

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2007

MESSAGE FROM THE GUEST EDITORS

The original plan was that *Executive Exchange* would focus one issue this year on evidence-based programs and one issue on organizational culture and change. It became clear to us that it would better serve our membership to incorporate the focus of these two issues into one. The challenge for leaders is to incorporate evidence-based practices into their organizations and to implement evidence-based programs and models that science indicates will best help us achieve our mission of community safety.

Each of us faces many challenges in our day-to-day operations. We've all either said or heard one of our colleagues' say some form of, "I'm just trying to drain the swamp and not get eaten by the alligators." There is no doubt that everyone is doing their very best to meet mandates, community expectations, the expectations of key decision makers, manage with fewer resources, and produce at least adequate outcomes. This issue challenges us to question whether we can produce better or even remarkably better outcomes and organizations as well as provides some practical ideas for doing that.

The articles in this issue are written from many perspectives so that each of us, as adult learners, can utilize their content. "A Probation Story" by Dot Faust tells the story of a probation executive who reluctantly, but successfully, implemented evidence-based practices within her organization. The first in a three-part series on the New York City Department of Probation's STARS program examines performance measurement and how such a system can add value to decision-making and organizational development. NAPE received approval from Robert D. Behn, Ph.D., to reprint two of his essays, "The Responsibility to Craft Purpose" and "Obsessed with 'Best Practice'." On the latter essay we are honored to provide a response by two of

NAPE's retirees, Ron Goethals and W. Conway Bushey. Steve Aos, Associate Director of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, was interviewed for this issue and offers us the best thinking on evidence-based research in community corrections for both juveniles and adults. A review of the literature on organizational change and an outline of the research that is being done on the effect of probation and parole officer culture on change in community corrections are presented as the first in a two-part series by Shea Brackin, MSW. Susan Lord provides an international perspective in "100 Years of Probation" in England. Finally, we have book reviews, a tribute to women by Betty Green, and substantial news from the field.

This issue may be one of the longest in NAPE history. It provides stories, research, and networking news. There are two important points to be made about this issue and the topics it covers. First, it takes both evidence-based practices and models/programs to be a high-performing community corrections organization that positively contributes to community safety. Secondly, to be a high-performing organization takes careful consideration of purpose, culture, measurement, best business practices, implementation of evidence-based models and hard work. It is our hope that this issue of *Executive Exchange* contributes to your life-long learning as an executive and to better outcomes in your organization and community.

Joanne Fuller
Director
Multnomah County
Department of
County Human Services
Portland, Oregon

Cherie Townsend
Director
Clark County
Department of
Juvenile Justice
Las Vegas, Nevada

CONTENTS

Message from the Guest Editors, <i>Joanne Fuller and Cherie Townsend</i>	1
A Probation Story, <i>Dot Faust</i>	2
Utilizing a Performance Measurement System to Enhance Decision-Making in a Community Corrections Agency, <i>John Evangelista, John Corrigan, and William Geoghegan</i>	5
The Responsibility to Craft Purpose, <i>Robert D. Behn, Ph.D.</i>	9
Obsessed with "Best Practice," <i>Robert D. Behn, Ph.D.</i>	10
A Response to Behn's Essay on Best Practices, <i>Ron R. Goethals</i>	11
A Response Interview about Behn's Views on Best Practices, <i>W. Conway Bushey</i>	12
Evidence-Based Practices: An Interview with Steve Aos, <i>Cherie Townsend</i>	12
Organizational Change in Correctional Organizations: The Effects of Probation and Parole Officer Culture on Community Corrections, <i>Shea Brackin</i>	16
100 Years of Probation, <i>Susan Lord</i>	21
A Tribute to All the "Little Women," <i>Betty Green</i>	23
From the Bookshelf, <i>Melissa Cahill, Ph.D., Donald G. Evans, and Dan Richard Beto</i>	24
News From the Field.	27

A PROBATION STORY

by

Dot Faust

The Setup

Once upon a time, there was a kind and diligent Probation Chief named Albie who lived in the tiny County of Stalwart in a Midwestern state known for its soybean and corn production, universal support of high school football and fast pitch, and no nonsense, zero tolerance of braggarts and slick politicians. The citizens of Stalwart were deceptively smart, compassionate, well read, and dependable. They raised their children to be patriotic, protective of family, and suspicious of new ideas that promised ease and comfort over hard work and responsibility.

Even in Stalwart, however, there were those who uncharacteristically engaged in illegal behavior. Most of these offenders were placed on probation by the Stalwart District Court unless one of the mandatory sentencing statutes prevented it. The judges had known Albie for years, and trusted her to be conscientious about keeping track of these people until their problems were fixed. For the past decade, Albie had run her probation department by the book. Policies and procedures on offender contacts, case documentation, and the timeliness of treatment referrals were reviewed on schedule, signed by both the administrative judge and the district attorney, and consistently enforced across the board. Regular statistical reports on the number of offenders supervised, treatment referrals made, and community service agencies enrolled were delivered to Stalwart's County Board every quarter. Albie's management style was tight, controlled, and relatively lawsuit-free.

The Sting

One day, Albie was invited to coffee by her Board Chairman, Josiah Percy. When she got to the coffee shop on Courthouse Square, she was surprised to find Josiah at the corner booth with two other people. Josiah waved her over, and introduced her to Lydia Farley, Chair of the Board in neighboring Venture County, and Venture's brand new Probation Chief, Sam Quincy. Sam, who looked way too young and relaxed to be a Probation Chief, had been hired about six months earlier by Venture's Board after a unanimous vote. During the hiring interview, Sam had described a popular trend in community corrections agencies across the country, something called Evidence Based Practices. Lydia described how her Board's vice-chair had rolled his eyes toward the ceiling when Sam had first mentioned the term, stopping him right then and there to explain it. "So, I leaned ahead in my chair," Sam shrugged humbly as he told the story, "and just told them that the term evidence based practices simply meant using information to make decisions (see Lowenkamp Note). Since the mission of my former department was to enhance public safety by reducing the number of victims in our community and lowering the number of crimes committed by probationers, we were especially interested in information about changing offender behavior (see Bogue, et al.). We were committed to learning more about how to do that. We used the internet to read research from other states, and we started

collecting better internal information on our own probationers and programs."

OK, thought Albie, that's interesting and sounds worthwhile, but Sam had indicated that his former agency had been working on EBP implementation for several years already. How could it take so long, just to set up some new programs and convince the judges and officers to use them? She'd once attended a conference, after all, to learn about Day Reporting Centers. She'd been able to write the new policy, rent the space, and start admitting probationers to the new Stalwart County DRC within six months! And, that included time to make the budget request and hold an Open House for the neighbors. "Big deal..."

Oops! Apparently, she'd said that last thought out loud. "Oh, but it was a big deal," Sam grinned and leaned back in his chair so he could look directly at Albie to make his next point. "We actually didn't start writing new bench scripts or designing programs until just a couple years ago. We were able to determine that our organization needed to build up its capacity to learn and change before we could handle a significant shift in direction. We used some assessment tools to figure out both our strong points and our weak points as an organizational team. We went through a culture changing process to review the values and mission of our agency. We invested in strategic planning, training, and rewriting our staff performance expectations and reward system before moving ahead with major program development."

Whew! Albie was beginning to figure out that the words "evidence based practice" were packed with meaning. Besides the evidence on behavior change, Sam talked about the research they'd used on organizational productivity and employee incentives. The staff were in a constant learning-mode.

The information wasn't all gleaned from gold standard randomized research models, either, but included other levels of evidence found in the journal articles and websites now available to staff at all levels. Staff knowledge and experience were certainly included in planning deliberations, as well as program evaluations from their contracted providers. Probably the most valuable of all were the internal report cards that informed the various management teams about their progress toward achieving strategic objectives related to performance of the organization and the offenders. They were beginning to operate and adjust policy according to facts and reliable information, rather than gut feelings or past practice alone.

Well, it was easy to see how the Venture County Board could resonate with the potential of this "EBP" approach: increased levels of accountability and public safety could actually be measured, analyzed, and opened to the system and community for review and discussion. Lydia and the other board members had apparently given Sam the job when he had shown them some of the results his agency had achieved, using evidence based management to guide policy direction and practice on offender assessment, case planning and program development. Reports from Sam's past jurisdiction showed that treatment program completions — successful completions — were currently up from when Sam had started there; the jail population was down, and

costs over the past two years had remained steady. He actually knew the recidivism rates for certain types of offenders under supervision, and whether these rates correlated with the predictive assessments made at the front end of the process. What was even more surprising was that Sam described changes in these numbers over time, and how both his department and some of the local community programs had used the data to improve services and reallocate resources.

According to Sam, probation staff in this system expected change and had learned how to apply both research in the field and data collected in their own department to their everyday work. They were used to making adjustments based on the numbers they were getting, and felt deep satisfaction in knowing that their informed decisions and skillful interventions actually made a difference to public safety.

Lydia and her colleagues on the Board were understandably excited about making this evidence based practices-approach happen in Venture County. They were committed to being honest with the public and giving them the best services that they could. They just wanted the truth about issues related to public safety so that they could reinforce what was working, and change what wasn't.

So, What Are You Saying?

It was dawning on Albie that Josiah hadn't invited her to coffee to talk about the lunch menu for their next Board meeting. She actually lost track of the conversation for a minute when a flood of stomach-turning thoughts invaded her mind: what did Josiah want from her? Did this mean that Stalwart's Board had lost confidence in her? Were they saying she hadn't been doing her job all these years? And, how had he found out about Venture's teenage probation genius, anyway?

The waitress bumped Albie's elbow with the piece of cherry pie she was carrying, bringing her head back to the table. Josiah was explaining that he and Lydia had worked together for years on the state's prairie restoration task force, and that Lydia had been anxious to discuss the new chief and his evidence based recommendations with her old friend. Josiah had been invited to monitor a couple of Venture County's strategic planning sessions with probation and court staff. As a father of two teenagers and volunteer 4-H leader, he thought the information about human behavior change made perfect sense. If this "evidence based" plan played out as advertised, Venture County would soon have information available that would answer questions they didn't even ask in Stalwart County. There would be information on what was actually working or not working with Venture's probationers, as well as specific program comparison costs based on effectiveness and efficiency measures developed by the planning group.

Folks from Venture County would know whether their hard earned tax dollars were really making the community safer for their families. The Venture County Board would be able to make smarter decisions about investments in staff positions, staff training and program development. They would actually know who was on probation — and who was successful on probation — because of better assessment information and more precise matching of offenders and program interventions.

The Angst

Albie patiently listened to all this, resisting the temptation to leave the table with the excuse that the judge wanted to see her,

or that she needed to get back to the office to make sure all her staff had returned from lunch on time.

Albie was an intelligent, caring person, however, who really did want to do the best job she could. So, she took a deep breath, ordered more coffee, and patiently listened to Sam's account of the probation information that staff were beginning to collect and analyze in Venture County. They were starting to learn about what was happening in the operation, when it was happening, and who it was happening to. They were preparing to make appropriate adjustments based on the information to help them reach the outcomes now defined and expected by their Board.

Albie's stomach churning ratcheted up another notch with the realization that, unlike Sam, she had no idea how many probationers in her county had been returned to prison the past year for noncriminal violations. She didn't know how many probationers made it through Stalwart's only drug treatment program, let alone how many returned to the system after they graduated. Actually, she didn't even know the profiles of probationers referred to this program in the first place, or what the operation there did with them (or to them). She'd heard countless stories from the officers on probationers who had ended up in good jobs or enrolled in school, but didn't know if their risk levels had actually decreased under her watch. Was all her good work actually making the community safer or not? And, what would her officers think of all this? Would she need to change her management style if her Board really expected performance-related results rather than an honest day's work for a day's pay? Could staff skills and attitudes really have a bearing on recidivism? This was pretty hard to take for someone who had always believed in the lead-a-horse-to-water theory of brokerage probation.

OK, Here's What I'm Saying...

Albie was beginning to feel distressed, and even Josiah couldn't help but notice that she hadn't touched her pie. "Albie," Josiah sighed with honest concern, "all of us on the Board feel fortunate that you are managing our Probation Department. You've always given 110 percent to the job, and have been a dedicated, conscientious public servant. Making it possible for you to have more information will probably confirm that much of what we're doing has been on track. You'll be able to give more information to your staff and to the community. You'll have the hard facts you need to implement programs and policies that move us toward the standard of excellence you've always tried to deliver. We'll work with you and the staff on this; we know that change takes time."

Fade to Epilogue

Albie looked up from the no frills jungle-experience travel brochure she'd been reading to smile at her husband. (He really was adorable, but what was he thinking?) She decided not to bring it up on the same day he'd been such a good sport about attending her office going away party. She had learned a thing or two about positive reinforcement over the past few years, and decided she owed him at least a couple days to play with his new water proof camera and rubber hiking boots before asking him to consider other options.

Instead, Albie went back to organizing the personal files she'd brought home from work. Five invigorating years after that first coffee shop meeting with Josiah, Lydia, and Sam, her impending retirement was putting her in a reflective mood. She and her team

Executive Exchange

had been leading Stalwart's Probation Department through a change toward excellence in service, using an "EBP" implementation approach. She was proud of the improvements in staff productivity, offender success and community collaboration that staff from her department and other Stalwart agencies had been able to produce and measure. She would be saying goodbye to a team of criminal justice professionals that had confidence about their true impact on public safety. Since that first cup of coffee with Sam Quincy, she and her staff had grown together to become a team that held each other accountable for results, that supported each other through a variety of transitions and that celebrated successes with each other and their community. They had become comfortable with remaining in a constant cycle of learning, adjusting to new information, and then implementing again. Documented results had helped them garner increased support from the Stalwart Board for resources, and greater credibility with the Court, the local government system and the community. Other Stalwart county agencies had noticed the consideration and respect that the Probation Department had earned in the community, and had started using evidence themselves to improve services and reach other system goals related to health, human services, and education. In fact, comparing research and sharing experiences between disciplines had become routine across Stalwart County.

Just last week, Albie had been a guest facilitator at an orientation program for new probation and parole executives. She had told them the story of her department's EBP implementation. Paying attention to organizational alignment and staff development had been key to building her agency's capacity for moving and maintaining the change effort over time. The new automated data system, a true countywide collaboration effort in terms of resources and talent, had also been critical for supplying staff and other county officials with the information they needed to make good decisions about sentencing options that were both effective and economically feasible. Those basic principles of behavior

change, it turned out, had applicability for offenders and staff, as well as to the entire organization and human services system.

It had been an experience that was sometimes frustrating and difficult, but always rewarding, and Albie had been glad to share it with the next generation of leaders. Maybe the next time a chief was invited to coffee by her boss, the cherry pie wouldn't go to waste.

In fact, it occurred to Albie that she could probably use an evidence based approach with her husband on this rain forest idea of his. If she could just get him to objectively weigh the benefits of chilled pineapple juice on the beach against those of freeze dried space food in the mud...

References

Lowenkamp Note: the author first heard this definition from Christopher Lowenkamp with the University of Cincinnati, who cites the following source: Sacket, D.L., Richardson, W.S., Rosenberg, W., & Haynes, R.B. *Evidence-based Medicine: How to Practice and Teach EBM, 2nd Ed.* New York: Churchill Livingstone, 2000.

Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Joplin, L., Keiser, G., Wasson, B., & Woodward, W. *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*, jointly prepared by the National Institute of Corrections in Washington, D.C., and Crime and Justice Institute in Boston, Massachusetts, 2004. This document is available at www.nicic.org/library/default.aspx?library=019342.

Dot Faust is a Correctional Program Specialist with the National Institute of Corrections in Washington D.C.

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 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.

UTILIZING A PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM TO ENHANCE DECISION-MAKING IN A COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AGENCY

by

John Evangelista, John Corrigan, and William Geoghegan

This is the first article in a three-part series about developing and using a performance measurement and accountability system at a community corrections agency.

Abstract

Performance measurement systems have become essential tools for managers in criminal justice agencies. These systems combine individual accountability with quantitative measurement of mission-critical activities, and allow empirical analysis of core functions. Community corrections agencies can utilize the information obtained from a standardized performance measurement system to manage more effectively throughout the chain of command. The New York City Department of Probation's STARS program is examined as a reference point for executives who are considering implementing a performance measurement system, with a focus on the value these systems add to decision-making and organizational development. STARS' two-tiered approach combines examination of key indicators — input, output, workload, efficiency, and outcome measures — with monthly accountability exercises to analyze and enhance agency performance. The lessons learned in six years of using STARS as a performance measurement and accountability mechanism are also described.

Introduction

Managers in criminal justice agencies face significant challenges regarding effective professional practices and efficient resource allocation. Community correction agencies are particularly vulnerable to resource-based trade-offs, with supervisors often making critical day-to-day operational decisions based on risk avoidance rather than a desire to optimize performance. With probation caseloads increasing nationwide (Glaze and Bonczar, 2006), and operating budgets for this segment of the criminal justice field generally decreasing, the stakes for managers throughout the ranks of probation departments have never been higher.

For this reason, the emergence of performance measurement/accountability systems in the public sector has been a positive development for our field, and one that holds great promise for future improvements in the profession. Specific to community corrections, there is now enough evidence in place to begin reviewing current practices at agencies that have developed this type of system. This article examines STARS, the performance measurement and accountability program at the New York City Department of Probation, as a potential model for other community corrections agencies.

History

The Department created the STARS program in 2001. STARS, which stands for "Statistical Tracking, Analysis & Reporting

System," was designed to assess the Department's ability to meet stated goals and objectives, identify both strengths and weaknesses in completing the agency's mission-critical tasks, and standardize reporting of key agency indicators. STARS' ultimate purpose is to serve as an instrument for maximizing public safety and increasing the life skills of adult and juvenile probationers. Additionally, the STARS system has improved accountability at all levels of management within the Department, rewarded individual managers for outstanding performance, and served as a catalyst for enhanced organizational development and strategic planning.

The history of performance measurement initiatives in New York City dates back to the 1970s (Ukeles, 1982), and the City's bi-annual Mayor's Management Report has incorporated performance measurement measures since 1995. The model for STARS, however, was the City's most successful performance-based program to date: the New York City Police Department's CompStat program, which had obtained unprecedented improvements in crime reduction over its five-year history (Silverman, 1998; McDonald, 2002). CompStat's performance system was developed for a modern police force, but based on concepts that could be applied to any large-scale organization:

- Reduce hierarchy and overhead.
- Maximize local responsibility at all levels of the organization.
- Decentralize power and authority.
- Reduce specialization, to maximize resources where services are delivered.

Given that the primary mission of a probation department is to protect the public, and that our client population consisted of offenders based in the surrounding community, CompStat's performance-based objectives were easily adapted to a community corrections setting. The Department also had the benefit of a mentoring agency, the City Department of Correction, during the start-up phase of the program. Corrections was chosen for this task because it had already created an adaptation of CompStat, and had a similar organizational culture to Probation due to its public safety mission. This relationship proved valuable in creating efficiencies during the developmental phase of STARS.

Description / Overview of the STARS System

STARS is a two-tiered system. It combines key indicators — input, output, efficiency, and outcome statistics — that measure performance against established standards, with monthly accountability exercises. The monthly STARS meetings place managers in a forum with senior executive staff where key indicators are examined and problem-solving strategies are assessed. At a qualitative level, STARS meetings are a mechanism for grooming managers at all levels of the organization. As such, the information obtained from six years of practicing STARS

Executive Exchange

has been valuable in advancing the Department's management training objectives.

The STARS reporting system is quite straightforward. STARS' twin components of performance measurement and accountability are linked, and are routinely applied to the Department's day-to-day work activities.

The performance measurement function consists of data collection and reporting on standardized templates. Key indicators are tracked on electronic forms that reside on selected users' desktop computers. Data is submitted in a "hub and spoke" fashion, with one responsible party in each branch office forwarding data and other necessary information to the STARS unit at headquarters. This design was chosen because it provided a one-to-one reporting relationship for branch offices but kept the system efficient and eliminated the "reporting silos" (multiple, unlinked reporting channels) that existed at the Department prior to implementing STARS.

