

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2008

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

WANTED: Leaders with the courage to journey along a road less traveled, taking risks,

When I came to Westchester County, New York, as Commissioner in 1989, probation was being done in a traditional office-based, limited field setting, utilizing a "social work" philosophy as its foundation. After asking many questions and pondering the Department's path, the first decision I made was to move probation officers from their office environment into the community. However, to insure staff and public safety, these officers needed to be armed. This was not a popular decision since very few probation departments in the nation armed officers.

Thinking back on my first NAPE address, I stated that "probation leaders must be willing to allow their departments to avail themselves of all legal authorities and traditional law enforcement tools to address the risk and needs of offenders while assuring, most importantly, protection of the community."

The second major decision was to identify specialized case specific populations with which to develop and implement new supervision strategies. Two specific populations identified were those involving domestic violence and sex offenses.

Our domestic violence initiative began with a separation of all domestic violence cases into a designated intensive supervision unit. Concurrently with this separation was an invitation to the domestic violence advocacy community. These efforts laid the foundation to make Westchester County eligible to apply for and secure significant levels of federal VAWA monies.

This action resulted in the evolution of a continuum of initiatives to address the needs of domestic violence victims in Westchester County. Some of the specific steps taken along the journey were:



- Outreach, including monthly meetings, with victim advocacy groups;
- Higher offender accountability;
- A separate designated Custody/Adoption Unit;
- A Supervised Visitation Program;

- Project Safewatch (Probation/Police Partnership Surveillance Program); and
- An Integrated Domestic Violence Court in Westchester.

Similarly, Westchester Probation's sex offense strategy began with the separation of all Family Court and Criminal Court sex offense cases into designated comprehensive intervention caseloads. This effort provided the foundation that led to:

- Assessment and treatment (off-site) for juvenile delinquent cases;
- On-Site treatment for adult sex offenders;

- Establishment of a county-wide Protect The Kids Committee;
- Active GPS Monitoring of sex offenders (24 hours a day, seven days a week, year round);
- A Sex Offender Surveillance Program component;
- A Westchester County Sex Offense Court;
- A Sex Offender Supervised Visitation Program for non-incest cases; and
- Polygraphing of sex offenders in Family and Criminal Courts.

Intensive offense specific training for probation staff, including administrators, that interfaced with the targeted populations was also provided. In fact, mandatory domestic violence training became a requirement for probation officers.

Continued on page 2

CONTENTS

President's Message	1
Factors Associated with Adult Probation Officer Turnover in Texas, <i>Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D., and Dan Richard Beto</i>	3
Twenty-First Century Probation: Delivering Effective Sentences for the Community, <i>John Scott</i>	12
Prisoners Abroad's Family Work, <i>Laura Bevan and Stephen Nash</i>	17
Probation in Ireland: A Brief History of the Early Years, <i>Gerry McNally</i>	19
From the Bookshelf, <i>Dan Richard Beto and Donald G. Evans</i>	27
Association Activities	29
News From the Field	30

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE *cont'd*

This process led to the birth of offense specific probation in Westchester County. My journey on a road less traveled continues in Westchester as probation is turning its attention to need/age specific issues related to older adolescents/criminal court offenders. A sampling of our innovative initiatives include:

- Mental Health Court;
- Establishment of a Young Offender Unit in Criminal Court (applies Family Court Model to Criminal Court);
- Integrated Youth Court addresses adolescents whose primary case is before both the Family and Criminal Courts concurrently; and
- Implementation of Cognitive Behavior Curriculum for probationers.

Thus far, the focus has been on the offender. Our next challenge is to take a different path and focus on developing community specific initiatives. Accordingly, Westchester is in the planning phase for the establishment of a Community Outreach Service Center, located in an urban, high crime area, to address the needs of the criminal justice population as well as their families.

All of the above could not have been achieved unless collaboration among a myriad of criminal justice and multidisciplinary agencies existed. Probation has evolved into the backbone of the criminal justice system — providing objective information to the courts, applying customized sentencing options, serving as the gateway to the Family Court process, and supervising more than half of all persons sentenced for crimes. Over the years, the courts have relied upon probation as the sentence of choice. Indeed, the number of probationers alone in New York State exceeds those incarcerated and on parole combined.

I once again refer to my original NAPE presentation wherein I stated that probation contributes to community safety everyday. Probation, however, cannot go it alone. We must rely on enhanced interagency planning and collaboration to heighten the quality of services and secure opportunities to share resources. I cannot emphasize enough that the key to success of any program development and/or enhancement is communication and collaboration on all levels, most importantly on executive and managerial levels among all disciplines. The ability to communicate directly and effectively with the courts, district attorneys, police agencies, mental health, and social service professionals to address issues is **priceless**.

Up to this point, I have focused on the road taken thus far. The question now becomes what is the road for the future of probation? More specifically, what does probation need to do in order to solidify its role as the major player in the criminal justice system?

Probation must embrace evidence based practices. Simply put, we need case record management and data collection

(information) systems in the criminal and family court operations. Professional judgment is a wonderful thing. However, in today's world, probation needs to objectify professional judgment with standardized instruments that yield the risks, needs, and strengths of our client base and their families. These instruments must be validated and reliable for our jurisdictions.

Risk assessments are critical tools that probation must utilize to gain objective data in order to determine classification and needs. Decisions must be made through a combination of probation investigations, forensic evaluations (psychiatric and psychological) and validated risk need instruments. Service delivery referrals must be targeted to match the identified needs of the assessment process. The services provided need to be uniform and consistent in approach and be able to yield quantitative outcome measures as they affect improvements in offender behavior.

Criminal justice decision makers must come together to share information among their own agencies. The ability to analyze our own data to determine the effectiveness of programs is no longer a luxury — it must be standard practice for all probation departments. Only when we are able to do this will resources follow. The origins of the probation "social work" model compelled us to describe anecdotally what we did for a living. Although we do not want to abandon these reflections, from this point forward, we must begin to strengthen our story by quantifying what we do under the law enforcement umbrella. The fundamental foundation of measurement must be recidivism for all probation offenders. By accurately providing outcome measures for our service delivery efforts, we will be in a better position to determine caseload size necessary to sustain these positive outcomes.

We have to acknowledge that volume is not enough to determine resource allocations. Even though we are the sentence of choice in America, until we can both demonstrate and accurately measure our effectiveness in reducing crime and enhancing public safety, probation will never get its fair share of the funding pie.

Probation must also be an active participant in the re-entry of offenders from criminal and family court incarceration. Probation must partner with correction agencies in this effort. A single point of return concept utilized in the family court arena provides interagency participation and discharge planning meetings which must include Departments of Social Services, probation, mental health, youth bureaus as well as representation from designated school systems. Similarly, in the adult arena, re-entry must include probation, parole, corrections, prosecution, social services, mental health, and community based agencies. No one should be released from a correctional facility — state or local — without a period of supervision and a comprehensive re-entry plan. The costs may be viewed as significant, however, the potential savings, both systematically and in reducing victimization, will more than pay for it.

Continued on page 16

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ADULT PROBATION OFFICER TURNOVER IN TEXAS

by

Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D. and Dan Richard Beto

Introduction

Principally based upon studies of the private sector, there is a vast amount of theoretical and empirical literature dedicated to answering the question of why employees leave their jobs. Similarly, voluntary turnover, not including termination or retirement, has been a significant subject of attention among American correctional agencies. Correctional executives – both in institutional and community corrections agencies – are faced with high levels of employee absenteeism, stress, poor health, turnover rates, low morale, and vacant positions, all of which contribute to poor job-related productivity. And in a probation setting, turnover can result in increasing caseloads assigned to the remaining officers. This in turn may have a detrimental effect on the quality of supervision and its negative consequences, such as increased unnoticed violations, absconders, and recidivism, thus negatively impacting public safety.

A review of the correctional literature suggests that criminal justice agencies have been less than successful in resolving high levels of employee turnover rates. For example, among probation officers, a turnover rate of approximately 30 percent was reported in Florida in 1995 (Simmons, Cochran, & Blount, 1997) and a turnover study conducted by the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission in 1999 revealed a 19.7 percent turnover rate among Texas juvenile probation line officers and 31.4 percent for juvenile detention and corrections officers (Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 2000). Additionally, although there have been no extensive reports on national rates of community correctional officer turnover, the 1993 National Institute of Corrections conference reached a consensus as to the difficulty in retaining qualified officers (National Institute of Corrections, 1994).

Reducing high levels of staff turnover should be a top priority for probation administrators who are faced with tightening administration budgets and expanding expectations. Unfortunately, no readily available and cost-effective mechanism has been in place to fully and empirically analyze actual turnover rates in detail and discover any underlying reasons for turnover among adult probation line officers in Texas. In response, this pilot study explores their voluntary turnover rates over the past three fiscal years (from fiscal years 2004 to 2006) and examines determinant factors that shape their turnover intention.

Data and Methods

This pilot study utilized a purposive sampling frame since a complete list of line probation officers in Texas was not available, thus making a statewide sample prohibitive. For the purpose of this study, four community supervision and corrections departments (adult probation departments) were selected based on several factors: size and populations served; receptivity to research; and leadership.

The Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Fort Worth is a large department in a major urban

center; the Brazos County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Bryan is a medium size department serving both urban and rural areas; the Fort Bend County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Rosenberg is located adjacent to Harris County and is a medium size department in one of the fastest growing areas of Texas; and the Concho Valley Community Supervision and Corrections Department headquartered in San Angelo is comprised of eight counties with both urban and rural populations.

