consequences."

Under the Governor's proposal, Pennsylvania would change the sentencing structure for repeat violent offenders who use a deadly weapon in the commission of a crime by instituting certainty in sentencing as a way to keep them in prison longer and end the possibility that they will be paroled.

"Currently, all offenders get an indeterminate sentence — a minimum and maximum sentence, with the offender being eligible for parole at the expiration of his or her minimum sentence," said the Governor. "That works well for most non-violent and less violent offenders, but it doesn't seem to be working for some of the worst repeat violent offenders. Some have learned to game the system and convince officials that they have learned their lessons."

"I propose that we put an end to this. I am asking on the legislature to establish flat, determinate sentences for repeat violent offenders. No more minimum sentence after which these thugs could be paroled," said Governor Rendell, adding that nearly 25 other states and the federal government have either eliminated or limited parole for certain classes of offenders.

The repeat violent offender designation would apply to anyone who was convicted as an adult or juvenile of committing one or more violent crimes with a deadly weapon, or has at least been convicted of at least one violent crime and is convicted of a weapons offense.

The definition is consistent with that provided by Professor **John Goldkamp** of Temple University, whom Governor Rendell hired last year to conduct a thorough, top-to-bottom review of the state's corrections and parole systems.

To ensure these offenders are provided with guidance, help and oversight after fulfilling their sentence and being released, Governor Rendell also proposed a 5-year supervision period by the parole board. Violations of post-release supervision could result in re-incarceration.

Governor Rendell added that he would ask state Supreme Court Chief Justice **Ronald D. Castille** to require that a detailed pre-sentence report on each repeat, violent offender be completed and made available to the judge, prosecutor, and defense counsel prior to sentencing.

"Pre-sentence reports, which provide critical information to judges about the background and prior acts and psychology of offenders, are only completed in about 15 percent of all criminal cases," said the Governor. "This needs to change. Our judges must know everything about repeat violent offenders in order to hand down the most appropriate sentence. Sentences should not be handed down in a vacuum, and we risk that problem without a good, comprehensive pre-sentence report."

"These measures are sound policy and good public safety legislation and I look forward to working with the legislature to pass them quickly," added the Governor. "In the interim, though, we are taking steps to better identify those offenders with a history of violence who are in our system now, either in a state correctional facility or out on parole."

---

“Beginning immediately, the Probation and Parole Board will identify each and every state parolee who has been out on parole for less than five years and falls within the repeat violent offender category; determine whether their supervision is adequate given their criminal history and record of violence; and impose more intensive, comprehensive supervision for those repeat violent offenders that need it.”

“I will have many priorities for 2009, but none will be as important to the safety of our citizens as guaranteeing that repeat violent offenders spend more time behind bars,” said Governor Rendell. “How we identify and treat offenders with a history of violence and supervise parolees is critical to stopping violent offenders from committing new crimes. This proposal means better evaluation, longer sentences, and mandatory post-release supervision for our worst criminals, which together, will make our streets safer.”

### **CRIME & JUSTICE NEWS MOVES TO THECRIMEREPORT.ORG**

After nearly six years, *Crime & Justice News* is expanding and moving to a new web site. As of February 2, 2009, *CJN* is based at <http://thecrimereport.org>, a site being launched with the Center for Media, Crime and Justice at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. *CJN* also will continue to be sent out by e-mail once daily on request. The *CJN* Archives of about 18,000 items also is now housed at this site.

Also as of February 2, 2009, persons visiting the website can read news items as they are posted. The site includes many other features that should be useful to journalists, criminal justice practitioners, and members of the public interested in crime and justice. There is a comprehensive guide to reliable sources in the field that is easily searchable. There will be blog by *CJN* editor **Ted Gest** and other journalists, as well as entries on notable criminal justice research and a discussion forum on controversial topics. This site is a valuable resource.

### **COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT SEPARATED IN PENNSYLVANIA**

**Raymond L. Hamill**, President Judge of Wayne County, Pennsylvania, advised the Wayne County Commissioners Friday of his decision to separate the adult probation/parole department from the juvenile probation department and named **James R. Chapman** as Chief Adult Probation Officer and **Sandy A. Fofi** as Juvenile Chief Probation Officer.

The decision to separate the departments and appoint separate directors follows the retirement of **Robert H. Williams** on January 2, 2009 who had headed up both departments since 1999. Judge Hamill noted the growth in the complexity of the administrative, personnel, and financial responsibilities of each department prompted his decision to create individual sections. Additional growth in supervisory and investigative responsibilities and separate legislative directives required of the departments were better suited for individual directors rather than one overall chief. Fofi and Chapman had been the deputy directors of juvenile and adult probation and have been with the departments since 1990 and 1991, respectively.

The Court further advised the Commissioners of the restructuring of the departments by naming **Jonathan Dunsinger** and **Lisa Salak** as deputy chiefs for adult services and **Mary Ann Swingle**

as deputy chief for juvenile services. Mindful of the difficult economic environment impacting on all county governments, the Court indicated that all personnel changes would be made within the parameters of the preliminary budgets approved by the County and that indeed, there would be significant savings to the County by the elimination of the overall director's position and restructuring of the supervisory personnel.

The Probation Departments currently supervise over five hundred (500) adult and juvenile offenders within the county and were responsible for conducting in excess of four hundred (400) pre-sentence and juvenile social summaries during 2008 alone. In addition, the departments are the collection branch of the Court system and were responsible for the collection of costs, fines and restitution exceeding \$600,000 in 2008.

### **VERHOFF NEW CHIEF IN PUTNAM COUNTY, OHIO**

**Ryan Verhoff** has been named the new Chief Probation Officer for Putnam County, Ohio. He replaces **Don Smith**, who retired after more than three decades of public service, the last 12 of which were spent as Chief Probation Officer for Putnam County.

Throughout the years, Smith and Putnam County probation received a number of awards including probation officer of the year. Smith is confident that Verhoff will strive to maintain the standards of the office.

A county native, Verhoff graduated from Ottawa-Glandorf High School and was a 1999 graduate of Ohio State University, where he majored in criminal justice. After a five year stint with the Franklin County Juvenile Detention Center, Verhoff has moved back to Ottawa with his wife and three children.

Smith is certain Verhoff will “be a real nice addition to our office.” Smith felt a “lot of enthusiasm and willingness to learn” from Ryan throughout the interview process. “He has a desire to take the probationary progress a step further, and I really think he can do it. He’s young and has new ideas” and he understands the dynamics of the county.

### **ALDAMA NAMED DIRECTOR IN NAVARRO COUNTY, TEXAS**

Judge **James Lagomarsino** of the 13th Judicial District has appointed **Chris Aldama** Director of adult probation for Navarro County, Texas.

Aldama, a 1993 graduate of Southwest Texas State University where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in criminal justice, comes to the Navarro County position after spending the last 15 years working with the Ellis County Juvenile Probation Department, the last eight years a Chief Juvenile Probation Officer.

“There were some good candidates from within and from the outside,” Lagomarsino said. “I went on the management experience he has, and I understand that Ellis County has done some things that are pretty progressive.”

---