The Department's technology infrastructure at the time STARS was developed consisted of a wide-area computer network and an automated case management system linked to a legacy database. The case management system had limited, proprietary reporting capabilities and did not allow users to produce customized reports. Based on the requirement to develop STARS with existing human and material resources, key indicators during the start-up phase were obtained from two sources: indicators that were already being collected were drawn from existing management reports within the automated case management system. New indicators were gathered by giving users reporting forms created from standardized spreadsheets. These spreadsheets were forwarded as e-mail attachments to the STARS unit each month. This method allowed the Department to launch STARS within three months of its design without purchasing additional equipment and with only a modest investment in computer spreadsheet training. The Department is currently developing a new automated case management system with an open architecture and customized management reporting to improve both the functionality and efficiency of STARS.

The STARS accountability function is comprised of a monthly meeting at headquarters, as well as internal review sessions at local branch offices. The monthly STARS meeting reviews the activities at two commands within the Department, one each from adult and juvenile operations. Executives and mid-level managers from branch offices discuss their operations relative to the STARS key indicators, then participate in a question-and-answer period with senior executive staff. The assessment of managers at the STARS meeting has both a macro and micro component: at the macro level, overall problem-solving and executive skills are scrutinized; at the micro level, the particulars of individual cases related to misconduct and programmatic issues are discussed, with a focus on the knowledge of case-specific material throughout the chain of command. This bifurcated assessment system has proven invaluable to managers striving to develop the proper skill set to lead a large-scale operation.

Internal sessions at the branch offices occur on both a routine and random basis. They engage branch chiefs, first-level supervisors, and probation officers in data review and problem-solving exercises. These internal meetings also serve as "mini-STARS" sessions, where new managers and officers are groomed for future participation in actual STARS meetings.

STARS' Effect on Decision-Making

To understand how STARS has simplified and improved managerial decision-making at the Department, it is instructive to review the four operational principals that drove CompStat development (Dussault, 1999). Practicing CompStat at the local command level requires:

1. Accurate, timely intelligence clearly communicated to all.
2. Rapid deployment that is concentrated, synchronized, and focused.
3. Effective tactics and strategies.
4. Relentless follow-up and assessment.

Emphasizing the importance of business intelligence and results, rather than simple outputs, was the key to changing the organizational culture at the Department. At the most fundamental level, the STARS system has improved decision-making within the Department by forcing managers throughout the chain of command to focus on the core mission, to prioritize objectives, and to develop creative problem-solving techniques. Standardization of key reporting functions and constant reinforcement of CompStat principals has resulted in a fundamental change within the Department, to the point where managers now know that STARS is not only a powerful management tool but also the primary basis for assessing and rating the value they add to the organization.

Since the key indicator sets in STARS were developed systematically and are based on the agency's core mission in the main functional areas of intake, investigations, and supervision, they have become organic to the operations of local branch offices. Managers recognize that their day-to-day decisions cannot occur in a vacuum, and that the data-driven indicators in the STARS Report actually help them make better decisions. In addition, managers at the Department routinely participate in STARS new indicator development, which improves their problem-solving skills and adds to the sense of buy-in within their ranks.

Participation in the question-and-answer period at STARS meetings has helped supervisors conduct better interviews, case conferences, and debriefings at their own branch offices. The practice of "drilling down" for information about individual cases of misconduct, repeat offenders, pattern crimes, crime clusters, and joint operations with other law enforcement agencies — an integral part of every STARS meeting's review of rearrests — has become a form of management training in itself. New probation supervisors learn the same methods employed by the Police Department at CompStat meetings; these systematic, case-specific reviews were the primary factor behind the historic crime reduction in the City over the past decade, and they have begun to generate similar benefits for the Probation Department in its mandate to supervise high-risk offenders in the community.

At the branch office level, supervisors are now exploiting the experience gained in six years of STARS reporting and assessment in multiple ways, both up and down the chain of command. They are now participating in resource allocation decisions previously made exclusively by executive staff based on their ground-level analysis of STARS workload and output indicators. They are also training probation officers to take ownership of their work within the macro context of STARS. This is a relatively new concept for officers who had traditionally managed their caseloads on an individual basis. Seeing the "big picture" aspect of misconduct,

case contacts, field work, and programming among the probationers they supervise within their community has helped groom many officers as supervisors.

Strategic Planning: A Premise to Performance-Based Operations

To develop an understanding of how an organization successfully pursues objectives related to mission, prioritization, and problem-solving, it is necessary to briefly de-construct the logic behind the CompStat process that served as the basis for STARS, and observe the way that it changes organizational culture. Creating a CompStat-based program requires a total evaluation of the organization's mission and core functions, followed by a systematic developmental process that adheres to sound business practices.

First and foremost, performance-based initiatives must be built on a solid strategic plan. A well-articulated mission statement and overarching goals must be developed. Without a clear mission, decisions are unlikely to be made consistently and cannot be effectively distributed below top organizational levels. Strategic context provides a guide for decision-makers throughout an organization. It encourages decision-making based on consistent criteria, regardless of who is making the decisions. The strategic plan must be understood and embraced by all levels of the organization before committing to develop such a system. Goals must be focused, achievable, and derived from the agency's overall mission.

A sound strategic plan is equally critical to the business objectives that emerge from the goal-setting process once the decision to develop a performance measurement system has been made. Objectives are the operational focal points for performance indicator development and describe specific results and outcomes to be accomplished. Objectives must be completed in a preset time frame; they are stated in terms of "what," "when," and "who." They are specific, quantitative, measurable, and time-limited.

In order for objectives to foster good decision-making, they must focus on the following principals:

- **Internal Accountability**

Measuring performance gives community corrections policy makers a significant tool to achieve accountability. The monthly reporting cycle keeps the focus on the agency's mission and goals. It provides "organizational gauges" that can be quickly referenced to maintain the proper course of action. If variances occur they must be explained and responsible parties must account for the differences. This needs to be done every month and it must be **relentless**. Follow-up is continuous until variances are corrected or the performance indicator is changed as a result of a strategic plan adjustment.

- **External or Public Accountability**

Public safety is the key mission of all community corrections agencies. The public is our stakeholder. While publicizing performance evaluation information can be discomfiting to government officials, public availability of performance measurement data is one of the strongest benefits of a good accountability system. It can stimulate a much greater interest on the part of the public, and can result in an even greater emphasis on quality. It holds senior executives accountable for results rather than simply being stewards of inputs.

- **Effective Use of Resources**

Resource allocation is one of the most critical elements of performance-based operations. People are the most important resource in any large-scale organization. In order to create the best work environment and obtain full value from the human resources in an agency, workload must be scrutinized. To ascertain optimal caseload ratios, targets need to be developed based on available staffing levels. The question, "Are you under or over your target staff levels?" must be asked and reviewed for each operational component of an organization. In order to optimize resources, community corrections agencies also need to analyze their population based on risk. Resources need to be focused on those at highest risk, and constant monitoring of this population is required. This re-affirms the risk assessment and "right-focusing" of staff resources.

- **Fiscal Responsibility**

One of the logical steps in the effort to manage for results involves the integration of performance measurement with budgeting systems. Agencies must be held accountable for use of resources, to measure the unit cost of services, and to determine if the public is getting "the biggest bang for the buck." Fiscal-oriented performance information helps policymakers place a monetary value on program operations. This allows them to ask if the end outcome is worth the full program expenditure needed for its achievement.

- **A Framework for Rapid and Focused Adjustments to Business Processes**

Intrinsic to strategic planning is selecting the organization's primary areas of focus. Performance measurement systems must be built on this framework. From the onset, STARS has been based on three main concepts tied to the Department's core mission:

- Produce accurate and timely investigations.
- Conduct aggressive, proactive supervision of offenders who present the highest risk for violent recidivism.
- Provide immediate, continuous, comprehensive follow-up on misconduct.

The daily business decisions that are made in our branch offices revolve around these key issues. Every question asked at a STARS meeting is related to our Department's success in pursuing objectives tied to these three concepts. CompStat provides a unique framework that "keeps the eye on the prize." The key indicator data associated with these concepts is continuously collected and routinely reviewed with accountability in mind. Part of this accountability model is the ability to make responsive changes to business processes and keep the operation on course. The operational manager actually owns the business process and adjusts it accordingly.

- **"Asking the Right Questions"**

Problem-solving drives the CompStat process. The biggest challenge in leading an organization relative to CompStat principals is linking big-picture strategy to everyone's daily actions. This sets the organization's direction. Leaders must develop and ask questions that secure meaningful information, provoke reflection and initiate action. The questions must be based on information gathered from both compo-

Executive Exchange

nents of the STARS system: results from key indicators in the monthly report, and the interaction inherent in the STARS meeting process.

Questions in a CompStat setting must be formed in a way that allow operational managers to employ their own logic and managerial skill set to the problem-solving process. This method of questioning takes longer than a simple interrogatory style, but provides significant long-term pay off. Experience gained in six years of practicing STARS has shown that junior executives and mid-level managers who learn creative problem-solving and who reach their own conclusions buy in to the CompStat process much faster than those who are simply admonished and told what to do.

Effective questioning encourages participation and teamwork, and fosters “outside-the-box” thinking in order to solve problems. It creates opportunities for others to ask questions and generate creative solutions. Most importantly, CompStat leaders who master the “*Asking the Right Questions*” process are modeling effective management behavior and grooming their subordinates for the next level of management. It is a practice that can be replicated, and it empowers all levels of the organization to act independently.

This type of organizational development doesn’t just happen; it is the product of careful planning. Developing a CompStat-based performance measurement and accountability system requires a significant commitment of human and material resources. The agency’s chief executive must create a working group whose primary purpose is to establish the new system, and should assign a responsible party who is a direct report as the head of this group. To increase the prospects for success, this individual must have some knowledge of formal project management, and also needs to be versed in creating management indicators that are based on the agency’s core mission and overarching values.

Payoff: Bottom-Line Benefits to the Organization

Six years of implementing STARS has provided the Department with valuable business intelligence and resulted in improved operations in each core functional area. Chief executives, however, must prioritize human and material resource costs when considering such an undertaking, so the focus of this section will be on the payoff of implementing STARS.

The primary institutional benefit of operating a standardized performance measurement system is the ability to increase the number of operational decisions that are empirically rather than intuitively based. From a quantitative, value-added standpoint, the yield of the STARS program is greatest in the following areas:

- Providing an empirical, data-driven method of evaluating performance.
- Standardizing data collection and reporting.
- Systematically improving case management and follow-up on misconduct.
- Improving organizational skills, time management and prioritization.
- Enhancing business processes through constant monitoring and analysis.
- Allocating scarce resources most efficiently.

- Moving the organization toward utilizing best practices in our field.
- Creating a catalyst for healthy competition among managers.

The qualitative benefits of STARS are no less impressive. They include:

- Creating an intense focus on the core mission.
- Eliminating sacred cows — every element of the operation is reviewed for potential improvement.
- Minimizing the fear of change.
- Creating a unifying sense of purpose.
- Requiring that every manager learn the organization’s culture.
- Including managers in developing agency priorities and business metrics.
- Increasing communication up & down the chain of command.
- Making performance review routine, rather than crisis-driven.
- Creating an expectation among managers that standards must routinely be met.
- Developing ownership of work throughout the ranks.
- Institutionalizing the “STARS factor”: intense scrutiny and follow-up that accelerates problem resolution.
- Improving problem-solving and presentation skills among managers.

The long-range benefits of data-driven performance measurement are useful for internal planning and for advancing our profession. Six years of experience in implementing a performance measurement system has provided the Department with ample historical data as well as operational experience about what works in assessing the main business processes in a large-scale community corrections setting. This information is being utilized as the basis for conducting comparative analysis of programs, long-term trend analysis, and further development of evidence-based practices.

Looking toward the future, the Department has begun to exploit the benefits of geo-coding its adult and juvenile caseloads by utilizing crime mapping in tracking probationer misconduct. This enhancement, combined with the availability of STARS historical data about offenders, has allowed the agency to improve field enforcement and share intelligence with City, state, and federal law enforcement officials.

Conclusion

A performance measurement and accountability system is a useful tool for improving core operations at a community corrections agency. It can also serve as a gateway to improving long-range planning, organizational development, and management training. The decision to establish this type of system should be made in the context of existing human and material resources, and requires total buy-in throughout the ranks of the organization to be successful.

Agencies committing to this type of project must assign a working group whose primary purpose is to deliver the program within established timeframes. A manager who reports directly to the chief executive, and who has some formal project management skills must lead the group. This individual must also be versed in developing key management indicators that are based on the agency’s core mission and overarching values.

The initial scope of the performance measurement system should be modest and attainable, and should draw on a combination of both existing reports and newly-developed statistical indicators. The planning and developmental stages of the program must adhere to sound business practices and project management principals.

Once underway, the organization must train its managers on the new system. The training must emphasize the principals of CompStat and the methods inherent in successfully running a two-tiered accountability system that combines key statistical indicators and data-driven accountability exercises. The combined effect of decentralizing authority and maximizing local responsibility improves decision-making throughout the chain of command within a department. The payoff of implementing a performance measurement system is significant and can measurably improve operations, particularly in an era of diminishing resources.

The next article in this series will provide a detailed description of how to establish a CompStat program at a probation department. The final installment will discuss the long-term effects of CompStat on organizational development at an agency.

References

Dussault, R., "Jack Maple: Betting on Intelligence." *Government Technology*, Vol. 12, No. 5, April 1999.

Glaze, L.E. & Bonczar, T.P. *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2005*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, November 2006.

McDonald, P.P. *Managing Police Operations: Implementing the New York Crime Control Model — CompStat*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth / Thompson Learning, 2002.

Silverman, E.B. *NYPD Battles Crime: Innovative Strategies in Policing*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998.

Ukeles, J.B. *Doing More With Less: Turning Public Management Around*. New York: AMACOM, 1982.

John Evangelista is Associate Commissioner for Management, Analysis, and Planning for the New York City Department of Probation.

John Corrigan is the Executive Director of the STARS Program at the New York City Department of Probation.

William Geoghegan is the Special Operations Liaison for the New York City Department of Probation.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO CRAFT PURPOSE

by

Robert D. Behn, Ph.D.

In his book *Certain Trumpets: The Nature of Leadership*, Gary Wills writes: "Lincoln had no clear expression of the popular will to implement. He had to elicit the program he wanted to serve, and that always involves affecting the views one is consulting."

The same is true for today's public executives. Many of the issues they face are not quite as polarizing or explosive as Lincoln's challenges of slavery and the preservation of a nation. Still, most public executives are given "no clear expression of the popular will to implement."

The legislature does not do this. Rather, the legislature needs — if it is to pass anything — to obscure a variety of tensions. Despite all of the "whereases" in the preamble — indeed, precisely because of all of the multiple and conflicting "whereases" — public executives lack definitive guidance about what specific purposes they should pursue. Further, a 51-49 agreement, even when it is enacted into law, is hardly a "clear expression of the popular will."

So what is a public executive to do? One obvious answer is the mimic the legislature — to reflect in words and deeds the bundle of contradictions and obfuscations reflected in society and the law. This, however, is not necessarily a safe choice. Despite the ambiguity and abstruseness of the legislation, each individual legislator has some very clear ideas.

At a legislative hearing, the public executive can be confronted with a series of very pointed questions that reflect very different purposes. The same can happen at any public forum, at which

stakeholders with very specific objectives will again confront the public executive with definitive but conflicting demands. A public executive may try — with a variety of individualized, targeted initiatives — to mollify every individual interest. This however, does not guarantee success, or even survival.

An alternative to dexterous mollification is active leadership. This strategy also comes with no guarantee of survival. But it does bring the potential to accomplish something.

To exercise such leadership, public executives craft a purpose and then mobilize the means to achieve it. Today's public executives cannot, any more than Lincoln, choose alone. Their choice must be acceptable to others — perhaps to only a few others, perhaps to many different others.

The leader needs followers, and to create such followers, argues Wills, "agreement on a goal is necessary." In fact, that is what Wills argues leaders do: "The leader is one who mobilizes others toward a goal shared by leader and followers." And lest his readers miss his point, Wills reiterates it: "the goal must be shared."

And, if a goal is, indeed, to be shared, the public executive must (as Lincoln did) affect the views of the followers. Thus, leaders must listen to these potential followers. In fact, while consulting these possible followers, the leader has the opportunity to influence their thinking.

Public executives have to "elicit the program" that they, the people who work in their organization, and a lot of citizens want "to serve." This requires the subtle kind of political leadership that

Executive Exchange

Wills advocates. Such leadership is neither dictatorial nor subservient. Rather, it requires both conviction and convincing.

Leaders set direction and assure others that this direction makes sense. They describe an alternative vision of the future and convince others that it is both desirable and achievable. And although such others are inevitably labeled “followers,” they are really more than that. For they not only accept direction but also shape it. Still, it is the leader (whether by exercising formal authority or by taking the initiative) who molds people’s beliefs, thoughts, and desires into a coherent whole — a strategy they can collectively pursue.

Most of the time, the leader does not need full agreement. Public executives in particular may need agreement only from some people within the organization and some in their authorizing environment. Perhaps one or two people — the Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, or the president of a key stakeholder organization — must give their consent. Or it may only be necessary to deter their active opposition.

Initially, the public executive may not need the support from even a majority of citizens or of those within the organization. A small, dedicated group can accomplish the first small wins. These

small wins provide an opportunity for learning and adjustments. And they can help to convince others that both the purpose and the strategy are desirable and prudent. Some will continue to dissent or disagree but, as the momentum builds, many will sign on. Others will remain quiescent or leave.

As leaders, public executives not only craft purposes judiciously to reflect and affect the views of others, they also pursue these purposes with a strategy that produces some initial successes. Then they use these successes both to learn how to adjust the strategy to produce more successes and to affect the views of those whom they continue to consult.

Robert D. Behn, Ph.D., is a Lecturer at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

This article originally appeared in the February 2007 edition of the *Public Management Report*. It is reprinted with permission. Copyright 2007 by Robert D. Behn. Subscription to the online *Public Management Report* is available free by going to www.ksg.harvard.edu/TheBehnReport.

OBSESSED WITH “BEST PRACTICE”

by

Robert D. Behn, Ph.D.

If, as Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, “consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds,” then “best practice” is the refuge of unimaginative ones. Unfortunately, public managers everywhere are on a manic search for “best practice.”

Students at the John F. Kennedy School of Government are required to write a second-year policy report for a client in the public or nonprofit sector. And what does this client inevitably want? You guessed it: “best practice.” The client, presumably a seasoned public official with significant responsibilities, asks this young graduate student with considerably less experience to identify “best practice” in the official’s own field.

Do these public managers not know what the leaders in their field are doing? Have they not devoted research and thought to how effectiveness is (could be and should be) achieved in agencies with similar responsibilities? Do they not go to a conference or two just to learn what approaches others might be trying? Do they not read (or, at least, skim) the management books that populate airport bookstores? Do they not subscribe to management magazines and executive e-zines? Have they not analyzed the origins of their agency’s unique challenges and examined possible strategies for overcoming them? Why are they so obsessed with identifying something that someone else has labeled “best practice”?

Because, if they can discover a “best practice” — a certifiably “best” practice — then they can stop thinking.

If a practice is indeed “best,” managers don’t have to worry about why or how the practice works. They don’t have to worry about whether the practice will prove effective in their specific organization with its distinctive problems and particular social,

economic, and political circumstances. Someone else has wrestled with all of the puzzling specifics, thus insuring that the practice is universally applicable. Managers who adopt a best practice don’t have to worry about the usual (though inevitably exasperating) details of implementation. After all, the practice is a “best” one. Everyone recognizes that.

Furthermore, once they have identified a “best practice,” public managers don’t have to explain it to others. They need not justify their new practice to colleagues, superiors, or overseers (from legislators, to journalists, to citizens). All they need to do is announce that they have implemented “best practice.” Everyone will be duly impressed.