The directors of these four departments are known for their receptivity to meaningful research. In addition, these four directors — Tom Plumlee, Arlene Parchman, Leighton Iles, and John Wilmoth — are members of the National Association of Probation Executives and are recognized as probation leaders in Texas.

Two different sets of surveys were conducted. The first survey was to look at voluntary turnover rate in the past three fiscal years, whereas the second survey (a mail survey) was to empirically examine the effects of determinant factors on turnover intention. The second survey was administered to line officers in the sampled departments to rate their perceptions of three different types of stressors (external, internal, and job/task), participation in decision-making, supervisory support, peer support, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Also, their socio-demographic and working experience information was elicited.

Data collection was conducted separately at each agency and between July and September 2007. A cover letter emphasized anonymity of responses from each collection site. Each respondent was provided a pre-addressed, stamped envelope to return the survey directly to the researcher at Angelo State University. Participation was entirely voluntary, identity would remain anonymous, and a completed and returned questionnaire would indicate the respondent's informed consent to participate.

This survey was limited to only line officers since existing literature indicates that they are more likely than probation supervisors to feel stressed, have less opportunity to participate in decision-making, have lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, thus leading to high turnover intention. Out of the 325 surveys, 199 were returned for analysis, giving a response rate of 61 percent. Social science agrees that at least a 50 percent return rate is required for adequate analysis and reporting (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005). Therefore, the 61 percent response rate in the sample of the line officers from the four Texas jurisdictions is considered as a good response rate.

Findings

Turnover Rates

All four directors were asked to collect and provide their official records on the voluntary turnover rates over the past three years (fiscal years of 2004, 2005, and 2006). It should be noted that voluntary turnover rate was expressed as the total number of line officers who voluntarily quit (excluding termination and

Executive Exchange

retirement) divided by the total number of line officers at each fiscal year. Based on responses of the directors from the four sampled probation departments, line officers' average turnover rates in the three years were estimated to be between 17 percent and 24 percent (17% for 2004, 20% for 2005, and 24% for 2006). Also, one department experienced an unusually high turnover rate (nearly 40% in 2006). Overall, voluntary turnover rates have steadily increased over the past three years.

Socio-demographic and Working Experience Information

Demographic findings reveal that probation officers were employed by the department an average of 6.54 years, ranging from a minimum of 0.1 to a maximum of 25 years, and 46.7 percent reported their current position was supervising specialized caseload. Females accounted for 65.3 percent of the officer population, and 63.8 percent of the officers were Caucasian. The average age was 38.44 years (ranging from 21 years to 66 years of age), with 59.9 percent reported being married. All had at least bachelor's degree with 18.1 percent having acquired a master's degree or more. Only 8.5 percent of the respondents had prior employment in law enforcement while 33.7 percent had prior employment in corrections.

Organizational Variables

Internal, Job/Task, and External Stressors. Fifty-four survey questions were adopted from the measurement instrument developed by Whisler (1994) and were used to probe into three aspects of stressors which contribute to a source for overall stress: internal, job/task, and external. All items were measured using a 1-5 Likert scale with a rating of 1 indicating "not stressful" and a rating of 5 indicating "very stressful." In brief, twenty-six internal stressor items present stressful conditions within the organization while fourteen external stressor items indicate stressful conditions found outside the organization. Thirteen job/task stressor items represent stress-induced job characteristics. These three subscales reflect multi-dimensional stressful conditions.

Moreover, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for all three subscale items examined were at least 0.84, well above the minimum level of acceptability, supporting the reliability of the three aspects of stressor scales. Simply put, the items used in the study were reliable. The total average of internal stressors was 2.81, which represents stressful conditions internal to the organization, is somewhat higher than that of external stressors of 2.72 and job/task stressors of 2.47. Overall, the respondents' average mean scores, approximately midpoint between "rarely stressful" and "sometimes stressful," suggest relatively low internal, job/task, and external stressful conditions.

However, as noted in Table 1, utilizing the cut-off point of 3.5 (midpoint between "sometimes stressful" and "fairly stressful"), three internal stressors, to a large extent, contribute to stressful conditions internal to the organization: inadequate salary (average 4.25); lack of promotional opportunities (average 3.76); and lack of recognition for good work (average 3.74). The vast majority of the respondents (78.9%) indicate their inadequate salary created a "fairly stressful" or "very stressful" condition.

Table 1
Itemized Internal Stressor Scores in Descending Order

	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
inadequate salary.	199	4.25	1.162
lack of promotional opportunities.	198	3.76	1.295
lack of recognition for good work.	199	3.74	1.319
inadequate support from the agency.	198	3.29	1.379
rigid agency policies.	198	3.20	1.257
political pressure within the agency.	198	3.12	1.304
job conflict (by the book vs. by the situation).	199	3.12	1.208
competition for advancement.	199	3.05	1.292
know the basis on which I am evaluated.	199	3.02	1.297
duties and responsibilities not clearly defined.	197	2.96	1.142
disagreeable agency regulations.	199	2.86	1.221
inadequate support from supervisor.	199	2.81	1.405
not treated like a professional at work.	199	2.80	1.491
assignment of disagreeable duties.	198	2.79	1.169
co-workers know their job and do it well.	199	2.77	1.285
more than one person tells me what to do.	198	2.69	1.341
assignment of new or unfamiliar duties.	199	2.67	1.164
inadequate or poor quality equipment.	197	2.64	1.114
inadequate or poor supervision.	198	2.50	1.237
lack of adequate training.	198	2.40	1.204
racial conflicts/pressures within the agency.	199	2.36	1.222
inappropriate or excessive discipline.	199	2.29	1.245
performing non-probation tasks.	199	2.24	1.105
difficulty getting along with supervisors.	199	2.22	1.180
lack of job security.	198	2.05	1.210
difficulty getting along with co-workers.	199	1.89	0.950
Total Average	188	2.81	0.755

* Responses to each item are made on a 5-point scale with anchors labeled (1) *not stressful* and (5) *very stressful*

Table 2
Itemized Job/Task Stressor Scores in Descending Order

	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
expected to do too much in too little time.	198	3.89	1.168
excessive paperwork.	198	3.80	1.208
due dates for reports.	199	2.88	1.303
difficulty in supervising offenders.	197	2.68	1.038
visiting probationer's home.	198	2.61	1.281
making critical on the spot decisions.	198	2.47	1.182
fear for my safety and co-workers safety.	199	2.34	1.152
probationer office visits.	199	2.26	1.069
work schedule.	199	2.25	1.241
periods of inactivity or boredom.	199	1.85	0.929
must take work home with me.	196	1.80	1.060
situations requiring use of force.	196	1.70	0.833
making arrests.	193	1.60	0.914
Total Average	186	2.47	0.648

* Responses to each item are made on a 5-point scale with anchors labeled (1) *not stressful* and (5) *very stressful*

Table 3
Itemized External Stressor Scores in Descending Order

	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
frustration with the criminal justice system.	198	3.32	1.160
courts are too lenient with offenders.	198	3.30	1.178
adequate community resources lacking.	199	3.17	1.172
ineffectiveness of the correctional system.	199	3.09	1.209
ineffectiveness of the judicial system.	199	3.06	1.183
lack of interagency cooperation.	196	2.96	1.283
politics outside the agency.	199	2.78	1.294
negative/distorted press accounts of probation.	199	2.71	1.261
negative attitudes toward probation officers.	199	2.62	1.183
scheduling of court appearances.	199	2.46	1.167
not treated like a professional by the public.	199	2.45	1.274
public criticism of probation.	199	2.34	1.138
demands for high moral standards.	199	2.03	1.199
racial conflicts/pressures outside the agency.	199	2.00	1.054
Total Average	194	2.72	0.835

* Responses to each item are made on a 5-point scale with anchors labeled (1) *not stressful* and (5) *very stressful*

Table 4
Itemized Participation in Decision-Making Scores

	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
My superiors ask me for input on decisions that affect me at work.	197	3.04	1.241
I am encouraged to offer my opinion at work.	198	3.16	1.240
There is opportunity for me to have a say in the running of this agency on matters that concern me.	198	2.42	1.086
Management responds in a satisfactory manner to what I have to say.	198	2.51	1.079
From past experience at this agency, I feel it is a waste of time. ®	198	3.21	1.172
I feel comfortable about offering my opinion to supervisors at work.	198	3.35	1.129
Those who actually do the work are involved in the writing of policies at this agency.	197	2.11	0.978
The quality of decisions increase as worker participation in decision-making increases.	197	3.52	0.993
Participation in decision-making tends to make one feel better about one's self.	198	4.10	0.771
Participation in decision-making tends to make individuals feel they have a stake in running the organization.	198	4.09	0.848
Participation in decision-making tends to make individuals feel more a part of the team.	198	4.26	0.735
Everyone should be allowed to participate in decision-making in the workplace on matters that affect them.	197	4.14	0.875
Total Average	198	3.33	1.012

® indicates a reverse-keyed item (scoring is reversed)

* Responses to each item are made on a 5-point scale with anchors labeled (1) strongly disagree and (5) strongly agree

induced job characteristics: expected to do too much in too little time (average 3.89) and excessive paperwork (average 3.80). Nearly 63 percent of the respondents report they were demanded to do too much in too little time while 64.2 percent indicate they felt stress about excessive paper work.

With respect to external stressors, there was no stressor over the cut-off point. Table 3 reflects the external stressors considered for the purpose of this survey.