In adopting a “best practice,” public managers conveniently avoid the hard work of figuring out whether this practice will do something that their organization needs done. The practice is the “best” one — or at least a “best” one — they can confidently assure both themselves and others.

Everyone will agree. Who will challenge the unnamed management gurus who have warranted the practice as “best”? Who is willing to look foolish by claiming that something else might be better — not that it is guaranteed to be better, just that it *might* be better?

You, of course, have heard of it: The International Center for Best Practice. It has charters from the United Nations and the World Bank, and is stocked with Nobel laureates in management. Once a year, they convene in Zurich, Singapore, or Capetown to choose a few, select practices to be officially authenticated as a “best practice.” If the head of a public agency can find one of these practices and implement it throughout his or her organi-

zation, no one can dispute that he or she is not is an *au courant* public executive.

Yet, regardless of who has accredited a practice as best, before implementing it, the public manager needs to answer two questions. Whether a practice is a narrow administrative system or an innovative leadership strategy — whether the practice is “best,” “better,” simply “good,” or purely experimental — the manager needs to be able to answer the “why?” question and the “how?” question.

Why? Why are we implementing this practice? What vital (or merely helpful) purposes will we achieve by implementing this practice? What will the practice accomplish? Management practices are not abstract cure-alls — organizational patent medicines that will remedy all kinds of organizational afflictions from dysfunctional legislation to conflicting stakeholder pressures. Implementing any managerial practice — good, better, or best — makes sense only if the practice will, somehow, help resolve one or more of the problems that prevent our organization from achieving our mission.

How? How will this specific practice help to resolve our particular problems? What is our cause-and-effect theory? How does this practice work in general — in the ideal case? And how must this practice be adapted to work in our particular circumstances to help our agency accomplish its public purposes?

The search for “best practice” is the early twenty-first century’s equivalent of the early twentieth century’s search for “one best

way.” The language is a little less absolute. It isn’t *the* one best way. It is merely *a* best practice (modified by a distinctly indefinite article).

This is the beauty of the search for best practice. There can be many best practices — maybe even thousands of them. Consequently, managers need not be very discriminating. The can choose from a long menu of best practices, without worrying about whether it will provide some operational nutrition or merely create institutional heartburn. Each manager can select from the menu of best practices something that he or she finds personally appetizing.

For too many public managers, the search for “best practice” has become a substitute for thinking.

Robert D. Behn, Ph.D., is a Lecturer at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He is the author of *Performance Leadership: 11 Better Practices That Can Ratchet Up Performance*.

This article originally appeared in the July 2006 edition of the *Public Management Report*. It is reprinted with permission. Copyright 2006 by Robert D. Behn. Subscription to the online *Public Management Report* is available free by going to www.ksg.harvard.edu/TheBehnReport.

A RESPONSE TO BEHN’S ESSAY ON BEST PRACTICES

by

Ron R. Goethals

Although I cannot imagine managing without the aid of research and some qualitative labeling of practices, I find myself in substantial agreement with Dr. Behn. In February 2005 I had the privilege of addressing the American Probation and Parole Association. While much of my presentation extolled the virtues of best (evidence based) practices, I expressed three serious cautions.

First was my fear that practitioners would develop tunnel vision. Managers would use only safe and defensible approaches. We would ignore the fact that empirical evidence often changes with time and that the best practices of today may be discredited tomorrow.

My second caution was that funding sources (legislatures, Department of Corrections, etc.) might fund only proven approaches. Experimentation and innovation would cease. We would forget that many of the current best practices were initiated with little supporting empirical evidence.

My final caution was that it is as important to do things right, as it is to do the right thing. When best practices are duplicated, program integrity is often lost. Changes are made as improvements or local accommodation, but serve to ensure that the program is no longer the empirically proven best practice.

I agree with Dr. Behn’s statement that “for too many public managers, the search for “best practice” has become a substitute for thinking.” Too often we are running around with solutions looking for the problems they will solve. The far more difficult task is to identify the problem and to develop the solution. I am reminded of the cliché that if all you have is a hammer, then every problem appears to be a nail.

Ron R. Goethals, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, is the retired Director of the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Dallas, Texas.

A RESPONSE INTERVIEW ABOUT BEHN'S VIEWS ON BEST PRACTICES WITH W. CONWAY BUSHEY

1. Prior to your retirement, when you described a proposal as "best practice," did you receive a more positive response from legislators, commissioners, etc.?

I did not deal with legislators, commissioners, etc. but my former supervisor (Director of the Office of Probation and Parole Services in Pennsylvania responsible for all field services) was very willing to listen to "best practices" and assigned me to chair a committee to study best practices and develop outcome-based objectives for the agency. One of my other responsibilities was to provide oversight services to county probation and parole administrators, and I had more difficulty in getting directors to listen to best practice concepts except in the more advanced counties. In my current role, I am developing our annual fall conference around "best practices" concepts and have the support of my Executive Board.

2. Do probation/parole leaders truly have the time and support needed to select best practices for their organizations? If not, why?

I believe that probation and parole administrators have the time and I know that my former agency has the support of the current Chairman of the Board. I also believe that one of the greatest difficulties is to "sell" new concepts to a work force that is resistant to change (e.g., motivational interviewing). However, if an agency is committed to implement new

practices and has the support of management staff, it can and will be accomplished.

3. When considering evidence-based programs and strategies what should our answers be to "Why are we implementing this practice?" and "How will this specific practice help to resolve a particular problem?"

One of the areas in which our profession was lacking was research to determine "what works." That has changed significantly in the last decade and if it can be shown that a particular practice works, it should be implemented, at least on a trial basis in local jurisdictions. Agencies that grow are willing to try new concepts and practices, some of which will have positive outcomes. High workloads have caused successful administrators to design programs that manage the risk of dangerous offenders as best they can and they need to rely on research that will help them make those critical decisions.

W. Conway Bushey, a retired executive with the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, currently serves as Executive Director of the County Chief Adult Probation and Parole Officers Association in Pennsylvania.

EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES: AN INTERVIEW WITH STEVE AOS

Guest Editor and former NAPE President **Cherie Townsend** recently interviewed **Steve Aos**, Associate Director of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, about issues in implementing evidence-based programs. The results of that interesting interview are found below.

Townsend: The Washington State Institute for Public Policy has issued a number of reports on evidence-based practices and programs. To begin our discussion, how do you define evidence-based programs?

Aos: Before providing a definition, I need to give a little background. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy was created by the Washington Legislature to carry out non-partisan research at the direction of the legislature and its board of directors. All the work we do comes to us during the legislative session. The Legislature or Board gives us assignments to study things. In recent years, the Board has asked that we do evidence-based research because the Board wants support for the outcomes in areas of juvenile justice, mental health, child welfare, and substance abuse (there may be more areas). The Board is specific about what it is that they want. We are asked to do an evidence-based review to find out what outcomes will be used to reduce crimes. We find out things that can help the

Board to achieve those outcomes, e.g., reduce prisons and costs. What can we do to achieve these outcomes and attain improvements in state systems? We then set up procedures that establish a reasonable, scientific probability that something exerts a cause and effect based on that outcome. Some people that do evidence-based research require random assignment in the research design which means some people are randomly given a treatment and some are randomly assigned not to get the treatment in order to determine if an outcome was achieved or not. We like these types of studies, and we include them whenever an assignment is well done. We also include other studies when there is a solid comparison group even if it wasn't randomly assigned, such as drug court studies that we have looked at. There are only a few drug court random studies. So, when we say evidence-based, what we are talking about is strong research with control groups whether it's randomly assigned or not randomly assigned; solid evidence that somebody got the treatment and somebody else didn't get the treatment and there is a reasonable follow up period and outcome for those two groups.

Townsend: One of the things you indicated is that your legislature tells you the outcome that they're really wanting to achieve and then you are doing research to try to find what kind of things will produce those outcomes. In community

corrections there has been some tension on the outcomes of treatment vs. public safety. Have you had to address that?

Aos: In other studies we have been asked to look at substance abuse, alcohol abuse, or smoking — illegal and legal... it has outcomes. So we've produced reviews for some of that literature as well as looking at those outcomes not as immediate causes on their way to crime or otherwise. Sub-measures of abuse of alcohol or drugs are the outcomes themselves. We've looked at these sub-measures. We have not looked at any programs where just completing an educational program is an outcome, because our legislature has not asked us to look at those as outcomes. And, normally people wouldn't regard those as ultimate outcomes of why you do public policy other than maybe completing high school. I don't know if just completing high school would be considered an outcome.

Townsend: **Would it be fair to say that people are selling or describing what they do as evidence-based and that is becoming a very popular thing to do? Would it be fair to say that leaders in this field should be looking at what outcomes these programs measured before concluding that they are truly evidence-based?**

Aos: Everybody should know what they want to accomplish. Different people will have different goals in life, in general. For someone that runs a school, the outcome may be to get a high completion rate out of that program. Our legislature has been less interested in outcomes that you would call process outcomes, such as how many people got through an educational program in prison. In a correctional situation, they are more interested in what would be a reduction in crime or reduced incarceration rates. Whatever your outcome is, you still want to be reasonable and assured that there is a cause and an effect. The critical thing is did some kind of action, e.g., putting a person into program, have an outcome that you wanted it to have or not have happen. It's like getting your hand burned — that is a clear cause and effect. What we look for are studies that can also make cause and effect statements about crime or completing an education or reducing substance abuse.

Townsend: **In your October 26, 2006 report — "Evidence Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Future Prison Construction Criminal Justice Cost and Crime Rate" — you looked at a lot of different programs. Of the options you looked at, which would you encourage the members of NAPE to explore?**

Aos: There are different options for juveniles and adults, though there are some commonalities that I think we've found in those programs. In the juvenile field there are some very specific programs that we found produce the desired outcomes. Some of these are "off the shelf programs" or sometimes they are called "manualized programs." They have already been tested. In these programs there is a specific approach to treatment, and we find that some of those programs are called "blueprint programs" after Del Elliott's work at the University of Colorado. Those programs don't have to be re-invented; they have already been tested in the field and are being implemented in places across the country. The very best programs that achieve outcomes, such as crime reduction or reduced recidivism, have attractive economics from a taxpayers' perspective. In these programs for every dollar that

they spend, they save a lot more money in terms of long-term criminal justice costs and saved costs to victims. Some of those programs — Functional Family Therapy, Multi-Systemic Therapy, and Aggression Replacement Training, look very attractive to us because there is scientific evidence they reduce crime rates, have attractive economics, and can be replicated — they do not have to be reinvented. Here in Washington State, governmental agencies don't have to hire the experts to go in and design and spend years testing different approaches to the program. What we have been able to do in our state is to implement the program faithfully with high levels of quality. It's not an easy task, but at least we don't have to go in and hire the experts. Whenever we can find programs that have been demonstrated to work with rigorous science that also have attractive economics and are manualized programs, we don't have to reinvent those so they appear to be very attractive to us. Attractive programs are not only easier to implement, but also happen to have some of the best economics around. Those are the programs we encourage in both the juvenile and the adult field. We find a few more of those specific kinds of programs in the juvenile field, which may be because of the interest of other researchers in this field over the years.

Townsend: **May we replicate Exhibit 4 in "Evidence Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Future Prison Construction Criminal Justice Cost and Crime Rate," which provides a comparison of several programs and their effect on crime outcomes?**

Aos: You can replicate it. It's important to know about Exhibit 4 that there are two kinds of information in this exhibit. Our assessment of recidivism rates or crime rates is based on research studies and would be the same if I had done the analysis. They would not be different if I was in Florida or Utah. Those would have been my assessment for the likelihood of success given all the research projects and reports that have been reviewed around the country. The next sets of columns are our estimates of the benefits that are in the costs that are associated with those programs that achieved those reductions and recidivism benefits. The benefits will be different from state to state. It is very important to understand that, because those are estimates for Washington State. For example, if a program like Functional Family Therapy reduces the crime rates for juveniles, part of the savings is that we are not going to have to spend as much money as taxpayers on the criminal justice system because they are not going through the system as often. That will depend on each state and each location and how punitive each state is. Washington's rate of incarceration is based on sentencing laws that are not as tough as the average state in the United States. The savings we get there are smaller as a result. The benefit would be higher in the average state in our nation.

Townsend: **As you've done this work have you identified any lessons that leaders in other states can learn about replicating and sustaining evidence-based programming in community corrections?**

Aos: I guess the first lesson is that it is hard work. Our first efforts in Washington State juvenile justice systems were to implement some of those blueprint programs from 1999. We did our first review of the research and our first economic analysis of all the literature from all around the country. A couple of them looked very attractive to us, so the legislature funded them as a result

Executive Exchange

of our recommendation. The funding was for implementation in our state's juvenile courts. When they began to implement those programs statewide, they also asked the Institute to do an evaluation to determine if Washington got the same kind of savings as those documented in the national evaluation. What we found out when we completed the evaluation three to four years later with an eighteen-month follow up on recidivism was that, on average, those evidence-based programs did not work. What we found was those therapists that were hired by the courts that were doing the program by the book were getting the savings that we had found in some of those other research studies where there were attractive economics. But, those therapists that we were paying to do functional family therapy who were actually off doing something else entirely on their own, they did not receive a significant reduction in recidivism. As a matter of fact, they had a higher rate of recidivism. We found that you have to have quality control. What we learned was that the State needs to spend some money to make sure that the programs are being done faithfully; according to the book. The lessons are that you must provide training of therapists or providers of an evidence-based program with update booster sessions. It is a management responsibility to insure that therapists are doing a program the way it should be done. When you get that, you get the benefits that we think you should get and when you don't do that, the program will probably go down. These are a couple of the lessons we have learned. It was one thing to analyze the program. On paper it looks like it should work, and it's another thing to implement the programs with fidelity. It needs to be tested and managed to make sure we are getting the results we want or you expect it to get. You have to work hard to make sure that they work.

Townsend: In your report on what works in benefits and costs, intensive supervision and surveillance-oriented programs always show up in the red. Given the costs out weigh the benefit costs of these programs, why do you think we continue to invest in them from a public policy perspective? Is it the benefits are based on perception rather than on actually outcomes?

Aos: Well... who knows? Not everyone uses the results of the studies and cost analysis to make decisions. We don't expect everyone to. People may have different objectives other than just reducing crime, which is the outcome we measured when we looked at these programs. The other motives that people have to do these programs are not ones we measured in this study... so I don't know. I can't speak to that. What we can speak to is that if your goal is to reduce crime or recidivism rates, then simply lowering the case load size of a probation or parole worker and not doing any more than that you shouldn't expect that you're going to achieve your goal. There is scientific evidence in both the juvenile and adult system that would indicate that on average you're not going to get a reduction in crime just because you have lowered the case load size of the average probation or parole worker. What we have found in the adult system is that if you reduce the caseload of a parole worker and accompany that with some increased spending for treatment, then you'll get a good rate of return for adult offenders. All those findings in our research point to the fact that we need to treat the reasons and some of the problems that cause people to be offenders in the first place. Whether it is substance abuse or mental health or other cognitive parts of one's thinking. Those need to be treated if you expect to have affects on subsequent crime rates.

Townsend: Why do you think it's so difficult for public agencies to invest in evidence-based strategies?

Aos: That's a very good question. Science is behind in actual practice. The actual number of research evaluations in some of these areas that we've looked at isn't that large. Some of them are brand new things. Mental health courts are relatively new areas of attempted programming, so we need more evaluations of that before for we'll know whether they will work. Some other areas, like drug court, just happened to come along at a time when there was an interest in doing evaluations. Drug courts have the most evaluation of any area we've found. So, we can feel confident about the results that we see on average for drug court. Some of these areas just have not been researched very much and so a manager wouldn't know whether some of these things work or not. Some of our own estimates are based on three to five studies on a certain topic. You'd like to have more studies before you can come out and say something works. The Food & Drug Administration has to confront the same issues when they determine what drugs can be sold and allowed in the United States. The FDA likes to have many trials of certain drugs to make sure they don't do harm before they are released — random assignments are done. So every field of scientific inquiry suffers these problems of not having enough studies to have a scientific conclusion. That causes a lot of difficulty in the real world and knowing how to implement these programs, let alone making an initial policy decision of selecting a strategy.

Townsend: What role does leadership play in the replication and sustaining of evidence-based strategies? How important is it that there is a formal or informal champion or a leader that said this is the outcome I want and I'm also committed to quality control?

Aos: There are decisions that have to be made along a long chain of decision makers. If we have a juvenile or adult offender, we want that offender to make a decision not to be engaged in crime. So this is the decision we want after the therapist is gone and the offender is out of jail or detention. Further up the chain there are a lot more decisions, which is the level where I work for the legislature and others work for city and county governments. Those people have to make decisions to embark on funding a strategy with taxpayer's money. There are key legislators that are important that make those decisions in Washington. There are probably ten people from the legislature that will be the key people in making a decision on how the money will be spent on evidence-based programs. So those are the people that have to be aware of what the possibilities are. They have to balance the interest in whether the money will be spent on priorities such as K-12 or transportation. The decision also affects the staff that is hired; so the right people can be hired. There has to be some people that have worked on the therapies. It's a substantial human endeavor to get to the final decision. Leadership is important. Some of the results that were reported in our October 2006 report are that we are doing what we are doing now to save taxpayers money and to provide a return on their dollar with the evidence-based programs that are already in placed in Washington. The report also shows we could save a number of prisons beds if we changed the portfolio.

For further information about the work of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy please visit www.wsipp.wa.gov.

Exhibit 4

Reducing Crime With Evidence-Based Options: What Works, and Benefits & Costs

Washington State Institute for Public Policy Estimates as of October, 2006	Effect on Crime Outcomes Percent change in crime outcomes, & the number of evidence-based studies on which the estimate is based (in parentheses) (1)		Benefits and Costs (Per Participant, Net Present Value, 2006 Dollars)			
			Benefits to Crime Victims (of the reduction in crime) (2)	Benefits to Taxpayers (of the reduction in crime) (3)	Costs (marginal program cost, compared to the cost of alternative) (4)	Benefits (total) Minus Costs (per participant) (5)
Notes: "n/e" means not estimated at this time. Prevention program costs are partial program costs, pro-rated to match crime outcomes.						
Programs for People in the Adult Offender System						
Vocational education in prison	-9.0% (4)	\$8,114	\$6,806	\$1,182	\$13,738	
Intensive supervision: treatment-oriented programs	-16.7% (11)	\$9,318	\$9,369	\$7,124	\$11,563	
General education in prison (basic education or post-secondary)	-7.0% (17)	\$6,325	\$5,306	\$962	\$10,669	
Cognitive-behavioral therapy in prison or community	-6.3% (25)	\$5,658	\$4,746	\$105	\$10,299	
Drug treatment in community	-9.3% (6)	\$5,133	\$5,495	\$574	\$10,054	
Correctional industries in prison	-5.9% (4)	\$5,360	\$4,496	\$417	\$9,439	
Drug treatment in prison (therapeutic communities or outpatient)	-5.7% (20)	\$5,133	\$4,306	\$1,604	\$7,835	
Adult drug courts	-8.0% (57)	\$4,395	\$4,705	\$4,333	\$4,767	
Employment and job training in the community	-4.3% (16)	\$2,373	\$2,386	\$400	\$4,359	
Electronic monitoring to offset jail time	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	-\$870	\$870	
Sex offender treatment in prison with aftercare	-7.0% (6)	\$6,442	\$2,885	\$12,585	-\$3,258	
Intensive supervision: surveillance-oriented programs	0% (23)	\$0	\$0	\$3,747	-\$3,747	
Washington's Dangerously Mentally Ill Offender program	-20.0% (1)	\$18,020	\$15,116	n/e	n/e	
Drug treatment in jail	-4.5% (9)	\$2,481	\$2,656	n/e	n/e	
Adult boot camps	0% (22)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Domestic violence education/cognitive-behavioral treatment	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Jail diversion for mentally ill offenders	0% (11)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Life Skills education programs for adults	0% (4)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Programs for Youth in the Juvenile Offender System						
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (v. regular group care)	-22.0% (3)	\$51,828	\$32,915	\$6,945	\$77,798	
Adolescent Diversion Project (for lower risk offenders)	-19.9% (6)	\$24,328	\$18,208	\$1,913	\$40,623	
Family Integrated Transitions	-13.0% (1)	\$30,708	\$19,502	\$9,665	\$40,545	
Functional Family Therapy on probation	-15.9% (7)	\$19,529	\$14,617	\$2,325	\$31,821	
Multisystemic Therapy	-10.5% (10)	\$12,855	\$9,622	\$4,264	\$18,213	
Aggression Replacement Training	-7.3% (4)	\$8,897	\$6,659	\$897	\$14,660	
Teen courts	-11.1% (5)	\$5,907	\$4,238	\$936	\$9,208	
Juvenile boot camp to offset institution time	0% (14)	\$0	\$0	-\$8,077	\$8,077	
Juvenile sex offender treatment	-10.2% (5)	\$32,515	\$8,377	\$33,064	\$7,829	
Restorative justice for low-risk offenders	-8.7% (21)	\$4,628	\$3,320	\$880	\$7,067	
Interagency coordination programs	-2.5% (15)	\$3,084	\$2,308	\$205	\$5,186	
Juvenile drug courts	-3.5% (15)	\$4,232	\$3,167	\$2,777	\$4,622	
Regular surveillance-oriented parole (v. no parole supervision)	0% (2)	\$0	\$0	\$1,201	-\$1,201	
Juvenile intensive probation supervision programs	0% (3)	\$0	\$0	\$1,598	-\$1,598	
Juvenile wilderness challenge	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	\$3,085	-\$3,085	
Juvenile intensive parole supervision	0% (10)	\$0	\$0	\$6,460	-\$6,460	
Scared Straight	+8.8% (10)	-\$8,355	-\$6,253	\$58	-\$14,667	
Counseling/psychotherapy for juvenile offenders	-18.9% (6)	\$23,126	\$17,309	n/e	n/e	
Juvenile education programs	-17.5% (3)	\$41,181	\$26,153	n/e	n/e	
Other family-based therapy programs	-12.2% (12)	\$15,006	\$11,231	n/e	n/e	
Team Child	-10.9% (2)	\$5,759	\$4,131	n/e	n/e	
Juvenile behavior modification	-8.2% (4)	\$19,271	\$12,238	n/e	n/e	
Life skills education programs for juvenile offenders	-2.7% (3)	\$6,441	\$4,091	n/e	n/e	
Diversion progs. with services (v. regular juvenile court)	-2.7% (20)	\$1,441	\$1,034	n/e	n/e	
Juvenile cognitive-behavioral treatment	-2.5% (8)	\$3,123	\$2,337	n/e	n/e	
Court supervision vs. simple release without services	0% (8)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Diversion programs with services (v. simple release)	0% (7)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Juvenile intensive probation (as alternative to incarceration)	0% (5)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Guided Group Interaction	0% (4)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e	
Prevention Programs (crime reduction effects only)						
Nurse Family Partnership-Mothers	-56.2% (1)	\$11,531	\$8,161	\$5,409	\$14,283	
Nurse Family Partnership-Children	-16.4% (1)	\$8,632	\$4,922	\$733	\$12,822	
Pre-K education for low income 3 & 4 year olds	-14.2% (8)	\$8,145	\$4,644	\$593	\$12,196	
Seattle Social Development Project	-18.6% (1)	\$1,605	\$4,341	n/e	n/e	
High school graduation	-10.4% (1)	\$1,738	\$2,851	n/e	n/e	
Guiding Good Choices	-9.1% (1)	\$570	\$2,092	n/e	n/e	
Parent-Child Interaction Therapy	-3.7% (1)	\$268	\$784	n/e	n/e	
Program types in need of additional research & development before we can conclude they do or do not reduce crime outcomes:						
Programs needing more research for people in the adult offender system						
Case management in the community for drug offenders	0% (13)				Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.	
COSA (Faith-based supervision of sex offenders)	-22.3% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Day fines (compared to standard probation)	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Domestic violence courts	0% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Faith-based programs	0% (5)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Intensive supervision of sex offenders in the community	0% (4)				Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.	
Medical treatment of sex offenders	-21.4% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Mixed treatment of sex offenders in the community	0% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Regular parole supervision vs. no parole supervision	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Restorative justice programs for lower risk adult offenders	0% (6)				Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.	
Therapeutic community programs for mentally ill offenders	-20.8% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Work release programs (from prison)	-4.3% (4)				Too few recent evaluations.	
Programs needing more research for youth in the juvenile offender system						
Dialectical Behavior Therapy	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Increased drug testing (on parole) vs. minimal drug testing	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Juvenile curfews	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Juvenile day reporting	0% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Juvenile jobs programs	0% (3)				Too few recent evaluations.	
Juvenile therapeutic communities	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	
Mentoring in juvenile justice	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE IN CORRECTIONS ORGANIZATIONS: THE EFFECTS OF PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICER CULTURE ON COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

by

Shea Brackin, MSW

Abstract

Organizational culture is the norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors that define an agency's character. The role of culture is of primary importance in organizational change efforts in community corrections. This is the first of two articles based on research designed to test the influence of organizational culture on the change efforts of one community corrections agency. Through a consideration of the current criminal justice and organizational change literature, this article will raise questions for consideration about the information that is needed when organizational leaders address the interaction between culture and change in the organizational change process. The second article (to be published in the next volume) will discuss the results of organizational culture research conducted in the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice: Adult Services Division (DCJ) in Portland, Oregon. Both articles are intended to provide corrections leaders with a greater understanding of the importance of organizational variables in the success of change efforts and encourage consideration of tools that may assist in implementation of innovative strategies.

The Current Reality of Correctional Organizations

The ability to bring about change on an organizational scale is never a simple task. The problem is made worse in correctional organizations (prisons, jails, and community corrections agencies) because organizational leaders are simultaneously motivated and impeded by economic concerns, rehabilitation reform efforts, and the cultural expectations of both correctional professionals and society at large. Due to the "tough on crime" legislation and determinate sentencing policies of the past three decades, the population of offenders under the authority of prisons, jails, and community corrections agencies has reached a number that has become economically unmanageable and has largely failed to demonstrate success in the reduction of violent crimes (Loftin, Heumann, McDowell, 1983; Merrit, Fain, Turner, 2006; Tonry, 2006). Traditional methods of incarceration and surveillance-based community supervision have been found to be limited in their ability to reduce recidivism (Byrne, Lurigion & Petersilia, 1992; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Gendreau et al., 2000; Latessa et al., 2002; Travis & Petersilia, 2001; Wilson & Petersilia, 2002). The public demands public safety practices that hold offenders accountable for their behavior while also increasing the likelihood that they will be rehabilitated through programs that demonstrate success (Applegate et al 1997; Cullen et al., 2002; Moon et al., 2000; Sundt et al., 1998; see also Oregon SB 267 requiring evidence-based funding for treatment programs). Methods for offender rehabilitation using evidence-based practices may hold solutions for corrections reform initiatives (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005), but the implementation of such

options demands innovation on an organizational scale (Joplin et al., 2004; Latessa, 2004).

Regardless of the methodological focus of innovative practices, corrections leaders must make transformative organizational changes if they are to successfully implement corrections reform initiatives (Joplin et al., 2004; Latessa, 2004). Putting new approaches into practice within traditional corrections organizations is a difficult undertaking. The systemic change necessary to implement corrections reform initiatives requires the reconsideration of organizational missions and values, support and training for new practices, potential shifts in the infrastructure, and changes in the organizational culture (Joplin, et al., 2004).

Contradicting values regarding corrections that are held by corrections professionals, legislators, and all of society also impact organizational stability throughout the change process. On one hand, it can be agreed that we all want to be safe from criminal activity. If it cannot be demonstrated that corrections practices provide this result, policy makers and organizational leaders interested in organizational changes toward innovative corrections strategies face the risk of public disapproval (Latessa, 2004). On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that corrections innovations and incarceration are mutually exclusive. Surveillance techniques, prisons, and jails will always be the most effective strategy for some criminal offenders. It is, however, clear that new organizational strategies that use both must be adopted. If there is to be any hope of long term implementation and change, these strategies will have to be accepted by personnel on all organizational levels (Joplin, et al., 2004; Latessa, 2004). Further, to understand how to make such changes appropriate research must be conducted to inform decision-making (Wilson, 2002). Research that evaluates corrections practices at the organizational level is necessary to find out what matters most in determining how to bring about change in the unique world of corrections.

Testing the Influence of Organizational Culture on Probation and Parole Practices

Transformative organizational change efforts in corrections settings are less likely to succeed if organizational leaders do not consider organizational variables and outcomes (especially related to culture) that influence the practical outcome of reform initiatives at the operational levels of practice. My proposed research is designed to examine the factors that are important in transforming the pressure for more effective correctional practices into meaningful differences at an organizational level. Put simply, it will explore how organizational leaders could be more effective in their implementation of innovative practices if they have more information about the elements of their organizations. The organizational characteristic with which this research is concerned is the organizational culture — the values, norms, and beliefs that make up the agency's character and behaviors.

I am especially interested in how this takes place in community corrections organizations. For this reason, this study will consider the organizational change efforts of the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice: Adult Services Division (DCJ) by testing the influence of the organizational culture on the practices of its probation and parole officers. I will test the impact of the professional subgroup culture (probation and parole officers) on the larger organization using the organizational leadership functional unit as the surrogate for the overarching organizational culture.

The Multnomah County Department of Community Justice: Adult Services Division (DCJ) supervises 9,000 adult probation and state parolees. The Department employs approximately 135 probation and parole officers (PPOs) who work with offenders that are designated within a variety of specialized and general supervision units. The organization is a national leader in the implementation of evidence based practices in probation and parole. To be successful in this implementation, DCJ has undertaken a major effort in cultural change.

Within DCJ, the functions of PPOs constitute the visible tasks for which the organization was designed. PPOs maintain custody over adult persons convicted of criminal offenses and sentenced to serve a term of community supervision. I assert that the PPO professional subgroup culture has a considerable impact on the effectiveness of the overarching organizational practices while the values and norms espoused by those who make of the organizational leadership form the basis for policy initiatives and sustaining these initiatives over time.

In the case of DCJ, the organizational leaders initiated a series of reform efforts more than a decade ago to shift probation and parole functions away from supervision based primarily on "surveillance" to a rehabilitative model based on risk management through offender assessment that is encompassed within the "What Works" literature (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005). They sought to sustain these efforts through a change in the organizational culture of both the organization as a whole and the PPO subculture.

The problem that serves as the focus of this research is the relationship between the goals of the larger organizational entity as defined by the organizational leadership subculture and the PPO subculture. In an effort to inform organizational decision-making, I seek to determine to what extent alignment – collaboration toward a common goal, between these two subcultures affects the ability of the organization as a whole to successfully implement an organizational change strategy.

At the larger organizational level, success is defined by DCJ as the promotion of public safety through the reduction of recidivism for adult persons convicted of criminal offenses and sentenced to a period of community supervision through a balance of supervision, services, and sanctions. Their mission statement illustrates this:

Our mission is to enhance community safety and reduce criminal activity by holding youth and adults accountable in a fair and just manner, assisting them to develop skills necessary for success, and effectively using public resources (Multnomah County webpage).

In addition, the formal values and principles include: change and rehabilitation, strong families, professionalism, information based decisions, collaborative relationships, restitution to

victims and communities, diversity, financial accountability, and investing in employees. In order to insure that PPOs are making effective efforts toward the adoption of the desired mission driven outcomes, DCJ requires the completion of practical tasks (offender risk assessments, case plans, and contact standards) in the supervision of offenders. These tasks are based on the What Works research that has demonstrated effectiveness in the reduction of recidivism. Therefore, PPO effectiveness is measured by the degree to which they successfully complete the required tasks.

However, at the suborganizational level, success is defined somewhat differently as a result of the culture operating within the PPO professional subculture. While PPOs and organizational leaders alike resoundingly support the overarching organizational goal of increased public safety, the attitudes regarding the appropriate methods for the attainment of this goal may differ considerably among those responsible for carrying out the operational tasks necessary to implement the DCJ change strategy. The practices defined by the new DCJ risk management strategy require that PPOs use tools that shift their attention from intuition, experience, and professional discretion to a focus on statistical probabilities to determine offender risk level and appropriate officer response. This, in many ways, goes against the values, norms, and beliefs upon which the PPO subculture has historically operated.

Traditionally, probation and parole work is broadly defined by a dual set of responsibilities. PPOs are officers of the Court who are sworn to enforce parole and probation sentences and court imposed sanctions. At the same time, PPOs are expected to exercise their duties with care and concern for rehabilitation. This dual purpose requires that PPOs maintain a balance between their enforcement function and their social service function as dictated by the needs and behaviors of the offenders they supervise (Cosgrove, 1994; Lynch, 1998; Schneider, Ervin & Snyder-Joy, 1996). PPOs are not quite police and not quite social workers. Rather, the professional culture of probation and parole officers demands a mix of both that is defined by the expectations of the organization within which they are employed coupled with a considerable degree of professional discretion (Chavaria, 1994). This focus has changed over time with the shifting values of society. However, PPOs have defined success by their ability to increase public safety through their use of professional skills gained through experience, training, and intuition about how best to supervise individual offenders. PPOs are further dedicated to professional practices that they believe *must* be effective because their failure may result in new crimes, new victims, and even death for the offender as well as others in the community (Chavaria, 1994; Cosgrove, 1994).

Within the past 15 years, new tools have been introduced across the country to improve the work undertaken by PPOs. Many of these tools are based on a "systems analysis approach." Systems analysis tools, such as offender risk and needs assessments, have been designed to quantify decision-making in order to reduce the degree of human error and bias that may take place in the supervision of criminal offenders in the face of a monumental increase in the number of criminal offenders entering the criminal justice system (Lynch, 1998; Schneider, Ervin & Snyder-Joy, 1996; see also Feeley & Simon, 1992).

Although it has been posited (Simon, 1993) that probation and parole officers will not easily embrace the resulting reduction in their discretion, research to measure the attitudes of probation and parole officers regarding this change is extremely limited.

Schneider, Ervin, Snyder-Joy (1996) conducted a study of PPOs in Oklahoma. Their findings suggest that, while dubious about the overarching benefit of the "scientification" of community supervision, a slight majority of PPOs were willing to consider the value of such tools. However, parole officers in California (Lynch, 1998) were somewhat less pleased with the loss of professional discretion that they perceived to be the result of increased use of assessment instruments. Many of these parole officers may have actively subverted the efforts of upper management to use actuarial risk management tools in an effort to maintain their ability to individualize the supervision of offenders (Lynch, 1998).

While almost a decade of offender assessments have followed these studies on PPO attitudes, it is reasonable to assume that officers in DCJ have experienced, and continue to have, similar feelings to their colleagues in Oklahoma and California. Even as the PPOs who work for Multnomah County Department of Community Justice have integrated the practices prescribed by the organizational change, there is anecdotal evidence from organizational leaders that they have done so with considerable skepticism. Put simply, it may be difficult for PPOs to trust organizational innovations that might result in greater success when the price of failure is so high.

Organizational Change and Culture

French and Bell (1996) define organizational development as "a process for teaching people how to solve problems, take advantage of opportunities, and learn how to do that better and better over time" (p. xiii). It is, they assert, fundamental to this process that both the organizational and the human goals and purposes be furthered through the management of the culture of the organization. This view of organizational development as "managing change" provides the theoretical foundation for this research. As such, the importance of organizational culture in the change process is pivotal.

Culture, Schein (1992) posits, is an omnipresent, but often underestimated or ignored component of all organizations. Defined as the "accumulated shared learning of a given group, covering behavioral, emotional, and cognitive elements of the group members' total psychological functioning" (p. 10), culture provides the informal norms that direct human social interactions on a level that is stronger than formal rules and more lasting than any written policy. Organizational culture consists of the norms, values, and beliefs that make up the character of an organization. The role of the culture of a group or organization commonly becomes so fully integrated that its expectations are unconscious for the members. For that reason, Schein (1992) asserts that frequently, only outsiders, who have not internalized the cultural expectations of the group, are able to consciously identify them.

Even when the term culture is not specifically used, organizational development theorists draw upon its concepts as fundamental to measures of success. As such, the development of social capital toward the mobilization of action (Adler & Kwon, 2002) and a sense of organizational membership for both internal and external actors (Bartel, 2001) are impacted by the unique organizational culture. Further, fundamental elements of organizational functioning that range from the likely response by staff to basic orders from administrators (Follett, 1926) to the overarching rationality of decision-making toward organizational structure (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Lindblom, 1959; Ouchi, 1982) all include strong elements of organizational culture. The

values imposed by organizational leaders (Selznick, 1984) as well as the institutionalized structures (Scott, 1995; 1992) are all influenced by culture as well. Put simply, even when it is not within the scope or focus of scholarly works, students of organizational development processes have included organizational culture as a primary factor for consideration.

The importance of organizational culture is also apparent in the works of scholars whose research is focused on organizational change. Kotter (1996) specifically argues that a failure to consider the existing culture will hinder change efforts. Kanter (1983) asserts that, in order to bring about change in organizational settings, change must become institutionalized into the fabric of the organization such that a culture of pride, innovation, and problem solving are supported. In this effort, professional cultures as well as the overarching organizational culture must be considered (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Greenwood, et al., 2002).

Schein (1992), one of the leaders of the culture-centered approach to the study of organizations, argues that unless the culture of an organization is understood and taken into consideration, lasting change will be difficult if not impossible. Organizational culture provides the structural stability that results in patterns of behavior and the overall integration of the various elements that define the paradigm under which an organization operates. That is not to say that no change can take place. As long as adjustments to the existing organizational structure are in line with the basic assumptions of the culture, limited operational corrections may be readily integrated into the organization. However, the types of large scale systemic changes that tend to become necessary when an organization is facing crisis situations or major innovations often require a reevaluation of the functional operations of the entire agency. When this is the case, basic cultural expectations will come into question and leaders who do not address this fact are destined to either fail or struggle needlessly against hidden and complex social psychological factors larger than either the leader or the organization.

Organizational Culture in Corrections Settings: Bridging the Gap between Organizational Development and Criminal Justice

Although organizational theorists have provided considerable insight into organizational change in general (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Doppelt, 2003; French & Bell, 1996; Kanter, 1983; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 1988; North, 1990; Scott, 1995; Selznick, 1984; Senge, 1994; Wheatley, et al, 2003), they have not focused on change in corrections organizations. Even when correctional organizations are discussed (DiIulio, 1987; Feeley, 1973), it is with current structure and practice in mind rather than the possibility of bringing about change. Therefore, not much is known about the methods of organizational change in correctional organizations. Similarly, much theoretical and empirical research has been conducted regarding the elements of organizational culture that must be considered when bringing about organizational change (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Schein, 1992). However, the study of corrections cultures has been limited to that of sociological analyses intended to elucidate the existing environment rather than to encourage organizational change (Carrabine, 2000; Crawley, 2004; Liebling, 2000; Liebling & Price, 2001; Sykes, 1958). As such, little is known about how best to define the cultural variables that are meaningful to the process of organizational change in corrections environments.

Correctional Organizations: The Role of Culture

In order to make organizational changes, researchers in corrections organizations and organizational leaders in corrections agencies must have an appreciation for the nature of corrections organizations; especially the elements of their distinctive culture. Correctional organizations are formal organizations through which individuals convicted of criminal acts are housed or supervised while serving a custody or community-based sentence imposed by a court of law. Corrections organizations have a singular nature relative to other criminal justice agencies such as the police due to their particular mandate to promote public safety through long term intervention. This is created by the following combination of characteristics. First, the primary goal of corrections organizations is to punish and rehabilitate convicted criminals. Second, the populations "served" by corrections organizations are involuntary participants who are forced to remain under supervision and custody of the agency for a period of time based on their criminal conviction as defined by law. Third, the nature of the clientele requires the fulfillment of legal mandates that allow the limitation of individual freedoms. This makes necessary the presence of laws designed to insure that human rights violations such as inhumane treatment do not take place. However, fourth, the nature of the primary goal and the clientele of corrections organizations makes it necessary that staff engage in professionalization and training that is specifically designed to allow them to manage and subdue potentially violent individuals who are forcibly restricted from leaving the confines of their criminal sentence (Marion & Oliver, 2006). These organizational characteristics have resulted in the development of a unique culture.