Participation in Decision-making. Based upon the organizational and correctional literature (i.e., Bolman & Deal, 1997; Kim, 2002; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Slate, Vogel, & Johnson, 2001; Slate, Wells, & Johnson, 2003; Wagner, 1994; Whitehead, 1987), it has been suggested that a participatory management structure, emphasizing participation in decision-making by employees, may be more beneficial than rigid autocratic structure for improving a stressful work environment through their own decision-making process. The literature cited also suggests that this type of management scheme may enhance employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment through intensifying their affective reactions toward the job itself and their psychological attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their organization, which in turn leads to better job performance and less turnover.

Developed by Slate, Wells, and Johnson (2003), the twelve items with a five-point subscale (1 indicating "strongly disagree" to 5 for "strongly agree") shown in Table 4 were designed to measure the respondents' perception (items 1 through 7) and attitudes (items 8 through 12) regarding participation in decision-making in their probation departments. In this study, all of the scales examined were well above the minimum level of acceptability evidenced by high Cronbach's Alpha scores (0.84). The respondents recorded an average of 3.33 for the level of participation in decision-making — neither "agree" nor "disagree" — which is considered mixed and therefore does not support any one particular view. Despite no indication of one particular view in overall participation in decision-making, separate sub-group analysis reveals that the majority of the respondents reported high levels of attitudes about participation whereas they showed low levels of perceived atmosphere for participation in their probation departments.

Regarding their high attitudes about participation (not shown in Table 4), for example, more respondents agree that participation in decision-making tends to make individuals feel more a part of the team (91.9%); make one feel better about one's self (86.4%); and make individuals feel they have a stake in running the organization (83.8%). On the other hand, there is evidence that officers' opinions are not sought

Moreover, as reflected in Table 2, two job/task stressors, superior to the cut-off point of 3.5, substantially contribute to stress-

have a stake in running the organization (83.8%). On the other hand, there is evidence that officers' opinions are not sought

Table 5
Itemized Social Support Scores

Supervisory Support	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
The people I work with often have the importance of their job stressed to them by their supervisors.	198	3.10	1.102
My supervisors often encourage the people I work with to think better ways of getting the work done which may never have been thought of before.	199	2.94	1.067
My supervisors often encourage us to do the job in a way that we really would be proud of.	199	3.00	1.068
My supervisors often encourage the people I work with if they do their job well.	198	3.01	1.047
My supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, which are possibly not the fault of those blamed. ®	198	3.19	1.092
When my supervisors have a dispute with somebody on the force, they usually try to handle it in a friendly manner.	198	3.25	0.927
Total Average	196	3.08	0.730
Peer Support	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
My fellow officers often compliment someone who has done his/her job well.	199	3.27	1.076
My fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong. ®	199	3.00	1.082
My fellow officers often encourage each other to do the job in a way that we would really be proud of.	197	3.07	1.031
My fellow officers often encourage each other to think of better ways of getting the work done with if they do their job well.	197	3.16	1.037
My fellow officers spend hardly any time helping me work myself up to a better job by showing me how to improve my performance. ®	199	3.23	1.048
Total Average	195	3.14	0.748

® indicates a reverse-keyed item (scoring is reversed)

* Responses to each item are made on a 5-point scale with anchors labeled (1) strongly disagree and (5) strongly agree

and respected. For example, 69.6 percent of the respondents did not feel involved in the writing of policies, and more than half (56.5%) felt that they had no opportunity to have a say in the running of their agency on matters that concern them. This evidence indicates the low levels of atmosphere for participation in their departments.

Social Support. Job stress was found to be negatively correlated with social support (Etzion, Eden, & Lapidot, 1998) and positively correlated with intentions to quit (Begley & Czajka, 1993). As a provision of instrumental and emotional assistance, social support can be obtained from both supervisors and fellow officers, and can function as a successful coping factor to job stress, which in turn leads to preventing stress and job dissatisfaction, enhancing high levels of organizational commitment, and reducing turnover intention.

Developed by Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank (1985), six items with a five-point subscale (1 for "strongly disagree" to 5 for "strongly agree") were employed to measure interpersonal support from supervisors while five items were utilized to measure social support furnished by peers. Both supervisory and peer support scales examined in this study were slightly above the minimum acceptable level of reliability (Cronbach's Alpha scores: 0.82 and 0.81, respectively).

The respondents reported an average of 3.08 for the level of supervisory support and 3.14 for the level of peer support. Peer support is slightly higher than supervisory support. However,

both averages indicate neither "agree" nor "disagree," which is considered mixed and therefore does not seem to support good quality of work-based helping networks for creating a coping mechanism to the line officer within his or her department. (See the detailed itemized analysis for both scales reported in Table 5).

Overall Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction is generally defined as an employee's affective reactions to a job based upon the level of congruence between an employee's job expectations and the actual situational attributes present (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). There are two measures of job satisfaction: global satisfaction with a job and satisfaction with specific aspects of the job such as pay, supervision, promotion, co-worker, and the job itself. A global measure of job satisfaction was selected for the study since Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner's (2000) meta-analysis suggests that overall job satisfaction is better than facet satisfaction in predicting turnover, although both overall job satisfaction and facet satisfaction are related to turnover.

Developed by Brayfield and Roth (1951), five items with a 1-5 Likert scale (1 indicating "strongly disagree" to 5 for "strongly agree") were used to construct the global job satisfaction. The additive scale produced of these five items had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.95, well above the minimum level of acceptability. Overall, a moderately high level of job satisfaction is reported with an average mean of 3.49 (approximately midpoint between

"neither disagree nor agree" and "agree"). As reflected in Table 6, more than half agreed with the statements: I am seldom bored with my job (67.3%, average = 3.64); I find real enjoyment in my job (64.9%, average = 3.54); I like my job better than the average worker does (62.3%, average = 3.55); I feel fairly well satisfied with my job (58.8%, average = 3.36); and most days I am enthusiastic about my job (55.5%, average = 3.37).

Affective Organizational Commitment. Nineteen survey questions originated by Meyer and Allen (1997) probe into three different dimensional organizational commitments: affective, continuance, and normative. All items consist of a 1-5 Likert scale, with a rating of 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and a rating of 5 indicating "strongly agree." Briefly, six affective commitment items present an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, representing that he or she wants to work for the organization. Seven continuance commitment items indicate an employee is aware of the costs associated with leaving the organization and remains with the organization because he or she needs to. The final six normative commitment items represent an employee's feeling obligated to continue employment, reflecting that employees remain because he or she should stay.

Organizational commitment has most often been used to predict turnover since it generally reduces turnover (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). In a sense, the three different dimensional organizational commitments are useful in predicting what may

Table 6
Itemized Overall Job Satisfaction Analysis

	N (%)	Mean	Std. Dev.
I am seldom bored with my job	199	3.64	1.163
1=Strongly disagree	10 (5.0)		
2=Disagree	34 (17.1)		
3=Neither	21 (10.6)		
4=Agree	87 (43.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	47 (23.6)		
I like my job better than the average worker does	199	3.55	1.038
1=Strongly disagree	6 (3.0)		
2=Disagree	33 (16.6)		
3=Neither	36 (18.1)		
4=Agree	93 (46.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	31 (15.6)		
I find real enjoyment in my job	199	3.54	1.072
1=Strongly disagree	11 (5.5)		
2=Disagree	28 (14.1)		
3=Neither	31 (15.6)		
4=Agree	101 (50.8)		
5=Strongly Agree	28 (14.1)		
Most days I am enthusiastic about my job	198	3.37	1.095
1=Strongly disagree	13 (6.6)		
2=Disagree	33 (16.7)		
3=Neither	42 (21.2)		
4=Agree	87 (43.9)		
5=Strongly Agree	23 (11.6)		
I feel fairly well satisfied with my job	199	3.36	1.109
1=Strongly disagree	13 (6.5)		
2=Disagree	40 (20.1)		
3=Neither	29 (14.6)		
4=Agree	97 (48.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	20 (10.1)		
Total Average	198	3.49	0.876

cause an employee to stay committed to the organization, and also, in predicting what will cause the employee to leave the organization. This study, however, used only six affective commitment items since it has much broader concept about the nature of the employee relationship through his or her emotional attachment and loyalty to the organization (O'Reilly, 1991). Also, existing literature has empirically supported the contention that affective commitment, compared to normative and continuance commitments, has the strongest correlations with withdrawal cognition and turnover (i.e., Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Based on the existing literature, it is reasonably assumed that if an employee begins to exhibit a low level of affective commitment, then he or she may no longer *want* to work for the organization and will voluntarily leave.

The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the affective commitment items examined was 0.81, slightly above the minimum level of acceptability. The average of affective commitment was 2.88, indicating the low levels of the respondents' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their department. Regarding their low affective commitment, for example, almost equal number of the respondents (see Table

7) either "agreed" or "disagreed" to feel like "part of the family at their organization (41.2% vs. 40.7%) and to feel "emotionally attached" to their organization (43.7% vs. 40.2%). There is more evidence of the low levels of the respondents' affective commitment: 40.7 percent of the respondents (vs. 39.7%) did not want to spend the rest of their career in their current organization and 61 percent (vs. 19.6%) did not feel as if their organization's problems were their own. Unfortunately, this evidence appears to indicate that the respondents are weakly committed to their department.

Turnover Intention. As the main dependent variable in this study, the questionnaire included six items measuring respondents' inclination to quit their job. Four of these items were originated by Shore and Martin (1989) and the other two were adopted from Simmon, Cochran, and Blount (1997). Turnover intention in Table 8 was measured on a 1-5 Likert scale (1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 5 for "strongly agree") by the level of agreement with the total six item statements. The additive scale produced of these six items had a high alpha reliability coefficient (0.92).