Organizational culture theories provide both the scope for a full consideration of the existing practical realities in corrections organizations and the tools for analysis and change that are needed. Consideration of organizational culture is necessary in all organizational change. The qualitative and quantitative measurement tools developed by organizational culture theorists (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Schein, 1999) in conjunction with criminal justice research defining new practices (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005) can be used to identify the existing organizational cultures and their impact on the implementation of organizational change efforts. Corrections leaders must identify existing cultures, define and advocate for necessary change, and lead organizational change in order to be optimally effective in the implementation of practices that demonstrate success in increasing public safety. However, community corrections agencies do not fit the strict hierarchical definition of prisons and jails. Further, probation and parole officers' mandate to combine enforcement and rehabilitative roles makes it likely that community correction organizations will range widely in practices. For this reason, it is necessary to collect cultural data in community corrections organizations so that an accurate understanding of the unique culture within each agency may be developed.

Value to Criminal Justice Practice, Policy Formation, and Evaluation

Corrections leaders are faced with a barrage of policy promises that they did not make. In the last three decades, the public and elected officials in support of "tough on crime" laws have expected to see a marked reduction in violent crimes based on laws that increase sentence lengths for many crimes (Tonry, 2006). More recently, others have looked for a monumental increase in

the successful rehabilitation of drug addicted offenders following the adoption of a requirement of evidence-based practices to demonstrate the likely success of state funded substance abuse treatment programs (Latessa, 2004). In practice, corrections organizations may have been successful in achieving incremental goals and may have made a significant impact on public safety, but in doing so they have fallen short of the lofty goals espoused by legislators. In order to demonstrate their success and promote legislation that can be effectively implemented, organizational leaders and professionals within the criminal justice system must be able to provide policy options that are organizationally practical. By making use of organizational change strategies, this is possible (Joplin et al., 2004).

Organizational culture is only one of many organizational variables that can inform decision-making for corrections leaders attempting to implement reform initiatives. However, no research will be effective if it is not designed to answer the immediate questions that corrections leaders must consider. The second article in this series of two will provide a discussion of the data drawn from the Department of Community Justice study and illustrate one method that may be employed for the evaluation of organizational characteristics toward informed decision-making. Through careful planning informed my meaningful consideration of the data and supporting literature, the changes that will provide the next generation of innovations in community corrections are within our grasp.

Bibliography

- Adler, P.S. & Kwon, S. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*. 27(1): 17-40.
- Applegate, B.K., Cullen, F.T. & Fisher, B.S. (1997). Public support for correctional treatment: The continuing appeal of the rehabilitative ideal. *The Prison Journal*. 77(3): 237-258.
- Bartel, C.A. (2001). Social comparisons in boundary-spanning work: Effects of community outreach on members' organizational identity and identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 46:379-413.
- Byrne, J.M., Lurigio, A.J., & Petersilia, J. (1992). *Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cameron, K.S. & Quinn, R.E. (1999). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture*. Prentice Hall.
- Carrabine, E. (2000). Discourse, governmentality and translation: Towards a social theory of imprisonment. *Theoretical Criminology*. 4(3): 309-331.
- Chavaria, F.R. (1994). Building synergy in probation. *Federal Probation*. 58(3): 18.
- Cosgrove, E.J. (1994). ROBO-PO: The life and times of a federal probation officer. *Federal Probation*. 58(3): 29-31.
- Crawley, E.M. (2004). Emotion and performance: Prison officers and the presentation of self in prisons. *Punishment & Society – International Journal of Penology*. 6(4): 411-427.

Executive Exchange

- Cullen, F.T. & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing correctional rehabilitation: Policy, practice, and prospects. In Julie Horney (ed.), *Criminal Justice 2000: Volume 3-Policies, Practices, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System*. (pp. 109-175). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Cullen, F.T., Pealer, J.A. Fisher, B.S. Applegate, B.K. & Santana, S.A. (2002). Public support for correctional rehabilitation in America: Change or consistency? In Julian V. Roberts and Michael Hough (eds.), *Changing Attitudes to Punishment: Public Opinion, Crime and Justice*. (pp. 128-147). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Cummings, T.G. & Worley, C.G. (2005). *Organization Development and Change 8th Ed.* Thompson-Southwestern Press.
- DiIulio, J. (1987) *Governing prisons*. New York: Free Press.
- DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*. 48(2):147-160.
- Doppelt, B. (2003). *Leading Change Toward Sustainability: A Change-Management Guide for Business, Government and Civil Society*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Feeley, M.M. (1973). Two models of the criminal justice system: An organizational perspective. *Law & Social Review*. 407-425.
- Feeley, M. & Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology*. 30(4): 449-473.
- Follett, M.P. (1926). The giving of orders. In Shafritz, J.M. & Ott, J.S. (1996). *Classics of Organization Theory 4th Edition*. New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- French, W.L. & Bell, C.H. (1996). *Organization Development 6th Ed.* Prentice-Hall: NJ.
- Gendreau, P., Goggins, C., Cullen, F.T., & Andrews, D.A. (2000). The effects of community sanctions and incarceration on recidivism. *Forum on Corrections Research*. 12(May): 10-13.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C.R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal*. 45(1):58-80.
- Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., & Woodward, W. (2004). Using an integrated model to implement evidence-based practices in corrections. *National Institute of Corrections: Crime & Justice Institute*.
- Kanter, R.B.M. (1983). *Change Masters: Innovations for Productivity in the American Corporation*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Latessa, E.J. (2004). The challenge of change: Correctional programs and evidence-based practices. *Criminology & Public Policy*. 3(4): 547-560.
- Latessa, E.J. (1999). What works in correctional intervention. *Southern Illinois University Law Journal*. Vol. 23. pp. 415-425.
- Latessa, E.J., Cullen, F.T., & Gendreau, P. (2002). Beyond corrections quackery: Professionalism and the possibility of effective treatment. *Federal Probation*. 66(2): 43.
- Liebling, A. (2000). Prison officers, policing and the use of discretion. *Theoretical Criminology*. 4(3): 333-357.
- Liebling, A. & Price, D. (2001). *The prison officer*. Leyhill: HM Prison Service.
- Lindblom, C.E. (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administration Review* 19: 79-88.
- Loftin, C., Heumann, M. & McDowall, D. (1983). Mandatory sentencing and firearms violence: Evaluating an alternative to gun control. *Law & Society Review*. 17(2): 287-318.
- Lowenkamp, C.T. & Latessa, E.J. (2005). Developing successful reentry programs: Lessons learned from the "What Works" research. *Corrections Today*. April. 72-77.
- Lynch, M. (1998). Waste managers? The new penology, crime fighting, and parole agency identity. *Law & Society Review*. 32(4): 839-869.
- Marion, N.E. & Oliver, W.M. (2006). *The Public Policy of Crime and Criminal Justice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Merritt, N., Fain, T. & Turner, S. (2006). Oregon's get tough sentencing reform: A lesson in justice system adaptation. *Criminology and Public Policy*. 5(1): 5-36.
- Moon, M.M., Sundt, J.L., Cullen, F.T, & Wright, J.P. (2000). Is child saving dead? Public support for juvenile rehabilitation. *Crime and Delinquency*. 46(1):38-60.
- Morgan, G. (1988). *Riding the Waves of Change: Developing Managerial Competencies for a Turbulent World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Multnomah County Department of Community Justice website. On-line at <http://www.co.multnomah.or.us/dcj/index.shtml>. Retrieved on April 24, 2007.
- North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oregon Senate Bill 267 (2003). On-line at http://pub.das.state.or.us/LEG_BILLS/PDFs/ESB267.pdf. Retrieved on April 24, 2007.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1982). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese Challenge*. New York: Avon.

- Schein, E.H. (1999). *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership, 2nd Ed.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, A.L., Ervin, L., Snyder-Joy, Z. (1996). Further exploration of the flight from discretion: The role of risk/need instruments in probation supervision decisions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 24(2): 109-121.
- Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scott, W.R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems. 3rd ed.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Selznick, P. (1984). *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Senge, P. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Currency.
- Simon, J. (1993). *Poor Discipline: Parole and the Social Control of the Underclass, 1890-1990*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sundt, J.L., Cullen, F.T., Applegate, B.K. & Turner, M.G. (1998). The tenacity of the rehabilitative ideal revisited: Have attitudes toward offender treatment changed? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 25(4):426-442.
- Sykes, G. (1958). *The society of captives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tonry, M. (2006). Criminology, mandatory minimums, and public policy. *Criminology and Public Policy*. 5(1): 45-56.
- Travis, J. & Petersilia, J. (2001). Reentry reconsidered: A new look at an old question. *Crime & Delinquency*. 47(3): 291-313.
- Wheatley, M., Griffin, P. & Quade, K. (2003). *Organization Development at Work: Conversations on the Values, Applications, and Future of OD*. Pfeiffer.
- Wilson, J.Q. (2002). Crime and public policy. In Wilson, J.Q. & Petersilia, J. (Eds). *Crime: Public policies for crime control*. Oakland, CA: ICS Press. pp. 537-558.
- Wilson, J.Q. & Petersilia, J. (2002). *Crime: Public policies for crime control*. Oakland, CA: ICS Press.

Shea Brackin, MSW, is a doctoral candidate at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon.

100 YEARS OF PROBATION

by

Susan Lord

When it comes to historical events we Brits like to think we rather outrank our American cousins. But in the case of the history of probation, we have to acknowledge that you were there before us.

Probation began in England in 1876 thanks to the generosity of a London printer, Frederic Rainer. Rainer had been impressed by the work of John Augustus, the famous Boston cobbler who is accepted as the world's first probation officer. Augustus' voluntary work in the Boston Police Court led to the first probation law being passed in Massachusetts.

Rainer, a well-known and far-sighted Victorian philanthropist, believed that Britain would benefit from the same type of diversionary work with offenders. He made a gift of five shillings (about 10 cents) to the Church of England Temperance Society in the hope that the money could be used to rescue people who fell into crime through drunkenness, regarded as the main social evil of the time and the cause of most petty crime.

That year George Nelson, the first probation officer — or court missionary as he was known — began work in a south London police court. A year later a second missionary, William Batchelor, was appointed to serve two north London courts.

Armed with no more than their bibles, these two visited courts, factories, and police stations. They toured the streets, the

cab stands, and railway stations taking pledges. They worked tirelessly with thieves, vagabonds, drunkards, prostitutes, and petty pilferers, urging them to give up the demon drink and repent their ways. Prison was the punishment for first offenders — men, women and children — and the capital's jails were overflowing.

Fast forward to 2007. The probation service in England and Wales now employs over 21,000 probation staff, first-time offenders are usually given a caution... and the country's jails are overflowing.

This year our probation service celebrates its centenary as a government body. In 1907 the first Probation of Offenders Act laid the foundations of the modern probation service. This was the first step in the change from a voluntary to a statutory service, and this is what we are marking in our year of celebrations. For another 30 years the service was under the dual control of state and religion until a government report recommended severing links with the Church and missionaries officially became probation officers.

We have chosen Monday 11 June as Probation Centenary Day. And it is fitting that, for a service launched by the Church of England, our main event is a multi-faith thanksgiving service in Westminster Abbey in London. Among the congregation will

Executive Exchange

be 93-year-old Georgina Stafford, the last missionary to be appointed in London in 1937. She will be accompanied by friends, also in their 90s, who numbered among the first state-employed probation officers in the capital.

Probation's growth since its early years has been constant, but has accelerated in the last few decades. When the service celebrated its golden jubilee in 1957 it was supervising 30,000 offenders, including juveniles. Now the daily caseload stands at around 200,000, not counting juveniles, who are now the responsibility of the Youth Justice Board.

The growth in probation has been mirrored by a similar growth in the prison population which is currently operating at its capacity of 80,000 inmates, despite a drop in crime rates. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Britain is becoming an increasingly punitive society.

The nature of probation work has changed beyond all recognition. Nelson and Batchelor were working exclusively with first-time petty offenders. Modern-day probation officers are working with some of the most dangerous offenders in society. Where Nelson and Batchelor had only their bibles and a strong conviction that they were doing the right thing, today's staff have risk assessment tools, National Standards of supervision, sophisticated offending behaviour programmes, electronic monitoring, and lie detector equipment.

For most of its history probation was regarded as a branch of social services. A government recruitment brochure of the 1970s shows staff in bell-bottom jeans and flip flops, with long hair and (the men) long beards. Their motto was "advise, assist and befriend."

It has taken a long time to shake off this image and there are still those, notably the print media, who see anything other than a jail sentence as "walking free" and portray a community sentence as a soft option.

This is not a new concept. Back in 1935, a London magistrate wrote to the Home Office: "A period of two or three years under a probation officer has saved thousands of people from becoming thoroughly bad.... For that reason I believe that probation has prevented crime more than any form of punishment. It might be argued that the world at large regards the offender who has been placed on probation as one who has got off scot free and that, therefore, probation is no deterrent. That was true in the past, and may be true now, but becomes less true as the public gets to know what is required of probationers."

Would that it were so....

The concept of probation as a law enforcement agency is relatively recent, but that is what we are, and our closest partners are the police. Our principal aim now is to reduce re-offending and protect the public.

Yet cutting re-offending rates is not as easy as many would believe. The rates have been dropping, but only slowly, since the start of the decade and stand at slightly over 50%. A typical offender on probation is a young man who attended school only spasmodically, left without any qualifications, is a habitual drug user, and sees crime as a career and prison or probation as an occupational hazard — a far cry from the drunks, vagabonds and petty pilferers of 1876.

In probation's early years the majority of the caseload consisted of low-risk first-time offenders, many of them juveniles. Now the reverse is true. The service is increasingly supervising serial offenders who have the potential to cause considerable public harm.

It is impossible to do justice to probation's rich history in one article. Dipping randomly into the archives produces some nuggets.

One of probation's early success stories was Maud Pell, a 14 year old arrested for buying gin for her mother and bringing it into court, where her mother was facing imprisonment for child neglect. Maud was sent to a Female Reformatory Institute in North London where her transformation was so dramatic she was used in early publicity material. She eventually trained as a ladies' maid.

During World War II, with husbands and elder sons on national service, women were left at home to deal with increasingly unruly children, and the number of juveniles under probation supervision increased markedly. The arrival of American GIs — "oversexed, overpaid and over here," as the media of the time would have us believe — led to a huge increase in cases involving young women "in moral danger and beyond control."

When the Blitz started in 1940 many London children were evacuated to the country for safety. Those on probation were accompanied by their probation officers. One officer had a caseload of 100 scattered over a large rural area in the south west of England. Unlike many other local people, she had a car and a petrol allowance, but had to find her way without benefit of signposts as these had all been taken down to confuse the enemy in the event of an airborne invasion.

In recent years a number of serious crimes committed by offenders on probation have hit the headlines. But not all re-offenders give any hint of their criminal potential.

February 1945 saw the first appearance in court of a young Ronnie Biggs, who was placed on probation for theft. In 1963, while on probation for the third time for theft of a bicycle, he committed the Great Train Robbery, eventually escaping to Rio beyond the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Police.

Probation in the UK has undergone many changes in its history. Now it faces another. A new bill — the National Offender Management Bill — is currently progressing through parliament. This will end probation's monopoly over community supervision and allow the Home Secretary to invite a whole range of other providers to compete for probation contracts.

The strategy envisages a five-year programme of competitions in both prison and probation services and covering around 25% of current annual spend on adult offender services.

By the middle of the next decade the probation picture could be very different.

<p>Susan Lord is Senior Probation Communication Manager, National Probation Service for England and Wales, London, United Kingdom.</p>

A TRIBUTE TO ALL THE “LITTLE WOMEN”

by

Betty Green

Twenty years ago, as an Assistant District Attorney in the Juvenile Court of Nashville, Tennessee, I was hard at work one morning when an older gentleman walked in my office and asked to speak to the District Attorney. I immediately put down my case file and offered to help him. With a look that suggested I get him a cup of coffee and then make myself scarce while he conducted his business, he again stated that he needed to talk with the District Attorney. When I boldly assured him that I was, indeed, the District Attorney, he stood up to leave saying “No, I need to talk to the real D.A.”

Recently my husband and I were celebrating an anniversary and made reservations at a local restaurant. When we presented ourselves for seating, the very young lady serving as “hostess” came up to us, smiled ever so sweetly, looked straight at my husband and said, “Judge Green, I’m so glad you and your wife could join us for dinner.” Before I had a chance to educate the young lady, my husband turned toward me with a twinkle in his eye as he responded to her and said, “The little woman and I are looking forward to our night out!” (For those of you who know me, I’m happy to report that due to my remarkable self-control and restraint, my husband survived this evening!)

While more than twenty years and a lot of other incidents separated these two situations, I think it is safe to say that stereotyping is alive and well, not only in the corrections profession but in all areas of our life. I was first employed as a childcare worker in a girl’s correctional school forty years ago. No eyebrows were raised, because after all, it was a girl’s school, and secondly, I was just a summer replacement for the “real” staff. It soon became apparent to me that the expectation was for women to work in female facilities and for men to handle the male facilities and the Central Office jobs — except, of course, the clerical jobs! This was in the 60s. We have only to look around us today and see the large numbers of women in all types of corrections jobs to see the changes that have taken place in our profession. A quick check of the 2006 ACA Adult and Juvenile Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies and Probation and Parole Authorities Directory indicates that almost 200,000 members of our profession are women. More than 2100 are serving as Directors, Administrators, Wardens, Superintendents, etc. We now have women filling virtually every role in our system — and doing it with enthusiasm and professionalism. As I sit back and reflect on my forty year career, it is rewarding to see the progress that has been made — but frustrating that many still stereotype the role of women, particularly in our field. I think it is important to remember that just because many women have succeeded in our field and are accepted by all as the true professionals they are, there are others just starting out who will need the benefit of our experience and support. There are still those who consider a successful woman in our profession to be an exception to the rule. While we have entered a brand new century, we have brought with us some perceptions and baggage from the previous one.

It is my humble opinion that the best way to destroy a stereotype is to prove it wrong. We can bemoan the fact that we are viewed differently from our male counterparts or we can roll up

our sleeves and work even harder to establish our vital roles in corrections. Over my forty years of work in a variety of different yet very challenging jobs in corrections, I have been fortunate to know and work with many talented and dedicated individuals, both male and female. They have been there for me through the good times and the bad (and believe me, there are always going to be some bad times in this business — but after all, that’s where most real personal growth begins!). One lady stands out in my mind and I want you to know her.

Judge Elizabeth McCain was the Juvenile Court Judge in Memphis, Tennessee, during the 60s and early 70s. There were very few women in this type role at this time in our state’s history. She was very prim and proper — an older lady with dignity and charm, and an abiding faith in our system. When she was no longer on the bench, she went to work for an advocacy agency for children, which is where I met her. Our state had a mandatory retirement age of 70 at this time, and after only a few years with the agency, she was forced to retire. Judge McCain had never married — her work was her life. I was hired to “replace” her — and I couldn’t help but wonder how she would react to a young “twenty-something” trying to fill her shoes. Her response was to support and guide me as I learned the ropes; to introduce me to individuals I needed to know but didn’t; to challenge me to do more than she had; and to remember that a woman could be tough, articulate, and successful and still be “a lady.”

There is a lesson here for all of us. Each generation makes progress — but no generation ever finishes the job. We have made much progress in our profession. We only need look at the improvement over the years in the programs in our facilities; the involvement of humane and fair policies and procedures both for inmates and for the daily operation of programs; our improved training and training opportunities; and in the professionalism that encourages us to do our best. But we aren’t perfect as a profession and from time to time we are embarrassed by the actions of a few. Just as we will continually need to look for new and better ways to manage our clients we also need to look for ways to improve our personal performance. We all need a “Judge McCain” to challenge us and to encourage us to push forward. Too often we are so wrapped up in our own life where demands are heavy and the day just doesn’t seem to have enough hours in it that we miss opportunities to help those working beside us to reach their true potential. Wasted potential feeds the negative stereotypes that still abound in our world. Until each individual, male or female, is allowed and encouraged to develop to the fullest and until we refuse to settle for anything less many talented individuals will be lost to mediocrity.