Understandably, there might be a reasonable suspicion that even if an officer shows an inclination to quit employment, the intention does not necessarily manifest the officer's actual turnover. However, Steel, and Ovalle's (1984) meta-analysis suggests that turnover intentions and turnover both are positively correlated and turnover intentions are better than job satisfaction and organizational commitment in predicting turnover. Furthermore, in an examination of the relationship between voluntary turnover and 35 different variables, Hom and Griffeth (1995) found that among these variables, turnover intention had the strongest relationship to actual voluntary turnover.

The respondents' report of this inclination is mixed with an overall mean of 3.00 on a 1-5 Likert scale. However, many respondents indicated strong inclination to quit their department on all questions. Regarding their high turnover intention, approximately 47 percent of the respondents would quit their department given any better job availability and a half had often thought about leaving their department. The negative response reveals substantial evidence to support a top priority for probation administrators to reduce staff turnover in an era of tightening budgets and expanding expectations.

Multivariate Analysis

Relying on descriptive statistical procedures would prevent proper examination of any data. The most appropriate method of analyzing any data is multivariate statistical techniques to examine the relationships and potential interactions between all variables simultaneously. A stepwise Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) model was employed to assess the effects of affective

Table 7
Itemized Affective Commitment Analysis

	N	Mean*	Std. Dev.
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	197	2.95	1.259
1=Strongly disagree	28 (14.2)		
2=Disagree	53 (26.9)		
3=Neither	39 (19.8)		
4=Agree	54 (27.4)		
5=Strongly Agree	23 (11.7)		
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	198	2.30	1.103
1=Strongly disagree	56 (28.3)		
2=Disagree	67 (33.8)		
3=Neither	36 (18.2)		
4=Agree	37 (18.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	2 (1.0)		
I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. ®	198	2.94	1.235
1=Strongly disagree	29 (14.6)		
2=Disagree	52 (26.3)		
3=Neither	35 (17.7)		
4=Agree	65 (32.8)		
5=Strongly Agree	17 (8.6)		
I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. ®	199	2.95	1.203
1=Strongly disagree	28 (14.1)		
2=Disagree	52 (26.1)		
3=Neither	32 (16.1)		
4=Agree	75 (37.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	12 (6.0)		
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	199	3.08	1.112
1=Strongly disagree	19 (9.5)		
2=Disagree	45 (22.6)		
3=Neither	49 (24.6)		
4=Agree	73 (36.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	13 (6.5)		
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. ®	199	2.99	1.221
1=Strongly disagree	29 (14.6)		
2=Disagree	44 (22.1)		
3=Neither	42 (21.1)		
4=Agree	67 (33.7)		
5=Strongly Agree	17 (8.5)		
Total Average	196	2.88	1.096

® indicates a reverse-keyed item (scoring is reversed)

* Responses to each item are made on a 5-point scale with anchors labeled (1) *strongly disagree* and (5) *strongly agree*

commitment, overall job satisfaction, social support (supervisory and peer support), participation in decision-making, and stressors (internal, job/task, and external) on line probation officers' inclinations to quit their jobs, while controlling for the influence of a variety socio-demographic and work experience variables. These control variables include respondent's age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, education level, employment in current agency, previous employment in law enforcement, previous employment in corrections, and supervision of special caseload.

In terms of possible multicollinearity, the simplest way to diagnose multicollinearity is to check a correlation coefficient larger than ± 0.7 . A preliminary Pearson's zero-order correlation analysis indicates no evidence of possible high levels of multicollinearity since there is no correlation coefficient higher than ± 0.7 . Also, all variance inflation factors with this model are below 4.0, also indicating no problematic multicollinearity. Table 9 presents five significant factors. Two significant demographic factors include

age and marital status while three significant organizational factors entail supervisory support, overall job satisfaction, and affective commitment. The other variables were excluded from the model since they failed to make a statistically significant contribution.

The five significant independent variables accounted for 61.9 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, officers' turnover intention. To test whether this variance explained is statistically significant, a *one-way ANOVA* and the *F* ratio were used. The calculated *F* ratio for the final regression model is 49.101 ($df = 5$, $p < .001$) which indicates a statistically significant amount of variance explained by the model.

As for age and marital status, the findings indicate that officers with more age ($Beta = -0.183$, $p < .01$) and married officers ($Beta = -0.130$, $p < .05$) are less likely to be inclined to quit; younger aged, single officers tend to feel inclined to quit. However, compared to the three significant organizational factors, age, and marital status had the statistically significant but weak negative effect on officers' turnover intention, suggesting the organizational factors play a larger role in predicting an officer's turnover intention than the individual factors. The effects of supervisory support, overall job satisfaction, and affective commitment can translate into less adverse consequences of turnover intention. Especially, affective commitment ($Beta = -0.461$, $p < .001$) had the strongest statistically significant effect on officers' turnover intention, followed by overall job satisfaction ($Beta = -0.257$, $p < .001$) and supervisory support ($Beta = -0.164$, $p < .01$).

The main finding from the stepwise OLS regression model for turnover intention indicates that affective commitment mainly and substantially contributes to turnover intention; when an employee shows a low level of affective commitment, reflecting a lack of desire to work for the organization, the employee is more likely to voluntarily leave his/her organization. From a managerial perspective, therefore, it should be imperative to examine determinant factors that shape affective commitment in order to prevent and reduce high staff turnover.

As presented in Table 10, officers' affective commitment was regressed on both the individual and organizational factors. The model produced no significant demographic factor but did identify four organizational factors which include internal stressor, overall job satisfaction, external stressor, and participation in decision-making.

The four significant organizational factors accounted for 52.4 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, officers' affective commitment. To test whether this variance explained is statistically significant, a *one-way ANOVA* and the *F* ratio were used.

Table 8
Itemized Turnover Intention Analysis

	N (%)	Mean	Std. Dev.
As soon as I can find a better job, I will quit at this organization.	199	3.20	1.314
1=Strongly disagree	24 (12.1)		
2=Disagree	44 (22.1)		
3=Neither	38 (19.1)		
4=Agree	54 (27.1)		
5=Strongly Agree	39 (19.6)		
I often think about quitting my job.	198	3.13	1.342
1=Strongly disagree	27 (13.6)		
2=Disagree	52 (26.3)		
3=Neither	20 (10.1)		
4=Agree	66 (33.3)		
5=Strongly Agree	33 (16.7)		
Which of the following most clearly reflects your feelings about your future with this organization in the next year?	199	2.85	1.289
1=I definitely will not leave.	34 (17.1)		
2=I probably will not leave.	50 (25.1)		
3=I am uncertain.	55 (27.6)		
4=I probably will leave.	31 (15.6)		
5=I definitely will leave.	29 (14.6)		
How do you feel about leaving this organization?	198	3.06	1.239
1=It is very unlikely that I would ever consider leaving this organization.	19 (9.6)		
2=As far as I can see ahead, I intend to stay with this organization.	64 (32.3)		
3=I have no feeling about this way or the other.	27 (13.6)		
4=I am seriously considering leaving in the near future.	63 (31.8)		
5=I am presently looking and planning to leave.	25 (12.6)		
If you were completely free to choose, would you prefer or to not prefer to continue working with this organization?	199	2.73	1.233
1=I prefer very much to continue working for this organization.	30 (15.1)		
2=I prefer to work here.	76 (38.2)		
3=I don't care either way.	28 (14.1)		
4=I prefer not to work here.	47 (23.6)		
5=I prefer very much not to continue working for this organization.	18 (9.0)		
How important is it to you personally that you spend your career in this organization rather than some other organization?	199	3.06	1.349
1=It is very important for me to spend my career in this organization.	34 (17.1)		
2=It is fairly important.	42 (21.1)		
3=It is of some importance.	33 (16.6)		
4=I have mixed feelings about its importance.	59 (29.6)		
5=It is of no importance at all.	31 (15.6)		
Total Average	198	3.00	1.096

The calculated F ratio for the final regression model is 44.204 ($df = 4, p < .001$) which indicates a statistically significant amount of variance explained by the model for affective commitment.

Similar to the findings from the previous model for turnover intention, the organizational factors play a greater role in predicting officers' affective commitment than the individual factors. The effects of internal and external stressors can translate into more adverse consequences of affective commitment.

On the other hand, the effects of participation in decision-making and overall job satisfaction can be interpreted into less adverse consequences of affective commitment. Particularly, internal stressor (Beta = -0.449, $p < .001$) had the strongest statistically significant effect on officers' affective commitment, followed by overall job satisfaction (Beta = 0.409, $p < .001$), external stressor (Beta = -0.157, $p < .01$), and participation in decision-making (Beta = 0.152, $p < .01$). This finding suggests that internal stressor, stressful conditions within his/her department, largely contributes to shaping affective commitment.

General Policy Implications

Reducing high levels of staff turnover should be a top priority for probation administrators who are faced with tightening administration budgets and expanding expectations. Unfortunately, there is little extant scholarly and professional literature on this topic. In response, this pilot study explored turnover rates of line adult probation department personnel in Texas and examined determinant factors that shape their turnover intention.