So who is responsible for encouraging this frontal attack on the status quo? We all are. For every woman who has established a successful career in corrections at any level and is enjoying that career, there is an obligation to help and support those women coming behind her. The best exercise is bending down to help someone up! It is not enough to be successful. It is somewhat intimidating to realize that others we come in contact with in our daily lives may emulate the behaviors they see in us, but the fact

Executive Exchange

remains that those of us working in the field have a wonderful opportunity to break down barriers and help raise expectations for all corrections. Only when we are willing to show others the same support we have enjoyed will we truly make a difference. Perception is not always fair, nor is it accurate. Perception is based on superficial information, which words alone will never change. It is not usually intended to be harmful or hurtful, but by “assuming” that something is fact without full and complete information, the result is often an unfair stereotype. The truth is, if we don’t act to educate others and demonstrate by our actions that a perception is neither fair nor accurate the perception easily becomes the reality. I have been fortunate throughout my life and career to have had support and encouragement from family, friends, co-workers and mentors — but I sometimes wonder where I would be today if these supporters had not been there for me. Would I have believed I could be a lawyer, a judge, a commissioner, a corporate officer, a teacher, or whatever? If perception does become reality, are there young women in our profession today who believe they cannot aspire to be wardens, directors, commissioners, etc.? I hope not — but life tells me I’m wrong. All members of our profession must join together to see that the best and the brightest have the opportunity to move from entry level positions within corrections to positions of decision making and authority, regardless of gender. It takes time, and an understanding that mistakes along the way are not fatal but can enrich our level of experience and be an opportunity for growth. While I’m personally proud of the progress that has been made

in the four decades that I have been a part of the corrections profession I believe there is much to be done. We cannot sit around and agonize over the inequities that may be present, but must become a force to be reckoned with. To be treated fairly, we must treat others fairly. To be promoted and advance, we must prepare ourselves through education, training opportunities, hard work and experience. To survive the tough times we must support one another. To be truly successful, we must share our success by being a friend and a mentor to others. It’s not enough to be a “successful woman” in this field. We must also be an example and an encouragement for the women who will walk in our shoes in the next century.

Looking back on one’s career is a humbling experience. I now realize how much of my success is attributable to others who have helped me along the way. While there are still worlds to conquer and those whose “perception” of a woman’s role still needs some enlightenment, this “Little Woman” is proud of the dynamic women who serve in a wide array of jobs including correctional workers, teachers, clericals, policy makers, wardens, probation officers, and commissioners. The field is better served by their presence and commitment, and the future of corrections is in good hands. Hats off to all the “little women” of the world!

Betty Green is Judge of the Davidson County Juvenile Court in Nashville, Tennessee.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Reviews of books and periodicals are contributed by: Melissa Cahill, U. S. Probation Officer for the Eastern District of Missouri and NAPE Secretary; Donald G. Evans, President of the Canadian Training Institute; and Dan Richard Beto, Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation and Editor of *Executive Exchange*

Executive Exchange welcomes reviews of books and periodicals dealing with leadership and management issues and innovative programs, strategies, and trends in criminal justice. In addition, because a number of NAPE members serve as faculty at institutions of higher learning, reviews of potential text books are also encouraged.

Where Are All the Women Leaders, and Why Do We Need Them?

A review of *Closing the Leadership Gap: Why Women Can and Must Help Run the World*, by Marie C. Wilson. New York, New York: Penguin Books, 2005, 224 pp., \$15.00 (paper).

Marie C. Wilson, founder of The White House Project, President Emeritus of the Ms. Foundation, and co-creator of Take Our Daughters to Work Day, outlines a compelling history of the lack of women in leadership positions and why women leaders are needed more than ever today. But this book does more than inspire and encourage women to action; it calls for a new style of leadership that both genders can embrace to the betterment of all.

Women comprise 51% of the population but only 13.6% of the boards of Fortune 500 companies, and merely 14% of Congress. Throughout the book Wilson outlines the various socio-cultural biases that have prevented women from rising to the top. Each

chapter is dedicated to a different arena, such as ambition and ability, and closes with an inspirational “call to action.” Although, as a woman, these points resonated with me, the more important aspect of her book involves the call for a different type of leadership, regardless of whether the leader is a man or woman.

Wilson indicates the “typical” style of male leadership involves a degree of self-centeredness, command-and-control style, and absolute, individual power that seems no longer appropriate or effective in today’s world. In contrast, “female” style leadership is characterized by good communication (including good listening), nurturing of others, shared decision-making, and a willingness to work alongside (rather than apart from or above) team members.

Wilson argues that the leadership style men and women learn is ingrained early on. She references many studies and authors that have reported on the ways we teach girls and boys to represent their gender. Boys learn early on to put aside their emotional selves and become invincible, whereas girls learn to discount their intellect and assertiveness, and instead become the social support to others. Leadership has traditionally been men’s

work, and the prototypical leader was the “heroic” leader — an individual person who is the source of all change and good. In contrast, Wilson cites Joyce K. Fletcher’s call for the “post-heroic” leader, someone who is relational and collaborative. Wilson states that we need “the female advantage — women’s ability to communicate across lines of authority, sharing information in a team-spirited work ethic that assumes one person’s effectiveness is both dependent on the rest and a contribution to overall excellence” (p. 110).

Although Wilson describes this style as prototypically female, she also acknowledges that such a leadership style is one both men and women can embrace. She argues that, as more women are allowed into leadership positions and seen as effective, more men will be able to expand their leadership style to include typically female characteristics. Ultimately, the inclusion of women will lead to more effective leaders of both genders. As Wilson states:

We long for leaders who project a clear and grounded human presence, a fully assembled package with no parts missing — leaders we can copy and admire, whose agendas don’t shift like wind socks. We trust people who are transparent — who say what they mean and mean what they say, and whose behaviors align with their belief systems (p. 98).

Some may feel put off by Wilson’s book. She tends to speak only to a female audience, and at times her characterizations seem stereotypical. But if one looks beyond the initial content and instead focuses on her message of transformational leadership, one may be inspired by her vision.

Wilson ends the book with a chapter of quotes from various female leaders, and this particular one by Helene Lerner struck me as something both men and women should strive for:

A true leader is one who leads with enthusiasm, courage, and faith. Integrity is key. We need people who lead from not only their heads but from their hearts.

Melissa Cahill, Ph.D.

Politics and Probation: Is This the End of Probation?

A review of “Abolishing Probation — A Political Crime?” by Philip Priestly and Maurice Vanstone, *Probation Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 4, December 2006, pp. 408-416.

It is one of those ironic twists of history, that just as the Probation Services of England and Wales are organizing to celebrate their 100th anniversary the future of probation in the United Kingdom is uncertain. Roger Hill, current director of probation in England and Wales noted in his introduction to the centenary brochure that “The centenary is being celebrated at a time of change, when staff are uncertain about the service’s future.” It is expected that there will be a number of responses to what to do with probation from a wide spectrum of commentators both pro and con on the issue. In the pages of *Executive Exchange* we hope to bring you the reader some of that comment. I am sure that whatever the outcome of governmental decisions on the

probation question there will be lessons we can learn on this side of the Atlantic.

In the December issue of the *Probation Journal* Philip Priestly and Maurice Vanstone contribute to the discussion on what may lie ahead for the probation services in the UK. In their article they try to explain how the possible extinction of probation arose and suggest a constructive evidence-based approach to the retention of probation as a critical aspect of the criminal justice system. They set the stage for the discussion by noting that the past three decades has seen an erosion of long held assumptions about criminal justice in the wake of a political agenda that has been shaped by the following:

- Law and order policies;
- Past ideals about probation have been discredited and discarded;
- An increased politicization of crime;
- Emergence of populist punitiveness;
- A new political order of exclusion and separation; and
- An increase in the prison population.

When probation was established in England and Wales (1907) and the legislation was in the House of Lords, one the Lords noted that there could be no doubt that this legislation “will prevent crime and to a large extent empty our jails.” Some 50 years later the distinguished criminologist Leon Radzinowicz described probation as an important contribution of England and Wales to the “new penological theory and practice” which took root in the 20th century.

The authors comment that even if these are overstated sentiments the history of probation in the UK has “upheld the ideal of offering those who offend and come before the courts the opportunity of rehabilitation.” For them, probation at the beginning of the 21st century “offers a constructive contribution to attempts to protect the public from crime.” This situation, notwithstanding, we still see the probation service on the brink of extinction!

Priestly and Vanstone, in reflecting on this situation, ask the pointed question: “Why, when punishment has such a demonstrably poor record in protecting the public from crime, is a non-punitive approach for reducing re-offending, which challenges and attempts to change attitudes and behaviour harmful to victims, being undermined?” The rest of the article is their attempt to answer this question.

They construct their answer by examining firstly shifts in probation practice “from homilies to problem-solving.” In this section of their paper they trace the origins of probation from Christian-inspired homilies and exhortation and continued for most the 20th century as an agency focusing on rehabilitation. Generally, probation was unchallenged by politicians, the media, and rigorous research. Towards the end of the 20th century, however, probation was being scrutinized by politicians, media, and the results of effectiveness studies. The result has been an effort to retool the probation service and its practices on the basis of evidence-based interventions, national standards, and increased accountability.

In the second part of the paper they discuss the issue of effectiveness. The authors survey the research literature that documents the value and effectiveness of specific interventions that are rehabilitative and pro-social in their orientation. They also note that programs offered in the community are considered to be more efficacious than those offered in confinement. The evi-

dence notwithstanding, the current political and organizational rhetoric tends to re-cast probation as a controlling, disciplinary, and enforcing mode. They also look at research that examines the effectiveness of prisons and note that the research on whether prisons deter or have an effect on subsequent crime rates demonstrates that prisons have a poor record on reducing re-offending. And although there are programs operated by probation in community settings that are having an effect on the reduction of re-offending (for those who complete the programs), it is clear that “there are no magic bullets and these interventions are the beginning of a long complex and relatively expensive process.”

Now, in light of these findings, that is, the fact that the findings are not clear cut, the new organization responsible for prisons and probation — the National Offender Management System — is scaling back its use of accredited programs. But when the actual expenditures on interventions — whether in the prison or on probation — are examined, it is clear that the matter of reducing re-offending has never been taken seriously. They call for a period of serious experimentation and research that is adequately funded. Further, the authors believe that probation — with its history over the past 20 years in “what works” — would be an ideal host for such experimentation.

This leads to their third point, their constructive response to the threatened demise of probation. They outline the value of retaining probation and having it become the host to experiment with various methods and interventions in the community setting. Their reasons for using probation in this manner relates to the following:

- Probation is based on values of fairness and social justice;
- Probation has a history of commitment to effectiveness; and
- Probation has understood working with offenders to establish control over behaviour and situations.

They also recommend that the requirement for the offenders’ consent be restored since; they believe this is an important aspect of engaging offenders in their rehabilitative work.

In conclusion the authors ask that serious consideration be given to retaining probation as “a viable way of addressing the complex problems that underpin most offending.” Probation efforts should be “viewed critically alongside the lamentable failure of punishment and the overuse of custody.” They believe that since probation efforts would be subjected to effectiveness evaluations, this would act as a form of warranty. Their argument hinges on the belief that the probation service is a reflexive, problem-solving organization that would be attempting to follow policies and practices that work. For them “a strong, properly-funded and research-led probation service might thrive as one component of criminal justice policies not driven by headline obsessions.” Probation, they state, needs to be accountable, critically self-reflective, and committed to the reduction of the harm caused by crime to communities, to victims, and to those who offend.

Donald G. Evans

Technology’s Impact on Criminal Justice

A review of *The New Technology of Crime, Law and Social Control*, edited by James M. Byrne and Donald J. Rebovich. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press, 2007, 379 pp., \$39.00 (paper).

A recent addition to criminal justice scholarship is found in *The New Technology of Crime, Law and Social Control*, edited by James M. Byrne, professor in the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell (hereinafter referred to as UMass Lowell), and Donald J. Rebovich, associate professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at Utica College in New York and Director of the school’s Economic Crime Investigation Program. This book should be of interest to almost any person working in the criminal justice system and to those in academia charged with the responsibility of teaching criminal justice courses.

In the introductory chapter, the editors provide a comprehensive overview of the book’s contents and establish the purpose of the text. Particularly helpful is their discussion of “hard” versus “soft” technology:

Hard technology innovations include new materials, devices, and equipment that can be used to either commit crime or prevent and control crime. Soft technology innovations include new software programs, classification systems, crime analysis techniques, and data sharing/system integration techniques that also provide opportunities for both crime commission and crime control.

A very helpful table is provided by the editors that offers examples of hard and soft technology applications in the areas of crime prevention, police, courts, institutional corrections, and community corrections.

In the second chapter, Kip Schlegel at Indiana University and Charles Cohen with the Indiana State Police discuss the role of technology in the commission of crime. Much of the chapter is devoted to distinguishing between and providing examples of crime “as work,” crime “at work,” and crime “after work.” This is a well crafted and thought provoking chapter.

Rebovich and Anthony Martino with the Utica Police Department provide Chapter 3, in which they build on the previous chapter and go on to examine the role of the private sector in controlling crime. They make a compelling argument for multi-agency and multi-disciplinary partnerships to address a crime problem that is growing in sophistication.

The next two chapters deal with the subject of crime prevention. Brandon C. Welsh of UMass Lowell and David P. Farrington at Cambridge University, focusing on hard technology, draw on available research to demonstrate that CCTV surveillance cameras and improved street lighting are effective tools in reducing crime. As for crime prevention and soft technology, Andrew J. Harris at UMass Lowell and Arthur J. Lurigio at Loyola University in Chicago distinguish between risk assessment and threat assessment and examine a number of assessment instruments currently in use.

In Chapter 6, Don Hummer with Penn State University at Harrisburg discusses hard technology and policing. Some of the non-lethal weapons he highlights include: chemical irritants; elec-

tric-shock immobilizing technology; rubber, plastic, and wooden bullet guns and beanbag shotguns; strobe and acoustical weapons; and non-electric immobilizing devices. In the next chapter Christopher J. Harris with UMass Lowell discuss the application of information technology to police work, including data collection and management and data-driven strategies. Hummer devotes considerable attention to CompStat, the successful strategy introduced by William J. Bratton in New York.

The courts are the subject of the next two chapters. In Chapter 8, Eric T. Bellone of Roxbury Community College provides a brief historical perspective of the use of hard technology in the courts; in addition, he lists, in considerable detail, various forms and uses of hard technology and suggests that with technological changes "new laws, protocols, and rules of evidence and procedures must be introduced." Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, offers a scholarly treatment of the use of soft technology in the courts in which he discusses the goals of transparency, efficiency, and effectiveness. In addition, he identifies several courts that may be viewed as exemplars in the use of technology.

Jacob I. Stowell with UMass Lowell reviews the application of hard technology in the institutional setting focusing primarily on security issues and officer/offender interaction. His chapter is followed by one written by Byrne and April Pattavina at UMass Lowell, who discuss soft technologies employed in prisons and

jails, including classification systems, risk assessments, and preparing inmates for release.

Chapters 12 and 13 are devoted to the use of technology in the field of community corrections. In their chapter, Patricia M. Harris at the University of Texas at San Antonio and Byrne do an excellent job of focusing on the hard technology innovations, such as the various forms of electronic monitoring, drug testing, managing special needs offenders, automated reporting systems, and language translation devices. They point out that for the most part the hard technology innovations are under-evaluated. Too, they note that most of the hard technologies they identify are used on only a small fraction of the offender population in the community. In the next chapter, Pattavina and Faye S. Taxman at Virginia Commonwealth University discuss current classification instruments and offer words of caution on the prudent use of information made available through technological applications.

The book is concluded with an essay from Gary T. Marx at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in which he examines potential pitfalls in the engineering of social control.

In *The New Technology of Crime, Law and Social Control*, Byrne and Rebovich have produced an excellent resource in the study of the criminal justice system.

Dan Richard Beto

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

IOWA DIRECTOR MOVES TO MARYLAND

Gary Maynard, Director of the Iowa Department of Corrections since 2003, resigned in January 2007 to become Secretary of Public Safety and Correctional Services for Maryland. He had previously been head of corrections in Oklahoma and South Carolina.

Iowa Governor **Chet Culver** immediately appointed Deputy Corrections Director **John Baldwin** as acting director of the agency, responsible for approximately 8,800 inmates and nine prisons and about 30,000 offenders in community corrections programs. Baldwin, who has been with the agency since 1977, has served as Deputy Director of Administration since 1983. He received his undergraduate degree in economics from the University of Iowa and a master's degree in public administration from Iowa State University.

NEW CHIEF APPOINTED IN SOUTHWESTERN GEORGIA

The *Americus Times-Recorder* reports that on January 24, 2007, **Vickie J. Covington** was administered the oath of office of Chief Probation Officer for the Southwestern Judicial Circuit of Georgia, which serves Sumter, Lee, Stewart, Webster, Schley, and Macon Counties.

Covington, who possesses a bachelor's degree in business administration from Georgia Southwestern College and a master's degree in public administration from Columbus State University, began working for the Georgia Department of Corrections as a probation officer in 1986. "When I started I never intended to work in this field for my entire career, but then after I got involved

with it, I found it very challenging and I liked the work and I just wanted to make that my career," Covington said.

Headquartered in Americus, Covington supervises a staff of 22 and an offender population of approximately 3,500.

CAMBRIA COUNTY PLACES FOCUS ON JUVENILES

In articles appearing in the Johnston, Pennsylvania, *Tribune-Democrat*, during the month of January, the Cambria County Juvenile Probation Department received positive press for its efforts in assisting juveniles to overcome many of the hurdles confronting them following release from a placement facility. The pilot after-care program, developed by Cambria County's Chief Juvenile Probation Officer **Cindi Wess**, provides youthful offenders with the opportunity to develop job skills and to further their education.

As of September 30, 2006, 18 juveniles had been or were in the program. Of those, one had enrolled in a community college and at least six others had secured employment.

The pilot program is funded by a three-year grant of \$435,671 from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. In addition, the state has received a \$2.5 million grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to provide technical support to Cambria County's initiative and to pilot programs in four other counties similarly aimed at deterring youthful offenders from repeat criminal behavior.

Most of the money received by Cambria County goes to the Goodwill Industries of Conemaugh Valley in Johnstown for a Learn to Work Program. Goodwill Industries, which has a long

Executive Exchange

history of training young people in career development and employment, developed three programs for the youthful offenders: working in Goodwill's stores; setting up and working in the document imaging system to convert records into electronic storage; and developing an online Goodwill store.

According to Wess and **Phyllis Bandstra**, Goodwill's Chief Executive Officer, before any of the juveniles are placed in one of the three programs, they are evaluated as to their strengths; in addition, specific goals are established. Typically, juveniles are expected to remain in the program for one year following release from a facility. When working, they are paid the minimum wage.

"It's been exciting to see kids really motivated and moving forward in their growth," said Bandstra.

"The results are quite promising," said Judge **David Tulowitzki**, a supporter of the program. "If we don't follow them in after-care, the recidivism rate will increase. It (the program) shows the kids that the system does care about them, and a lot of times, that's all they need."

In the newspaper's "Laurels and Barbs" column, this program received a "laurel" with the following praise: "Hats off to the Cambria County juvenile probation office, whose after-care program has been selected as a model for all of Pennsylvania. The program, developed by Cindi Wess, chief probation officer, gives juvenile offenders a chance to gain job skills, educational opportunities, and help in overcoming problems. The Goodwill Industries of the Conemaugh Valley Inc. plays a major role in the program. A very worthwhile effort."

MORGAN RETIRES IN JEFFERSON COUNTY

Veteran probation administrator **Montie E. Morgan**, Director of the Jefferson County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Beaumont, Texas, retired in January 2007, following a distinguished career that spanned close to four decades.

Morgan, a NAPE member and a former President of the Texas Corrections Association, held a number of leadership positions in the Texas criminal justice system. In addition, he was known for encouraging his staff to become active in professional organizations peculiar to the corrections profession, such as the Texas Probation Association, American Probation and Parole Association, and Texas Corrections Association.

"Montie Morgan was a leader in community corrections in Texas," said **Dan Richard Beto**, a NAPE past President and a close friend. "He was an innovator; he did the right things; he was a role model; and his commitment to the profession has had a significant impact on it. His visionary leadership will be missed."

He was replaced by **Michael D. Fairley**, a supervisor with the department who was mentored by Morgan. Fairley, a graduate of Sam Houston State University, is active in a number of criminal justice professional organizations.

JENNINGS APPOINTED NEW JUVENILE JUSTICE CHIEF IN KANSAS

As reported in several media outlets in Kansas, Governor **Kathleen Sebelius** has appointed **J. Russell Jennings** as Commissioner of the Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority.

"Russ brings a unique perspective through his experience as a law enforcement officer, magistrate judge, and juvenile detention center director," Sebelius said. "His insight on how we can best

help juvenile offenders make the right decisions in their lives and become productive, law-abiding adults will be a great asset as he accepts this new challenge."

Jennings began his career in law enforcement three decades ago as a Kearny County deputy sheriff. He was promoted from deputy to Undersheriff in 1979. He also served as a district magistrate judge for Kearny County. In 1994 Jennings was named Director of the Southwest Regional Juvenile Detention Center in Garden City.

Jennings, who assumed his new position on February 26, 2007, replaces **Don Jordan**, who was appointed Secretary of the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services.

NEW CHIEF IN EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

In February 2007 **James M. Johnson, Jr.**, was appointed Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the Eastern District of North Carolina, headquartered in Raleigh. Johnson, a North Carolina native, graduated from the University of North Carolina at Wilmington in 1976.

Johnson served as Supervising U. S. Probation Officer in the Wilmington Office from 1991 to 2003, when he was named Deputy Chief U.S. Probation Officer.

He replaces **Robert G. Singleton**, who retired. In his new position, Johnson will supervise more than 80 employees located in seven divisional offices.

MARYLAND HAS NEW JUVENILE JUSTICE HEAD

Maryland Governor **Martin O'Malley** has selected **Donald W. DeVore** to head the Department of Juvenile Services. Prior to his appointment in February 2007, DeVore was Director of Juvenile Services for the Connecticut Department of Children and Families.

DeVore, who possesses a bachelor's degree from Temple University and a master's degree from West Chester State College, has a lengthy history in working in the juvenile justice systems of several states.

STAPLES REPLACES RETIRING REMINGTON IN VENTURA COUNTY

Cal Remington, who has devoted close to four decades to the community corrections profession, retired as Chief Probation Officer for Ventura County, California. In February 2007, he was replaced by **Karen Staples**, his Chief Deputy.

Staples has worked for the department for 35 years, starting as a group supervisor in the former Ventura juvenile hall and rising through the ranks to become Chief Deputy for Special Projects in the late 1990s.

Both Remington and his successor have enjoyed good working relationships with the Ventura County Superior Court judges, the County Executive, and the Board of Supervisors.

ARNONE IS NEW JUVENILE DIRECTOR IN CONNECTICUT

In February 2007 Connecticut Governor **M. Jodi Rell** appointed **Leo C. Arnone** to serve as Director of Juvenile Services for the Connecticut Department of Children and Families. Arnone, who

replaces **Donald W. DeVore**, held a number of positions with the state's Department of Correction from 1974 to 1995, and had been serving as Deputy Director of Juvenile Detention for the Connecticut Judicial Branch.

"As we reshape juvenile services in Connecticut, I know the Department of Children and Families will benefit from Leo's tremendous experience," said Governor Rell. "We are turning our focus to treatment, rehabilitation, and education to ensure that the young people in our care are steered in the right direction. We must make meaningful change in their lives."

Arnone, a graduate of Westfield State College in Westfield, Massachusetts, began his career with the Department of Corrections as a corrections officer and worked his way up through the ranks, serving as Director of Region I with overall responsibility for the agency's six facilities in the Enfield/Somers area.

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM HELD IN HUNTSVILLE

The Executive Development Program for new probation and parole executives was held in Huntsville, Texas, on February 4-9, 2007. This successful program, first delivered in 1997, is a collaborative effort of the National Association of Probation Executives, Correctional Management Institute of Texas, and the National Institute of Corrections.

Participants included: **Carmen Ayala** of Puerto Rico; **Karen J. Burch** from New York; **Michael Fairley**, **Bob Hughes**, and **Rodney J. Thompson** of Texas; **Jo G. Holland** and **Mario Woodard** of Virginia; **Therese McCoy** from Minnesota; **Jesse Montgomery, Jr.**, of Illinois; **Frank A. Owens** from Arizona.

The faculty was comprised of NAPE members **Dot Faust** of Washington, D.C., **Marcus Hodges** from Virginia, **Martin J. Krizay** from Arizona and NAPE Treasurer, **Rocco A. Pozzi** of New York and NAPE President, and **Christie Davidson** from Texas and NAPE's Executive Director. Also providing instruction was **Phillip M. Lyons**, a criminal justice professor at Sam Houston State University, who spoke on the legal aspects of management.

During the week long program, participants were exposed to training dealing with leadership, organizational culture, management styles, strategic planning, presentation skills, media relations, and legal liability issues.

As in previous programs, all participants were provided a one year free membership in NAPE.

NEW LEADERSHIP IN WILLIAMSON COUNTY

Marty Griffith, Assistant Director of the Williamson County Adult Probation Department in Georgetown, Texas, assumed the top job on May 1, 2007, following the retirement of longtime Director **Rick Zinsmeyer**. Griffith, who has been with the department since 1979, earned a bachelor's degree and a Master of Arts degree from Sam Houston State University. He has served as Assistant Director for more than two decades.

Zinsmeyer, who earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Sam Houston State University, has been active in a number of professional criminal justice organizations. He has served on the board of directors of the National Association of Probation Executives and American Probation and Parole Association. In addition, he was a member of the Advisory Board of the Texas Probation Training Academy of the Correctional Management

Institute of Texas. Zinsmeyer also served as President of the Texas Corrections Association.

"All the judges are enthusiastic and welcome Marty to the post of Chief. We know him well and have great confidence in his abilities," said Presiding Judge **Billy Ray Stubblefield**. "We know the department is in good hands."

The Williamson County Adult Probation Department is an organizational member of the National Association of Probation Executives.

PUBLIC FAVORS JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

The nation's juvenile justice system emerged a century ago out of the belief that young offenders were less culpable and more salvageable than their adult counterparts, but today, that system is under attack by get-tough policymakers claiming wide public support that Florida State University (FSU) criminologists say simply doesn't exist.

In fact, a rigorous study by those FSU researchers snapped a very different picture of public opinion on calls to abolish the juvenile justice system: More than 80 percent of the representative sample of 1,308 Florida adults surveyed were against such a move, nearly 40 percent strongly so. Throughout the nation's fourth-largest state, that point of view prevailed even across demographic lines such as age, race, ethnicity, education, income or political and religious affiliations.

"These findings make for a compelling argument against the politicization and criminalization of juvenile justice," said FSU Associate Professor **Daniel P. Mears**. An expert on juvenile justice reforms, he is the lead author of the FSU study, "Public Opinion and the Foundation of the Juvenile Court," that appears in the February 2007 edition of the journal *Criminology*.

Mears points to the biggest surprise in a state where policymakers have taken increasingly hardnosed approaches to juvenile crime and incarcerate more juvenile (and adult) offenders than almost anywhere else in the country. About 64 percent of survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that even violent juvenile offenders can be rehabilitated. Once again, the differences among those with otherwise disparate views weren't substantial — 70 percent of self-identified liberals agreed or strongly agreed, as did 66 percent of moderates and a majority, 57 percent, of conservatives.

What's more, Mears and fellow FSU researchers found no consensus in a mixed bag of public opinions on the age at which youths should be tried as adults: 28 percent of respondents said age 14 or younger; 13 percent, age 15; 28 percent, age 16; and 31 percent, age 17 or older. While those calling themselves political conservatives were more likely than self-described liberals to favor a lower age, differences were small. On average, conservatives favored an age threshold just a half-year younger than that which liberals supported.

"Although policymakers sometimes say the public demands harsher treatment of juvenile offenders, research like ours shows that the public strongly supports retaining the juvenile justice system and emphasizing not just punishment but also rehabilitation," Mears said. While the study calls "non-trivial" the percentage of respondents who did favor abolishing juvenile courts (19.6 percent), it points to the "child-saving" spirit apparent among most adults.

Results from the FSU College of Criminology and Criminal Justice study derive from its spring 2006 telephone survey. The

survey sought opinions about respondents' political leanings and general attitudes toward juvenile justice and both violent and non-violent offenders. Mears' co-authors include Assistant Professor **Carter Hay**, whose widely published research focuses on the causes and consequences of juvenile delinquency; Professor **Marc Gertz**, a noted authority on the study of public opinion and the criminal justice system; and doctoral student **Christina Mancini**.

"We found that factors such as age, race/ethnicity, education, income, conservative Protestantism, victimization and employment in the criminal justice system are largely unrelated to views one way or the other about eliminating the juvenile justice system," Mears said. "This finding in turn reinforces the idea that support for a child-centered juvenile justice system cuts equally across many segments of the Florida adult population."

He contends that such a study — set in the fourth-largest state and based on a sizeable survey sample demographically similar to the country as a whole — offers nationally relevant insights. It also offers several recommendations to U.S. policymakers, including one urging them to consider adopting a uniform age cut-off for juvenile versus adult court jurisdiction, eliminating what Mears describes as "the odd 'justice by geography' problem of, say, a 16-year-old being treated as a juvenile in one state and as an adult in another."

What's clear is that public opinion on juvenile justice is more complex and multi-faceted than some policymakers realize or acknowledge, said Mears. "More than 100 years after the birth of the juvenile justice system, we have strong evidence that the public's 'child-saving orientations' still flourish in spite of punitive attitudes and political ideology."

ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON FOUNDATION EXPANDS RECLAIMING FUTURES INITIATIVE

In a news release dated February 20, 2007, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) announced a national expansion of its Reclaiming Futures initiative, housed at Portland State University, citing the program's success in getting more services to teens in the justice system who are struggling with drugs and alcohol. The ten communities that have piloted Reclaiming Futures over the past five years reported significant improvements in the quality of juvenile justice and substance abuse treatment services, according to research conducted by the Urban Institute and the University of Chicago's Chapin Hall Center for Children.

The RWJF board approved \$6.5 million to support the ten pilot sites for two more years and to help additional new sites implement the Reclaiming Futures model over the next four years. The expanded effort also will create a national resource center to provide data, case studies and other information to even more communities seeking to improve drug and alcohol services for justice-involved youth.

"By spreading Reclaiming Futures across the country, we are creating a national movement that can make a vital difference in the health of youth and their families," said **Kristin Schubert**, RWJF program officer for Reclaiming Futures. "These pilot communities are leading the way."

The Reclaiming Futures model combines system reform, treatment improvement, and community engagement to help teens in the justice system get off drugs and alcohol. Teens who enter the justice system with serious drug and alcohol problems rarely receive treatment, even though research shows that young people

who use drugs and alcohol are more likely to end up in trouble with the law, behave violently, or drop out of school.

Key elements of the Reclaiming Futures model include screening and assessing teens for drug and alcohol problems; assembling a team to develop a personal care plan; training drug and alcohol treatment providers in evidence-based practices that work with teens; providing family support; and involving community members as mentors and role models to provide the support teens need.

Beginning in 2002, ten communities helped create and test the Reclaiming Futures model: Anchorage, Alaska.; Santa Cruz, California; Chicago, Illinois; four counties in Southeastern Kentucky; Marquette, Michigan; the state of New Hampshire; the Sovereign Tribal Nation of Sicangu Lakota in Rosebud, South Dakota; Dayton, Ohio; Portland, Oregon; and Seattle, Washington.

"During the past five years, we have created a new national standard of care in juvenile justice," said **Laura Nissen**, Reclaiming Futures national program director and associate professor at Portland State University Graduate School of Social Work. "With this new grant, our ten original pilot projects can refine the model they created, new sites can help test ways to implement this approach, and eventually dozens of other communities can use what we learn to change the way juvenile courts work with teens with drug and alcohol problems."

Nissen said Reclaiming Futures will invite applications from communities interested in participating as one of the new pilot sites. Successful applicants will be selected in the summer of 2007 and will receive technical assistance, on-site coaching, educational materials and invitations to national conferences and workshops. Application forms will be posted on the Reclaiming Futures Web site in late spring. To learn more about this initiative, please visit the website www.reclaimingfutures.org.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation focuses on the pressing health and health care issues facing our country. As the nation's largest philanthropy devoted exclusively to improving the health and health care of all Americans, the Foundation works with a diverse group of organizations and individuals to identify solutions and achieve comprehensive, meaningful and timely change. For more than 30 years the Foundation has brought experience, commitment, and a rigorous, balanced approach to the problems that affect the health and health care of those it serves. When it comes to helping Americans lead healthier lives and get the care they need, the Foundation expects to make a difference in your lifetime. For more information, visit www.rwjf.org.

HAYES MOVES FROM JUVENILE JUSTICE TO SOCIAL SERVICES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Kathleen Hayes, who has worked on children's issues most of her adult life, was been nominated by South Carolina Governor **Mark Sanford** to be the Director of the Department of Social Services. She leaves the Department of Juvenile Justice, where she has served as Chief of Staff since 2003.

Hayes, who possesses a doctorate in psychology from the University of New Mexico, replaces **Kim Aydlette**, who resigned in November. She will inherit a \$1 billion agency that is recovering from budget cuts and that has been subject to criticism. The agency serves about 800,000 people per month.

In making the appointment, Sanford said that Hayes has "a long term commitment to serving people with needs." He referred to her as a "change agent," and said he wants the Department of

Social Services to be an agency he would feel comfortable with if his children had to go there.

TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION UNDERGOING DRASTIC CHANGES

Dwight Harris, Executive Director of the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), abruptly retired on February 23, 2007, following more than a quarter of a century of service. He began his career with the agency in 1981 as a caseworker at the Giddings State School in Giddings, Texas. Throughout the years, Harris served as a halfway house community coordinator, youth rights administrator, parole supervisor, Superintendent of the Gainesville State School, and the corrections division director that oversaw institutions. In 1998 he was named Deputy Executive Director. In 2004, following the retirement of **Steve Robinson**, Harris was named Executive Director of the agency.

The Texas Youth Commission incarcerates youthful offenders between the ages of 10 and 21 years of age.

Harris' sudden retirement came as the Texas legislature began an investigation of sexual molestation in one of the agency's facilities. The Texas Senate, viewing the situation as a crisis, voted to place the agency under a conservator and urged Governor **Rick Perry** to fire its board. Perry subsequently replaced the board's chairman and strongly urged the new leadership to bring in a director from the outside and to hire an inspector general to vigorously investigate allegations of abuse.

On March 1, 2007, in an emergency session, the TYC Board unanimously named **Edward G. Owens** acting Executive Director of the agency. Owens, Deputy Executive Director of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, brings three decades of criminal justice experience to the position. Owens, a graduate of Sam Houston State University with a degree in criminology and corrections, said of the appointment: "I'm honored the board and the Governor trust my ability to lead TYC during this critical time. We have a lot of work to do and problems to fix, but I'm confident this agency can meet that challenge. There are thousands of good people across Texas who don't consider TYC just a job, but instead a mission. They genuinely want to help the state's most troubled children get back on the right path in life. It's a new day for the agency. It's time to roll up our sleeves and get to work."

On March 2, 2007, Perry appointed former aide **Jay Kimbrough** as Special Master to investigate a growing number of charges involving sexual abuse; he will receive assistance from the Office of the Attorney General and the Texas Department of Public Safety. In addition, the Texas Legislature began its own investigation into the youth prison agency, as did State Auditor **John Keel** and Travis County District Attorney **Ronnie Earle**.

On March 6, 2007, in a coordinated surprise sweep authorized by Owens and Kimbrough, authorities investigating widespread sex-assault allegations in the Texas Youth Commission took control of all the facilities operated by the agency, including the headquarters in Austin. The sweep was carried out by more than 70 law enforcement officers from at least four different agencies — Texas Rangers, Texas Department of Public Safety, Office of Attorney General, and the Office of Inspector General of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice — along with representatives of the State Auditor's Office.

Officials said the investigation teams will retain a presence at the facilities until further notice "to ensure that incarcerated

children are safe, that computers and paper files possibly needed in the widening investigation are not destroyed, and that possible witnesses are not coerced or harassed."

Owens pledged a "zero tolerance policy of any type of mistreatment of youth," and said a new "integrity program" was being launched to guide employees' ethical conduct and enforce the reporting of wrongdoing. As part of the plan, Owens activated hotline program where people can call in to report allegations of mistreatment of youth.

Upon growing reports of past abuse within the agency, the Texas Senate voted unanimously to abolish the current TYC board on March 14, 2007. Feeling legislative pressure, Governor Perry advised he would have the board resign on March 16, 2007, following receipt of a report on how the agency might be rehabilitated.

In a separate investigation that had been ongoing for several months, the U.S. Department of Justice released a report on March 15, 2007, indicating that conditions at one of the agency's facilities in South Texas violated the constitutional rights of the confined youth because an undermanned staff used excessive force, applied unnecessary physical restraints, allowed inmates to fight each other, and ignored inmate grievances. The report also indicated that the facility used a faulty inmate classification system.

On March 16, 2007, following a presentation by Owens of his plan to rehabilitate the agency, members of the TYC board resigned and transferred their powers to Owens.

On March 20, 2007, two high ranking TYC officials resigned under threat of termination: Deputy Executive Director **Linda Reyes**, who has been with the agency for 18 years, and General Counsel **Neil Nichols**, a TYC employee for 33 years.

Upon additional reports of cases of abuse continue to grow, a number of members of the Texas Legislature have questioned the Governor's authority to appoint a "special master" and have criticized him for bringing in someone from the Texas Department of Criminal Justice to assume control of the juvenile agency. Too, they are critical of Owens' "rehabilitation plan," which they feel does not go far enough in resolving problems within the agency.

On March 29, 2007, the Texas senate voted to elevate Kimbrough to conservator of the agency, placing Owens in a subordinate role.

Over the ensuing month, a number of employees quit or were terminated.

NON-CUSTODIAL NEW HAMPSHIRE PROGRAM HELPS JUVENILE OFFENDERS

According to an article written by **Scott Brooks** that appeared in the March 4, 2007, issue of the *New Hampshire Union Leader*, that state has a new program that is putting juvenile offenders on the fast track to rehabilitation.

New Hampshire judges now have the option of sentencing teenagers who repeatedly run afoul of the law to a three-month stay at the state's youth reformatory, followed by continued treatment and counseling when they return home.

"That's the goal here, to return them to their community," said **John Stephen**, the state's Commissioner of Health and Human Services.

The Division of Juvenile Justice Services launched the program, known as Excel, last October. Since then, it has served 27 New Hampshire teens.

Stephen says the program is an alternative to the long-term residential care typically offered to teens whose crimes don't warrant a stay at the Manchester reformatory, known as the Youth Development Center (YDC).

Residential placements can last months or years, depending on the child, and may cost anywhere from \$100 to \$500 a day. A child in Excel would cost the state \$370 a day, or \$33,300 for all three months.

"We're starting to see significant savings to the taxpayer," Stephen said, "and we're also seeing significant positive results in the youth because they're being returned to the community."

Stephen estimates the program will save the state several hundred thousand dollars this year. In 2008 and 2009, he said, the total savings should approach \$500,000.