Overall, the findings indicate to a large degree that organizational factors are more important in explaining Texas probation line officers' turnover intention than individual factors. Mainly affective commitment was found to be a pivotal factor in predicting turnover intention. On the other hand, internal stressor and overall job satisfaction were found to be the key variables in predicting affective commitment. Therefore, it is concluded that when an employee feels stressful conditions internal to the organization and job dissatisfaction, the employee's level of affective commitment will decrease, which in turn will intensify his/her turnover intention.

By implication, general recommendations to policy-makers are provided. First, managers should be acutely aware of not only the transition from individual to organizational factors, especially the significance of affective commitment, as a possible underlying cause leading to an employee's inclination to quit. Stressful conditions internal to the organization — such as inadequate salary, lack of promotional opportunities, and lack of recognition for good work — are identified as significant problems with affective commitment. Managers confront these in their work structure and should be aware of possible effects of these situations on staff retention.

Given the increasing turnover rates found in this study, it is recommended that managers should realize chronic problems with extrinsic rewards, such as inadequate salary and lack of promotional opportunities, and should find a way to expand more external rewards in order to avoid getting trapped in the vicious cycle of the internal stressor and its negative consequence of turnover intention. At the same time, managers should immediately develop internal rewards, such as better recognition for good work and opportunities for professional growth and development. This might serve to compensate for the temporary lack of extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards need to be implemented whereby probation officers are encouraged to become involved in decision-making, thus contributing to their autonomy and sense of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Such strategies would involve a shift in supervisory and managerial roles from directing and controlling line officers in a traditional autocratic culture to facilitating, coaching, and consulting line officers.

Executive Exchange

In sum, managers need to assess how their organizations influence individual and aggregate officer performance. Strategies which increase employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, which are conceptualized and defined as affective commitment, should be embodied as integral processes in the strategic plans of evolving organizations.

Finally, the present study has one limitation which should be addressed in future studies. Because a sample frame of all probation line officers in Texas was not available, this study used a purposive sample, thus limiting the generalizability of the findings and conclusions. Future research should secure Texas State funds to conduct a state-wide survey to enhance the generalizability of results.

References

Begley, T. M., & Czajka, J. M. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 552-556.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brayfield, A., & Roth, H. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 307-311.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, C. P., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel about Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance*. New York: Lexington Books.

Cullen, F., Link, B., Wolfe, N., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly, 2*(4), 505-533.

Etzion, D., Eden, D., & Lapidot, Y. (1998). Relief from job stressors and burnout: Reserve service as a respite. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 577-585.

Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). *Employee Turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South Western.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*, 463-488.

Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administrative Review, 62*, 231-241.

Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology* (4th ed.). Belmont, California: Thomson/Wadsworth Publishing.

Table 9
Stepwise Ordinary Least Square Regression Model for Turnover Intention

Independent Variables	B ^A	Std. Error.	Beta ^B	t
<u>Included Variables</u>				
<i>Personal Factors</i>				
Age (in years)	-0.107	0.031	-0.183	-3.407**
Marital status (currently married = 1)	-1.781	0.715	-0.130	-2.492*
<i>Organizational Factors</i>				
Affective commitment	-0.602	0.087	-0.461	-6.940***
Overall job satisfaction	-0.396	0.099	-0.257	-3.982***
Supervisory support	-0.251	0.084	-0.164	-3.010**
<u>Excluded Variables</u>				
Gender (male = 1)				
Ethnicity (Caucasian = 1)				
Educational level (Master's degree or more = 1)				
Employment in current agency (in years)				
Prior employment in law enforcement (yes = 1)				
Prior employment in corrections (yes = 1)				
Supervise special caseload (yes = 1)				
Internal stressor				
Job/Task stressor				
External stressor				
Participation in decision-making				
Peer support				
R-square		0.619		
F (df)		49.101 (5)		
Significance		0.000		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

^A Unstandardized Coefficients

^B Standardized Coefficients

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20-52.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

National Institute of Corrections. (1994). Recruitment and retention in community corrections: Report from National Institute of Corrections conference. *Federal Probation, 58*, 16-19.

O'Reilly, C. (1991). Corporations, control and commitment. In R. Steers & L. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and Work Behavior*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Shore, L. & Martin, H. (1989). Performance and turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in relations to work. *Human Relations, 42*: 325-638.

Simmons, C., Cochran, J. K., & Blount, W. R. (1997). The effects of job-related stress and job satisfaction on probation officers' inclinations to quit. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 21, 213-229.

Slate, R. N., & Vogel, R. E. (1997). Participative management and correctional personnel: A study of the perceived atmosphere for participation in correctional decision making and its impact on employee stress and thoughts about quitting. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 397-408.

Slate, R. N., Vogel, R. E., & Johnson, W. (2001). To quit or not to quit: Perceptions of participation in correctional decision making and the impact of organizational stress. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 68-78.

Slate, R., Wells, T., & Johnson, W. (2003). Opening the manager's door: State probation officer stress and perceptions of participation in workplace decision-making. *Crime and Delinquency*, 49, 519-541.

Steel, R. P., & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 673-686.

Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (2000). *A Study of Salaries and Turnover Rates of Juvenile Probation Department Personnel in Texas*. Retrieved January 1, 2008, from the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission Website: <http://www.tjpc.state.tx.us/publications/Reports/RPTOTH200001.pdf>

Wagner, J. A. (1994). Participation's effect on performance and satisfaction: A reconsideration of research evidence. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 312-330.

Whisler, P. M. (1994). *A study of stress perception by selected state probation officers*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Florida, Tampa.

Whitehead, J. T. (1987). Probation officer job burnout: A test of two theories. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15, 1-16.

Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Angelo State University in San Angelo, Texas.

Dan Richard Beto, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, is a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario.

Persons desiring additional information about this study are encouraged to contact Dr. Lee at wlee@angelo.edu or at (325) 942-2262.

Table 10
Stepwise OLS Regression Model for Affective Commitment

Independent Variables	B ^A	Std. Error.	Beta ^B	t
Included Variables				
<i>Organizational Factors</i>				
Internal stressor	-0.117	0.021	-0.449	-5.477***
Overall job satisfaction	0.480	0.075	0.409	6.422***
External stressor	0.069	0.031	-0.157	-2.220*
Participation in decision-making	0.107	0.053	0.152	2.040*
Excluded Variables				
Age (in years)				
Gender (male = 1)				
Ethnicity (Caucasian = 1)				
Marital status (currently married = 1)				
Educational level (Master's degree or more = 1)				
Employment in current agency (in years)				
Prior employment in law enforcement (yes = 1)				
Prior employment in corrections (yes = 1)				
Supervise special caseload (yes = 1)				
Job/Task stressor				
Supervisory support				
Peer support				
R-square		0.524		
F (df)		44.204 (4)		
Significance		0.000		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

^A Unstandardized Coefficients

^B Standardized Coefficients

NAPE LISTSERV AND WEBSITE

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

At present there are over 190 members registered on the NAPE Listserv. Members who are not receiving this service but wish to should send an email to probation.executives@gmail.com, indicating a desire to be added to the NAPE Listserv. In addition, members who would like to update their email addresses, or add a second email address, should feel free to do so.

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

If you have not done so recently, please visit the NAPE website at www.napehome.org.

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY PROBATION: DELIVERING EFFECTIVE SENTENCES FOR THE COMMUNITY

by

John Scott

Introduction

Have you ever been put to the test? Had to prove yourself? Stood anxiously before an examiner or had your accounts inspected by an auditor? In some universities in England, they have a viva system where students face a panel of professors who probe and challenge answers in an oral, as opposed to written, examination — just thinking about it makes me nervous!

I expect that all of us know what it is like to face an exam or a trial period in a new job or an appraisal with a manager. We therefore understand the basic concept of “probation” — unlike a recent delegation of Chilean senators, who visited London to find out how we, in England, dealt with offenders in the community. One senator said they simply had no concept of probation in their justice system, no word for probation. We therefore spent time exploring the term. “Probation” comes from the Latin verb *probare* — to prove. An English definition is: “the testing of a person’s conduct, character or moral qualifications.” Probation could thus apply to a trial period as a candidate for a religious body or a college. The senator eventually found the phrase “supervision in the community” helpful.

This paper examines the concept of probation in the European criminal justice context, the origins of probation, and the direction of its journey into the 21st century.

We are fortunate to have the opportunity to take a step away from the rigors of our professional lives to reflect, to learn together, and to be challenged by different ideas and experiences. Such time is gold dust, but I do not think it is a luxury. Rather, it is essential to engage with the hardest problems our societies face — crime and upholding law and order — and to work in a multinational and multidisciplinary environment. Scientists gain a great deal from the ideas emerging from different fields and countries. We might not aspire to be social scientists, but as policymakers or practitioners in criminal justice, it is imperative that we learn from others, to find out “what works” in different jurisdictions and to strive to improve the services available to our citizens. Robert Harris, an English academic, called this approach “the comparative imagination” — it is demanding to understand differences and similarities, but it is also demanding to use our imaginations. These beliefs underpin the work of the European Probation Conference (CEP), which has 26 countries in membership and more about to join in September in Tallinn, Estonia.

I aim to pose the following questions to examine how probation needs to deliver modern and effective sentences for the community:

- What are the origins of probation?
- What does the community want from probation?
- What do we know about effective practice? About programs and supervision?
- What direction should probation take?
- What is my vision for the future of probation in Europe?

The Origins of Probation

Earlier this year at Westminster Abbey in London, there was a special service to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the foundation of the probation service in England and Wales. It was a privilege to look back on the 100 years that have passed since the 1907 Probation of Offenders Act, the statutory beginning of the probation service in England and Wales. But the international history of probation goes back much further. Although it has its roots in England, it needs to incorporate North American philanthropists in Massachusetts and reformers in Holland.

In Medieval English Law. The origins of probation can be traced to the English criminal law of the Middle Ages. Harsh punishments were imposed on adults and children alike, even for minor offenses. Sentences such as branding, flogging, mutilation, and execution were common. A variety of measures were devised to mitigate these harsh sentences — royal pardons could be purchased by the accused; judges could refrain from applying statutes or could opt for a lenient interpretation of them; stolen property could be devalued by the court so that offenders could be charged with a lesser crime. Eventually, the courts began the practice of “binding over for good behavior,” a form of temporary release during which offenders could take measures to secure pardons or lesser sentences, and certain courts used suspended sentences.

In the United States. In the United States, particularly in Massachusetts, different practices were developed. “Security for good behavior,” was much like modern bail — the accused paid a fee as collateral for good behavior. Indictments were “laid on file” or held in abeyance. To mitigate unreasonable mandatory penalties, judges often granted a motion to quash the charge based upon minor technicalities or errors in the proceedings. Although these American practices were genuine precursors to probation, it is the early use of recognizance and suspended sentence that is directly related to modern probation.

John Augustus, the “Father of Probation,” is recognized as the first practicing probation officer. Augustus was born in Woburn, Massachusetts, in 1785. By 1829, he was a permanent resident of Boston and the owner of a successful boot-making business. He was a member of the Washington Total Abstinence Society, an organization that believed abusers of alcohol could be rehabilitated through understanding, kindness, and sustained moral persuasion, rather than through courts and prison sentences.

In 1841, John Augustus attended the Boston police court to bail out a “common drunkard,” the first probationer. The offender was ordered to appear in court three weeks later for sentencing. He returned to court a sober man, accompanied by Augustus. To the astonishment of all in attendance, his appearance and demeanor had dramatically changed.

Augustus thus began an 18-year career as an unpaid probation officer. By 1858, John Augustus had provided bail for 1,946 men and women, young and old. Reportedly, only ten of this number forfeited their bond, a remarkable achievement when measured

against any modern standards of effectiveness. His reformer's zeal and dogged persistence won him opposition and devotion in equal measure. The first probation statute, enacted in Massachusetts shortly after his death in 1859, was widely attributed to his efforts.

In Holland. In Holland, the probation service was founded in 1823 under the name "The Society for the Moral Improvement of Prisoners" (Genootschap tot zedelijke verbetering der gevangenen). The founders were three merchants who were strongly influenced and inspired by the English penal reformer John Howard. In the early years, the society's work consisted mainly of visiting prisoners and handing out reading matter. The aim was to influence offenders by providing education and religious guidance, so that they would refrain from further criminality. Other private citizens, who shared the same ideals, provided the financial means to undertake the completely voluntary work.

In England. Two names are most closely associated with the founding of probation in England: Matthew Davenport Hill, an 18th century English barrister and judge, and John Rainer, a 19th century printer. As a progressive judge appointed to be Recorder of Birmingham, Hill used his independence to sentence offenders to a single day in custody on the condition that they were closely supervised by a parent or guardian. If offenders demonstrated a potential for rehabilitation, they were placed in the hands of guardians who willingly took charge of them. Hill had court officers pay periodic visits to these guardians in an effort to track the offender's progress.

In 1876, Rainer wrote a letter to the Church of England Temperance Society with a donation of five shillings (35 cents does not seem a lot!) — he was concerned about the "lack of hope and help for those who come before the court." The donation led to the appointment of the first missionary at the Southwark Police Court. By 1894, there were 70 men and women working for the London Police Court Mission. They saw the link between alcohol and crime and were "muscular" in urging abstinence and in distributing tracts.

Development of Probation: Implementation

The origins of probation lie in religion, philanthropy, judicial creativity, and a desire to break the cycle of alcohol misuse, criminality, and imprisonment. Over the 20th century, probation evolved to become a leading component of criminal justice systems, but variety in implementing the concept can lead to confusion. I am grateful to Professor Anton van Kalmthout from Holland, whose book *Probation en Europe* provides a thorough examination of European probation systems. His work identifies three approaches to probation:

1. **Probation as an order** — a disposal of the court that consists of a conditional suspension of punishment while the offender is placed under personal supervision and is given individual guidance or treatment.
2. **Probation as a sentence** — a punishment of the court that combines controls and assistance with a "socio-pedagogic basis" and seeks to modify the behavior of offenders so they can reclaim a place in society.
3. **Probation as a system** — a system in which probation activities go beyond the implementation and organization of community sanctions and incorporate work with remand

cases, victims, crime prevention, and community safety. Probation as a concept is integrated into the criminal justice system rather than being an adjunct to it.

You may wish to consider which of these approaches to probation is dominant in your jurisdiction.

Development of Probation: Framework for Delivery

Another layer of complexity is related to the framework for delivering probation services. In Europe, there are two main modes of delivery — correctional and community justice systems. There is not always a stark divide between these two, and some countries have features from each system, but the characteristics cluster in this way. In the correctional system, we have the following features:

- Penitentiary administration;
- Joint prison and probation services;
- Administration by the State;
- Employees are civil servants;
- Central controls;
- Strong judicial role;
- Emphasis on containment; and
- Focus on execution of sentences.

In the community justice system, we have:

- Local administration;
- Separation from prisons;
- Independent organization and employment;
- Welfare and social work mode;
- Links with local courts and agencies;
- Emphasis on rehabilitation; and
- Focus on range of interventions.

Again you may wish to consider where on the spectrum your jurisdiction lies.

In England and Wales, we operate a mixed model, but our origins are in community justice, and the developments of the last two decades have been toward correctionalism. As we try to have the best of both worlds, there have been many demands upon managers and staff to change attitudes and methods of working.

For example, the community justice model is characterized by the exercise of discretion by the probation officer — high levels of professional autonomy. All the recent changes have constrained discretion — national standards, computerized assessments, performance targets, and accredited programs for specific types of offender. These developments are paralleled in many other European probation systems — they are indications of "managerialism" in all walks of life — but also the result of increasing political attention and public concern about crime and community safety.

What Does the Community Want From Probation?

"Tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime" was Tony Blair's most famous quote. It was coined while he was the opposition spokesperson on Home Affairs in the 1990s. The reason it worked so well, not just as a piece of "spin," was that it struck

a chord with what the public wanted from government and from the criminal justice system.

Across Europe, it is a common sociological feature that increased political attention is being given to crime and punishment. Crime is often cited as the number one social concern in opinion polls. Newspapers and other media highlight the drama of crime, so even though reported crime is falling in many countries, there exists a “merry-go-round” involving politicians, media, and public anxiety, which has increased the fear of crime. There is an irony that those least at risk of violent crime, women over the age of 50 years, are most fearful of being a victim—those most at risk of violence, young men under the age of 25 years, are least fearful. Older people choose not to venture out at night. Communities become more defensive—gated estates are increasingly common, and not just in the United States; newspapers feed the fear; politicians see votes in being tough; and the merry-go-round spins.

The impact on probation is clear—the public expects us to be tougher. On the whole, the public has very little understanding of what probation officers do—compared to teachers, for example, because everyone has an experience of school. Probation happens behind closed doors, and because probation staff have historically been reluctant to open up their work to public scrutiny, there is often only a vague impression of the probation role.

In the United Kingdom, probation is largely perceived as “soft”—headlines such as “Offender Walks Free” or “Let Off for Thugs” are common. To counter this, probation has sought to emphasize the demands made upon offenders on community sentences—in unpaid work or on programs—but the basic perception remains that probation is not enough of a punishment and is not concerned enough about victims.

I think the community wants two things from the criminal justice system—and therefore from probation—to protect the public and to reduce reoffending. These are aims that sit easily with probation staff; what is more problematic are the expectations that accompany the aims when there is a terrible crime involving someone on licence or on a community sentence. All around Europe, there are instances of public outcry followed by inquiries and recommendations to reform and improve. I can think of examples in England, Holland, and Sweden. I want to propose that these inquiries should be visited by probation leaders in every jurisdiction—“There but for the grace of God go I”—because it is always better to learn from the mistakes or misfortune of others than from your own. I have extracted five key pointers to what the public wants from probation:

1. **Enforcement**—holding the offender to account and going back to court or prison if there is a breach;
2. **Clarity about standards and responsibility**—ensuring that the probation officer knows what is expected and who is responsible;
3. **“Doing a proper job”**—being organized, thorough, and professional in delivering the community supervision required by courts and licences;
4. **Acknowledging the victim’s perspective**—being sensible of and realistic about the victim’s concerns and needs;
5. **Maintaining open and accountable systems**—not trying to cover up poor practice or processes; regular public reporting on the success and failures of probation.

As a Chief Probation Officer, I often had to face audiences of magistrates, and the “tough versus soft” debate often arose. Because I could never imagine a politician winning votes by saying: “Soft on crime, soft on the causes of crime,” my primary response was to shift emphasis toward “what works”—and to ask the audience what is effective with offenders to reduce the risk of reoffending and risk of serious harm to the public? And I now want to answer that question.

What Do We Know About Effective Practice and About Offender Programs and Supervision?

For this section of my discussion, I will unashamedly draw on experience in the United Kingdom and the work of researchers in the United States.

By “offender program,” I mean a specific intervention focused on a type of offender, designed to change the offender’s behavior and reduce reoffending. In England and Wales, we have about 20 such programs that are accredited by a panel and made available to courts across the 42 probation areas. The programs vary in length and frequency and cover a variety of offender types such as drunk drivers, sex offenders, prolific offenders, drug and alcohol abusers, and domestic abusers.