Teenagers in Excel are detained in the "architecturally secure" confines of the YDC. While there, they receive medical, educational, vocational, social and spiritual assessments and answer to a team of counselors.

Once home, they must complete a personalized treatment program, which may include drug or alcohol counseling, a job or "community-based activities." Juvenile probation officers track their progress.

Penny Sampson, who manages clinical services at the YDC, tells the story of a 16-year-old boy who entered Excel after accumulating a record of truancy problems, drug use and burglary attempts.

"He wasn't going to make it in school," Sampson said. "What we identified was that what he wants is to get his GED and some trade where he works with his hands."

The teen left the YDC this past week. Now, she said, he is working for a moving company and will soon be tested for a general equivalency diploma.

"This is what we want Excel to do," said Sampson, who helped create the program. "If you don't find out what's going on, they're just going to continue on that (track), and sometimes they make irreversible mistakes."

New Hampshire has traditionally sent juvenile delinquents to residential treatment facilities both in and out of state. One of the most prominent facilities is Webster House, a Manchester home and counseling center that dates back to the 1880s.

Lou Catano, the center's director, was not familiar with Excel but said he supports any initiative that aims to rehabilitate troubled teens. He noted, however, that he is leery of programs that come with claims of great savings. "When a program is fiscally driven, sometimes other things give," he said.

Webster House charges a daily fee of \$115 per child, an amount that ranks among the lowest in the state, according to Catano. The average stay for a juvenile delinquent is about six months, he said. At that rate, Webster House is significantly less expensive than Excel.

The first crop of Excel participants left the YDC in January. As of last week, none of those teens has returned to court, according to **William Fenniman**, the state's Director of Juvenile Justice Services. "They're doing extremely well within their communities," he said.

Today, 12 teens are enrolled in the program, Fenniman said. Incidentally, those teens are filling beds that have been empty since the YDC's \$32 million renovation. Last October, the YDC was one-third empty.

Teens that enter the Excel program might have expected to go to the YDC anyway, Fenniman said. With Excel, he said, they're out in 90 days, hopefully never to return.

NEW PAROLE BOARD CHAIRS IN NEW YORK AND MISSOURI

In February 2007, **George B. Alexander**, Commissioner of the Erie County Department of Probation and Youth Detention Services in Buffalo, New York, since 2000, was nominated by Governor **Eliot Spitzer** and Lt. Governor **David Paterson** to serve as Chair of the New York State Board of Parole. Alexander is not new to the New York Division of Parole, as he began his career there as a field officer in 1984 and worked his way up in the organization, serving as a parole revocation specialist and senior parole officer before becoming a deputy director in 1993. He possesses a bachelor's degree from Buffalo State College.

On March 1, 2007, Missouri Governor **Matt Blunt** appointed **William Seibert** of Jefferson City to Chair the Missouri Board of Probation and Parole. Seibert, who was appointed to the board last year, was previously Assistant Superintendent of the Missouri State Highway Patrol. He replaces **Dana Thompson**, whose re-nomination as Chair was blocked by Senator **Chuck Graham**.

RUSSIAN PRISON POPULATION LESS THAN A MILLION

According to **Yury Kalinin**, head of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia, there are 878,000 people confined in prison and detention facilities in Russia. In a March 1, 2007, news release by the Russian News and Information Agency, Kalinin said that about a third of those imprisoned are under 25 years of age. He added that some 400,000 convicts were suffering from a mental illness and 46 percent of the prisoners were serving a second prison term.

The Russian Federal Statistics Service places Russia's population at 142.2 million in 2006.

THREE REPORTS PROVIDE INSIGHT TO PRISON PROBLEMS IN FLORIDA

Throwing all Florida probation violators back behind bars is clogging courts, severely crowding prisons, and hurting their chances of straightening out their lives, according to a new study by state auditors.

The Legislature's fiscal watchdogs also said prison education and drug-treatment programs can help a lot — but reach only a small fraction of prisoners who need it.

A third Florida Department of Corrections (DOC) review by the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) said the prison system has chronically high turnover among correctional officers and medical personnel.

State legislators ordered OPPAGA to study the prison system last year, after the forced resignation of former DOC Secretary **James Crosby** — now awaiting sentencing in federal court on a \$130,000 kickback conviction — and the arrests of some probationers for headline-making murders.

OPPAGA's three reports came just before the March 6 beginning of the legislative session. One of the first bills expected to pass is a high priority of Gov. **Charlie Crist**, an "anti-murder" act that would make it easier for courts to lock up parole and probation violators for long periods.

OPPAGA's first report said a 2003 "zero tolerance" policy on probation violators has increased "technical" violation reports by 54 percent. Technical violations are not new crimes, but less

serious infractions that include being late for an appointment with a probation officer, missing curfew by a short time or not keeping up with community-service work ordered by a judge.

"The zero tolerance policy has enhanced public safety by increasing scrutiny of offenders and incarceration of those who commit new offenses," OPPAGA reported. "However, in addition to removing dangerous offenders from the community, the policy requires a significant amount of resources to be spent on offenders who commit minor technical violations and who pose little threat to public safety."

OPPAGA said 291,137 probationers have been busted for technical violations in the three and one-half years since the zero tolerance policy was ordered. But after a hearing, judges released 169,050 of them — 58 percent — with no further penalties, the auditors said.

Meanwhile, it cost public defenders and state attorneys between \$20 million and \$33 million to prepare cases for those offenders and, OPPAGA said, many of the probationers may have lost jobs, harming their rehabilitation chances.

The auditors recommended that legislators allow judges and probation officers a wider range of increasingly stiff penalties, starting with a written reprimand and extension of probation time or withdrawal of privileges.

In the second report, OPPAGA said 90 percent of inmates in education programs do not complete them because they get out of prison, get transferred or leave for other reasons. OPPAGA said 68 percent of prisoners have less than ninth-grade literacy and 60 percent have a history of substance abuse, while 16 percent have been diagnosed with some form of mental illness.

The auditors said that since 2000-01, the departments' education budget has been cut by 24 percent — while the inmate population has risen 24 percent. In that time, the number of academic instructors has fallen 31 percent and vocational teachers are down 47 percent.

DOC Secretary **Jim McDonough** is a strong advocate of getting every inmate a high-school equivalency certificate or meaningful job training. Because it takes seriously deficient inmates longer to get up to high school levels of reading and other skills, OPPAGA said 64 percent of those who got into education programs were released before finishing school.

The third OPPAGA study, on staffing, said the department had about 500 correctional-officer vacancies and 200 empty job slots for doctors, nurses and dentists at the end of last fiscal year. The rural location of most prisons and salary competition from county jails were cited as big reasons for the high vacancy rate, although the Legislature has increased starting salaries for correctional officers from about \$25,000 to over \$30,000 in the last five years.

OPPAGA said the DOC turnover rate among correctional officers rose from 15 percent in 2002-03 to 21 percent last fiscal year, compared to an 8 percent rate among all state law-enforcement officers. The vacancy rate for health-care professionals was 23 percent last year, with more than 200 vacancies at certain times.

Despite the vacancy rates, OPPAGA said the department does a good job of security — with steadily declining rates of use of force by officers on inmates, attacks on staff, inmate injuries, escapes and crimes against prisoners. The auditors said that DOC "is meeting and exceeding its critical staffing complement level most of the time."

This news article, written by **Bill Cotterell**, appeared in the *Pensacola News Journal*. The reports he references (Report Nos. 07-

13, 07-14, and 07-15) may be found at the following web address: www.oppaga.state.fl.us/reports/topic/newrpts.html.

DRUG ABUSE FUELS JUVENILE CRIME IN SOUTH AFRICA

According to an article appearing in the *Pretoria News* on March 3, 2007, rampant drug abuse among young people, combined with an inefficient justice system that exposes petty juvenile offenders to hardened criminals, is fuelling crime in South Africa, experts say. Crack cocaine, heroin and amphetamine abuse is found among young people in all our largest cities, with juveniles often turning to crime to support their habit.

Although prison is a last resort for juveniles, an overstretched system means those arrested for petty drug-related crimes risk exposure to hardened criminals in prison. "Once juveniles serve time with hardened criminals they are taken up by prison gangs and no longer fear going to jail again," said **Shafiek Davids**, director of the Cape Town-based Sultan Bahu Drug Rehabilitation Centre in Mitchell's Plain. "This leads them to commit crime more often," he said.

The link between drug abuse among youth and high crime levels was one of the issues that emerged at a drug summit hosted by the National Social Development Department, in partnership with the Central Drug Authority in February.

The director for substance abuse in the department, **Conny Nxumalo**, said they were "very concerned" about increasing levels of drug abuse and its impact on the crime rate.

The Western Cape had the most drug cases, according to crime statistics, and there had also been a significant increase in the number of young children committing crime since 2004, said **Deborah van Stade**, of the Western Cape Social Development Department. Youth aged 15 to 17 who had committed drug-related crimes represented the highest numbers of those assessed by social workers, she said.

Professor **Charles Parry**, Director of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Research Unit at the Medical Research Council, said although drug abuse had led to an increase in crime by young offenders, there was a shortage of statistical data. The latest police crime statistics also give a disturbing insight into the scale of drug-related crime: a total of 95,690 such crimes were committed from April 2005 to March 2006 — an increase of 11,691 from the previous year.

Pretoria-based Penal Reform Project Coordinator **Louis van der Merwe** said the justice system for juveniles was "not very desirable." "Often offenders who are not streetwise are detained with streetwise offenders who then assault or sexually abuse them," he said. And many offenders turned to prison gangs as a means of protection while in custody, he added.

A Children's Justice Bill, designed to deal specifically with the needs of juvenile offenders, was introduced in August 2002, but has yet to be passed by parliament.

According to the website of the Child Justice Alliance, almost two-thirds of convicted children reported that their first contact with gangs occurred in prison, either awaiting trial or while in prison serving a sentence.

Currently, the Criminal Procedure Act requires an arresting officer to inform a probation officer within 48 hours of the arrest of a child, but there is often little communication.

The bill sets out procedures to protect juveniles from contact with hardened criminals. According to Civil Society Prison Re-

Executive Exchange

form Initiative Manager **Lukas Muntingh**, there are about 4,000 children under the age of 18 in custody.

Jacqui Gallinetti, a researcher at the Children's Rights Project, which is part of the Community Law Centre, said: "The bill was drawn up to protect young offenders from a criminal justice system that fails to protect juveniles." She said children awaiting trial should be released on bail into their parents' custody or to a place of safety. "Children are only supposed to be placed in prison if the magistrate thinks they are a threat to themselves or others."

NEW DUTIES FOR CALIFORNIA PROBATION CHIEF

Linda Penner, Chief Probation Officer for the Fresno County Probation Department, has been appointed by California Governor **Arnold Schwarzenegger** to the Corrections Standards Authority and the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. The Corrections Standards Authority position requires conformation by the California Senate.

Penner has worked for the Fresno County Probation Department for three decades, beginning as a probation officer in 1977.

WHITE HOUSE RECOGNIZES NUECES COUNTY DRUG COURT

On March 6, 2007, **Stephen Katsurinis**, Chief of Staff of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, was in Corpus Christi, Texas, to attend the third anniversary celebration and graduation ceremony of the Nueces County Drug Divert Court.

"The White House Office of National Drug Control Policy truly appreciates the hard work and dedication of the Nueces County Drug Divert Court," said Katsurinis in presenting a certificate of recognition to District Judge **Sandra Watts**. "The success witnessed here in Corpus Christi should serve as a national model for existing and emerging drug courts. With success rates near 88 percent, the Nueces County Drug Divert Court is truly pushing back against drug abuse in an innovative and effective way."

Since its inception in 2004, the Nueces County Drug Divert Court has served over 200 individual participants. Annually the Court serves between 65 and 70 non-violent drug offenders and divers them from jail into drug treatment programs.

Judge Watts commended **Javed Syed**, Director of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, and the probation officers he assigned to the Drug Court for their dedication in working with a very challenging offender population. She also commended the prosecutors assigned to the program.

MULTI-AGENCY TEAMS MAKE ARRESTS IN OPERATION CLEAN SWEEP IN NORTHERN NEVADA

According to an article written by **Maggie O'Neill** and appearing in the *Reno-Gazette Journal*, area law enforcement officers visited the homes of 115 people named on felony warrants charging parole and probation violations on March 7, 2007, in Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County. After 14 hours, 13 arrests had been made by 10 p.m.

The Clean Sweep effort was scheduled from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. The warrants charged failure to report to probation officers, failure to pay court-ordered fees and failure to attend court-ordered counseling. Each person had a felony or gross misdemeanor conviction.

"These people are mostly employed, so they may not be home when we're knocking at 9 o'clock in the morning because they're out," said **Richard Tiran**, public information officer for the Nevada Department of Public Safety's Adult Parole and Probation Office. "As we've found these people, we've arrested them for either parole violations, probation violation, or in certain cases we've had outstanding warrants from Reno, Sparks, or justice or district courts."

The sweep, organized by the Nevada Department of Public Safety, was the first of its kind in Northern Nevada and operated out of the department's mobile command unit parked at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office on Parr Boulevard.

The command unit was purchased through a \$408,000 grant through Homeland Security, NHP Trooper **Chuck Allen** said. Fifty-five officers worked in pairs, typically a parole and probation officer with a police officer. Police officers engaged in this multi-agency effort were from the Reno and Sparks Police Departments, the Washoe Sheriff's Office, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

The agencies have mounted a joint effort in October — Operation Scarecrow — when they visit registered sex offenders around Halloween.

CHANGES AT NIC

Having served as Deputy Director of the National Institute of Corrections since 1982, **Larry Solomon** has elected to retire. His career in corrections spans 34 years. Before joining NIC as Chief of its Community Corrections Division, he served as a senior program analyst for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Solomon also held key positions at both the state and local levels in Massachusetts and the District of Columbia.

Replacing Solomon is **Thomas Beauclair**, former Director of the Idaho Department of Corrections. Beauclair, who worked for the Idaho corrections agency for more than three decades, holds a bachelor's degree in criminal justice and a master's degree in counseling. For the past 15 years he has served as an adjunct faculty member at Boise State University.

PILOT PAROLE PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA

For the next three and a half years East Palo Alto, California, will conduct a pilot parole reentry program, the East Palo Alto Community-Based Coalition. The parole program was developed collaboratively by the East Palo Alto Police Department and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and will blend enforcement with programming services. It will serve 120 East Palo Alto parolees annually.

A major component of the parole program will be the Day Reporting Center, which will provide a single location where parolees can check in with their parole officers and find a variety of services to help with their reentry, such as housing options, anger management help, educational services, and family reintegration counseling, police reported.

The program will assess the needs of inmates who are scheduled to parole in East Palo Alto, so they can develop a plan identifying the individual needs of each parolee who is returning to the

community. Partnerships between community organizations and service providers will also enhance support services provided to the parolees, police reported.

Another aspect of the parole program is the ongoing partnership between the police and corrections agents to increase the level of supervision and accountability of the parolees in East Palo Alto. The department of corrections will assign a full-time parole officer to the East Palo Alto Police Department and will fund two additional police officers to be assigned to the newly formed Parole Reentry Unit.

According to the corrections department, six out of every ten parolees will re-offend and return to jail within two years of their release. High recidivism rates contribute to crime and violence. Programs like this one aim to lower that rate, according to police.

The program will be funded by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the projected cost of the three and a half year contract is around \$3.4 million. The city will subcontract the Day Reporting Center and programming services to local vendors to create a community network that is involved in helping program participants. The city manager and chief of police will be in charge of overall program oversight and fiscal management.

There are approximately 200 parolees who reside in East Palo Alto, and another 100 currently in jail that will be eligible for release within a few years, police reported.

POWERS RECEIVES APPOINTMENT

On April 18, 2007, California Governor **Arnold Schwarzenegger** appointed **Jerry Powers** of Modesto to the Sex Offender Management Board. He has served as Chief Probation Officer of the Stanislaus County Probation Department since 2002 and served in the department since 2000.

Powers previously served as a probation officer for the San Diego County Probation Department from 1984 to 2000. Additionally, he is a member of the Stanislaus County Peace Officers Association, Law Enforcement Executives Association, and the California Council on Criminal Justice.

NEW DIRECTOR IN ERIE COUNTY

In May 2007 **Anne E. Martin** was named Director of Probation for Erie County, New York; she replaces **George Alexander**, who was appointed Chair of the New York State Parole Board.

"Anne Martin has done an outstanding job as Deputy Director of probation for Erie County and has earned the promotion to the director's position," said County Executive **Joel A. Giambra** in announcing her promotion.

Martin has served as Deputy Director since January 2005. Before that, she spent four years as Chief Deputy Director for the Suffolk County Probation Department.

IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS SEEK ASSISTANCE FROM NORTH CAROLINA PROBATION OFFICERS

According to an Associated Press article appearing in the *Fayetteville Observer* on May 21, 2007, Federal immigration officials have started working closely with local probation officers to detect and deport illegal immigrants.

Since the beginning of the year, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has arrested 219 people from probation offices in ten North Carolina counties. Probation officers have started to report clients they believe are illegal and then holding mock appointments so immigration officials can round up the suspects.

"They have all broken the law," said **Robert Guy**, director of North Carolina's Division of Community Corrections, which oversees the state's probation officers. "If they are here illegally and that's detected, we have an obligation to report that to the feds."

Guy said the probation office arrests, which started late last year with an experimental program in Mecklenburg County, help remove illegal immigrants that are taxing the state's resources by taking seats in drug treatment programs and overloading probation officers' calendars.

Richard Rocha, a spokesman for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, said working with probation officers is just another tool for finding the criminal illegal aliens that are the agency's focus.

"We're removing these people from the country so we can ensure that our communities and streets are safer," Rocha said.

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

Plan to attend the annual events of the National Association of Probation Executives in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on July 7-8, 2007.

On Saturday, July 7, 2007, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., at the Downtown Philadelphia Marriott Hotel, the NAPE Annual Members Reception will be held.

On Sunday, July 8, 2007, commencing at 8:00 a.m., NAPE will hold its Annual Awards Breakfast, during which the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award will be presented. In addition, several other awards will be presented.

Following the Annual Awards Breakfast, the Board of Directors Meeting will be held.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

Founded in 1981, the National Association of Probation Executives is a professional organization representing the chief executive officers of local, county and state probation agencies. NAPE is dedicated to enhancing the professionalism and effectiveness in the field of probation by creating a national network for probation executives, bringing about positive change in the field, and making available a pool of experts in probation management, program development, training and research.

What We Do

- Assist in and conduct training sessions, conferences and workshops on timely subjects unique to the needs of probation executives.
- Provide technical assistance to national, state and local governments, as well as private institutions, that are committed to improving probation practices.
- Analyze relevant research relating to probation programs nationwide and publish position papers on our findings.
- Assist in the development of standards, training and accreditation procedures for probation agencies.
- Educate the general public on problems in the field of probation and their potential solutions.

Why Join

The National Association of Probation Executives offers you the chance to help build a national voice and power base for the field of probation and serves as your link with other probation leaders. Join with us and make your voice heard.

Types of Membership

Regular: Regular members must be employed full-time in an executive capacity by a probation agency or association. They must have at least two levels of professional staff under their supervision or be defined as executives by the director or chief probation officer of the agency.

Organizational: Organizational memberships are for probation and community corrections agencies. Any member organization may designate up to five administrative employees to receive the benefits of membership.

Corporate: Corporate memberships are for corporations doing business with probation and community corrections agencies or for individual sponsors.

Honorary: Honorary memberships are conferred by a two-thirds vote of the NAPE Board of Directors in recognition of an outstanding contribution to the field of probation or for special or long-term meritorious service to NAPE.

Subscriber: Subscribers are individuals whose work is related to the practice of probation.

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ E-MAIL _____

DATE OF APPLICATION _____

<i>CHECK</i>	Regular	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$ 50 / 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$95 / 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$140 / 3 years
	Organizational	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$ 250 / 1 year				
	Corporate	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$ 500 / 1 year				

Please make check payable to **THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES** and mail to:

NAPE Secretariat
ATTN: Christie Davidson
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
(936) 294-3757