What Are the General Learning Points? Programs should be:

- Targeted on factors associated with the likelihood of reoffending (criminogenic need);
- Include a cognitive skills training element (cognitive-behavioral approach);
- Of a scale and dosage proportionate to risk of reoffending (resources to follow risk);
- Carefully designed and structured (drawing on international developments);
- Delivered in a way that is responsive to offender’s learning style (horses for courses);
- Supported by processes to prepare, rehearse, apply, and consolidate learning (program to be a component of a whole process, not an isolated intervention);
- Subject to continuous evaluation (remain receptive to “what works” principles and new ideas); and
- Delivered by knowledgeable, committed, and competent staff (prosocial modeling—setting a good example and valuing the learning process).

Offender supervision has a longer history than structured programs have, but there is probably less research on this aspect of the probation task than on programs, many of which have been evaluated and come from a psychology background, where evaluation is frequently built into program development.

What Have We Learned About Offender Supervision? The most effective work with offenders is associated with:

- **Doing the right things**—focus on criminogenic needs; in a scale proportional to likelihood of reoffending; average 4+ factors related to reoffending.
- **With the right people**—assessment and targeting; highly individualized;
- **At the right time**—sequencing; coordinating;
- **In the right way**—cognitive/behavioral core; experiential learning; the 4 Cs;

- **Consistency of method and message** — offenders need to receive consistent prosocial messages from the same person over time and different people at the same time, a real challenge to coordination and teamwork;
- **Continuity of “treatment” and of relationship** — there needs to be a continuity of approach (“treatment integrity” or “continuity of care”) and of relationship — a single plan, a single offender manager;
- **Commitment (sometimes referred to as “genuineness” or “the human link”)** — most offenders have many experiences of exclusion; they are highly sensitive to staff “going through the motions”;
- **Consolidation of learning into routine behavior** — new attitudes, cognitive, or life skills need to be consolidated into “routine” behavior if change is to be sustained.

Combining this learning into an integrated systemic approach is the probation challenge for the 21st century. I would go further: It is the challenge for criminal justice — to avoid the “silo” mentality of separate cultures and development that are frequently present in European prison and probation services.

What Direction Should Probation Take?

Challenge the Predominate Construct. First, I want criminal justice leaders to challenge the predominate construct of sentencing policy, which places prison at the center of the system. This is termed the “carcio-centric” approach. In the mindset of most of our public and politicians, prison is seen as the only effective way to respond to crime — all other sentences are seen as secondary alternatives to prison. The bull’s-eye of the target is prison, and any arrow or sentence that drifts away from the center scores less trust with the public. My preferred construct is of a spectrum with diversion from prosecution at one end of the spectrum, increasingly demanding community sentences in the middle, and imprisonment at the end. The level of intervention should be proportionate to risk and, in Patrick Carter’s phrase, “resources should follow risk.”

Probation and Prison Services Should Work Together. Second, probation and prison services should together address the need to manage the offender’s journey through the system. My current job is to act as the advocate for end-to-end offender management across England and Wales, so what I am about to argue could be seen as an advert for our approach. I want to use our model only as an illustration of what each jurisdiction needs to address — the need for a business-like process to eradicate the gaps, the duplication, and the mistakes of unreformed penal systems.

Effective process management is vital to every organization. My deputy, Tony Grapes, who developed the offender management model now adopted by the National Offender Management Service, uses a car breakdown service to persuade doubters! Imagine breaking down on your way to Santander — you are reliant on an effective range of responses so that systems and people work together to help you complete your journey! You would not take it kindly if you were told no help was available because the mechanic was on a two-week holiday. Equally, the offender’s journey needs to be effectively managed, with the right interventions sequenced to affect the likelihood of reoffending.

It is my view that accurate assessment is the key to offender management — not just at the start of a sentence but at regular

intervals, so progress can be mapped and the program can be tailored to the individual’s changing circumstances.

We teach our probation and prison staff involved in offender management that ASPIRE is their goal — assess, sentence, plan, implement, review, and evaluate.

As the former Head of the Public Protection Unit in the Home Office, I wanted every prison officer and probation officer to be a front-line risk assessor. Risk is a dynamic. In a prison, an angry letter from home can increase risk of self-harm or violence. In the community, the loss of a job or a new relationship can increase the risk of acquisitive crime or the grooming of a new partner’s child. Skilled assessment and the gathering of intelligence is the “heart” of offender management, and so we have invested heavily in OASys, a computerized assessment tool.

The “head” of offender management is differentiating need and risk and allocating resources effectively. I am committed to the spectrum model because it is vital to avoid overloading the system by ensuring that low-risk offenders do not absorb resources that should be targeted on high- and very high-risk cases. I will not dwell on the tiering approach because it represents only an English approach, but we have found that it works well with both managers and practitioners and has quickly become part of the language of discussing cases.

Make Use of New Technologies and Information Systems. Third, I want to mention new technologies and information systems because they will radicalize the supervision of the future, and I think probation has to engage with the potential of IT and electronic monitoring — not pretend that it will not happen. As Head of Public Protection, I was committed to pilots for satellite tracking of dangerous offenders and for the use of polygraph machines for sex offenders. In the United Kingdom, we are the highest users of electronic monitoring for enforcing curfews in Europe, but I do not see technology as a magic bullet or “prison without bars.” Rather, I welcome new technologies as additional protective factors, additional tools in our tool box to be used alongside the “people skills” of supervision and programs.

The Importance of Victims’ Issues. Next, I am going to highlight the importance of victims’ issues and services to criminal justice. I am sorry to say that many of our established probation systems are weak in this area. We need to look to the Czech Republic for the fundamental shift that is necessary to see victims as stakeholders in the criminal justice process, not just as burdensome afterthoughts. The Czechs have called their national service the Probation and Mediation Service — victim reparation and mediation are built into their core tasks so that work with offenders is naturally victim orientated. Victims deserve better information, better services, and better protection at all stages of the criminal justice process. Probation and prison leaders must lead on victim’s issues. Their credibility depends on it.

Marketing and Media Strategies. Fifth, I think probation has to invest in marketing and media strategies. I know this is alien to most of us, but having been on the inside of several very difficult media episodes, I am convinced that we should not wait for things to go wrong and merely hope to survive the onslaught. Probation has endless human interest stories with a positive ending — the challenge is to harness them. It may be that national media are hard to engage, but local radio and newspapers reach very high percentages of the population and are often pleased to give space to local people and initiatives. I would urge every national service to engage with the media on the intellectual “what works” debate and to generate interviews and features showing creativity and

victim interests. The possibilities are endless. I have found that annual reports, statistical analyses, new projects, and foreign visits are useful hooks on which to hang a story.

The Value of Partnerships. My final directional point is to emphasize the value of partnerships to probation. These could be with the private sector or with the voluntary and community sector or with other public bodies. A confident probation service always “punches above its weight,” to use a boxing term. It also holds the ring for the offender. No other agency is involved at every stage of the offender journey, and so on behalf of offenders, probation must engage with every opportunity to harness the market of agencies to deliver better services.

In the United Kingdom, we estimate that 50% of the resources needed to turn an offender’s life around come from outside the criminal justice system and are in health, education, employment, drugs, and accommodation agencies. Offenders are citizens, and it is through partnerships that we access services that we can use to bridge offenders into new experiences and acceptance as citizens.

I have not yet mentioned the partnership that was most important to me as Chief Probation Officer and as Head of Public Protection — that with the police. Over the past two years, 11 foreign delegations came to London to find out about our Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements — known as MAPPA. The police, prison, and probation services have a statutory responsibility to work together to supervise violent and sexual offenders. It is work that has revolutionized practice and has led, for example, to police officers working in probation offices and joint teams of staff. These are the sort of partnerships that add new dimensions to probation work and may surprise us with their effectiveness in reducing crime and protecting the public.

A Vision for Probation in Europe

I hope my six directional challenges will help shape the development of probation across Europe. The forthcoming General Assembly of the CEP in Tallinn will be a great opportunity for the new and old probation services to learn from each other. My own view is that the vibrant new organizations of the east and north are an antidote to the complacency of “mature” organizations. What I can confirm is that there is unparalleled interest in probation development — Turkey founded a probation service in 2005 with the help of a Twinning project involving Catalonia, the Czech Republic, Holland, and the United Kingdom; there

are several projects involved with Russia and former Soviet satellite states; and three new countries are expected to join the CEP shortly.

How will this activity be channeled into improved effectiveness across Europe? The Council of Europe has made probation the developmental priority for its penological council, and new probation rules are to be drafted for the Council of Ministers. I see these as having potential to be “supra-national standards” and will urge the Council to ensure that they integrate with the full suite of Rules—for Juvenile Offenders and Prisons. It is my view that there should be an overarching statement of principles for all rules that cover the criminal justice systems of Europe and that the Council should endeavor to integrate the rules. After all, it is the same person who is before a court, in a prison, on a licence, or on a community sentence.

I believe that the exchange of ideas, research, and staff is needed to take us to a new level of learning in Europe. Interpol has existed for decades — Interprob or Interpris should be developed. At a Council of Europe conference in Turkey in November 2005, there was a call for the European Union to establish an International Probation Knowledge Center. I support this proposal — not necessarily to set up a static building on the edge of a European city, but to develop a virtual center that could easily be established involving universities and national services. Because crime and criminals are increasingly mobile and transnational, so, too, should our solutions be unfettered by national boundaries.

I close, then, with this vision — that together we can reduce crime and protect the public and that the sum of the whole of European probation is greater than the sum of its parts.

John Scott is Lead Probation Manager for the Implementation of Offender Management, Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom, and immediate Past President of the European Probation Conference (CEP). This article is based on a speech given by Mr. Scott to the Universidad Internacional Menéndez Pelayo for the seminar New Penal, Social and Health Challenges, August 22, 2007.

This article was published under the same title in ICCA’s *Journal of Community of Corrections*, Volume 17, Number 1 (Fall 2007); © International Community Corrections Association. It is reprinted here with permission of the publisher.

PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE *cont’d*

There are challenges that face probation in the future. I strongly recommend that our probation leaders should develop programs to address these important issues. This cannot be accomplished in isolation. Success can only be achieved in these endeavors through true collaboration and partnering with other criminal justice and juvenile justice decision making agencies. By formulating and maintaining these partnerships, all probation departments nationwide are capable of traveling down their own path which may not

have even been considered in the past. The end product is a balanced probation department embracing the historical notion of the social work model effectively combined with our law enforcement responsibilities.

Are you ready to embrace the risk to venture down a road less traveled....

Rocco A. Pozzi
President

PRISONERS ABROAD'S FAMILY WORK

by

Laura Bevan and Stephen Nash

Prisoners Abroad, located in London, United Kingdom, was established in 1978 to provide practical and emotional support, advice, and information to British citizens detained in and returning from prisons overseas, as well as to their families.

Families and friends of people in prison often go through an extremely difficult time during their relative's incarceration. For our clients, this is worsened by the distance between home and prison; even if someone is allowed access to a phone, the cost is high for an international call. Additionally, with few opportunities for work if you do not speak the language, it can be difficult for prisoners to find the money to buy stationery, envelopes and international stamps so that he/she can stay in contact with family. This is why Prisoners Abroad provides an unlimited supply of international freepost envelopes to those in prison (where they are allowed) so that letters can be sent to our office and forwarded on to family and friends. We received more than 2,300 letters in freepost envelopes last year, and many of these will have contained letters from prisoners for us to post on to family and friends. The everyday contact that loved ones might have had before their relative went to prison is completely lost and communication suddenly becomes very slow when they rely on long-distance postal systems.

"I have started sending mail through you and my family did receive the letters. It is hard for me to have funds for stamps as often as I'd like so that is a big help to me."

MB, USA

Difficulties in communicating with a family member in prison overseas can be made worse by the fear of telling other people what has happened. Our family linking scheme helps families to contact others who are in a similar position to them and talk about issues they have in common. There are about 60 family members who have been linked in this way, and we have had very positive feedback about the strong friendships that people have built up; one mother of a prisoner in the USA told us that she and her "link" regularly phone each other to share experiences and wish each other well. We also have a free phone help line for callers from the UK; the number does not appear on the phone bill and conversations are confidential. Last year the number of calls we received on this line increased by 16%; these might have been requests for information, for advice about how we could help, or simply might have reflected a need to talk to a supportive caseworker.

We have recently been fortunate to have funding for family days, where relatives can come and meet staff and each other to talk through their situation in a friendly, non-judgmental environment.

"Just a note to say thank you to everyone for the family day. We both found it really helpful, and it was nice putting 'faces to names.' It was also really good to meet other people in the same situation. We found it very comforting to talk to them

and have swapped numbers with another family and have promised to keep in touch. Thank you all again for all your hard work and kindness – it does really mean a lot to know there is someone there who understands and can give practical advice as well as emotional support at a truly nightmare time in our lives."

Mother of client in USA

Financially, having a family member in prison can be punitive, as the person in prison will often have been the main earner. In addition to this, it can be very expensive just to cross the Channel to visit a prison in France, let alone to travel to the more far-flung countries in North America or the Caribbean, where around one third of our clients are detained. Prisoners Abroad has a small Travel Fund, which is available for family members who need financial assistance to visit their loved one, as well as fact sheets to help people prepare for what the experience will be like and local information to help with the trip. We are often told that our grants are not enough, and recent funding meant we were able to increase these; as a result, last year we made 39 grants for trips to 15 countries, stretching from France and Spain to USA and Australia. In total, there was a three-fold increase on the previous year's amount of financial assistance to families.

"Thank you for your assistance with my flight over here. It has been lovely to see my partner again after 10 months apart. He could not have managed without the help he's received from Prisoners Abroad, so from both of us, thank you once again."

Partner of client in Thailand

Many countries have established transfer treaties with the UK, which mean that some prisoners can apply to return to their home country to serve the remaining sentence. The transfer process takes a long time, and an application can be turned down, so families go through an agonising wait. The transfer process is especially difficult in North America, where over a quarter of Prisoners Abroad's clients are in prison. Many of these prisoners will have moved there as children and know nothing of life in the UK, which is why Prisoners Abroad's resettlement service is so vital when they are deported here at the end of their sentence. This means that, even if there was not distance between them while they were in prison, they will now be separated from their children, siblings or parents and may not be allowed to return to the country they considered to be their home.

"PA is not just a support organisation, agreeing to forward correspondence to family members and giving account of nameless and faceless prisoners far-flung across the globe. As important as those things are to lonely and forgotten prisoners, PA is much more, and God bless them for it – they are watchful eyes, open ears, a persistent voice and a heart beating

Executive Exchange

for that prisoner's return home. And that, trust me as I speak from personal experience, can be the difference between hope and despair, between nothing and everything."

O, USA

Another financial demand on a family's resources can be customs fines, imposed by some countries as part of the sentence for drug offences. These can be very large sums of money and often a family is unlikely to be able to pay the amount asked for. This can mean their relative has to serve extra time away from their family or may have to prove insolvency, which is a stressful process to go through. Relatives may even receive highly distressing demands from unscrupulous lawyers or unidentified callers for huge sums of money or be threatened with their loved one coming to some harm.

The language barrier created when their relative is imprisoned overseas is one of the most difficult hurdles to cross for family members. Booking prison visits can therefore be impossible for families, but all our caseworkers speak a European language and can often assist with calling the prison, organising visiting permits or liaison with social workers and lawyers; this is particularly necessary in France and Spain, which are currently the second and third countries in the client numbers list.

Prisoners Abroad is in contact with a team of volunteer translators who can translate any documents which the family might need to provide to support their relative's conditional release application, or documents which the family has been sent by the detainee. While an interpreter may have been available to explain proceedings to a prisoner, the family may have less of an idea about what is happening. This can impede communication with the local lawyer acting on the detainee's behalf, but our caseworkers can act as a go-between to aid the family. Although we are not trained to offer legal advice, we can give information to aid better understanding of the criminal justice system in a country.

Sometimes the prison conditions in a foreign country are such that a person's state of health can deteriorate substantially. Prisons in developing countries in particular do not provide nutritious food to inmates, and this often means that the family will be required to send extra money to their relative to supplement their diet. In cases where families do not have the means to support the prisoner in this way, we can ease the burden by making regular payments from a fund set up to assist detainees in purchasing essential items in prison.

Drinking water in a developing country may be unsafe and many other factors, such as climate, can exacerbate the spread of disease; this is very worrying for family members. We recently visited prisoners in South America, many of whom had skin infections from drinking and washing with contaminated water; even if they were able to get medication to put on it, the condition would recur with continued use of the water. Prisoners Abroad has decided to provide funds for chlorine tablets for some of these prisoners, so that they can now ensure their water is safe.

Families may find that the mental health of their relative in prison suffers from the isolation or harsh physical conditions that they face. A prisoner may also not be able to access any medication which he or she needs, depending on what is provided by the prison. Prisoners Abroad's Medical Fund exists to provide grants for essential or emergency treatment or medication, and we do our best to reassure the family that their loved one is receiving as much care as is available in that country.

Prisoners Abroad aims to make the family's experience of their relative's imprisonment overseas as informed and supported as possible. With over 600 family members in contact with us, our family work is an essential part of our core service, and we hope to be able to expand and adapt it continually as our client group grows and changes.

Our support does not stop at the end of the sentence. Prisoners who are deported often arrive at Heathrow airport in London with no money, no one to meet them, and no idea where to go. This is especially the case for people returning from North America — they have often spent the majority of their lives living outside the UK, and have little or no knowledge of life in Britain. There is no special statutory support for ex-prisoners from outside the UK; the British probation service does not support them, the police are only involved if there is an immediate risk to the public, and were it not for Prisoners Abroad these people would have nowhere to go and would more than likely end up sleeping rough.

In fact, Prisoners Abroad provides a full resettlement service to help ex-prisoners re-integrate into British society, and to help them lead crime-free lives in the future. Returning prisoners can seek the help of a small charity called Travel-Care, which can provide funds and directions to enable people to make their way to our office in north London. Once there, we arrange temporary accommodation for the first couple of weeks, to give people the reassurance that they will not be on the streets. We assist people making benefit claims, so that they receive the government assistance to which they, as British citizens, are entitled. We can help people register with a doctor, and we can refer them on to other agencies which are better placed to address any particular needs — from education and re-training to addressing alcohol or drugs issues. We also encourage people to contact any family they may have in the country and, if they want to, we can pay for their ticket to anywhere in the UK to reunite them. Each year, over 200 people return to the UK and are helped by our Resettlement team.

In 2007, Prisoners Abroad was given a special award by the Metropolitan Police in recognition of its work with returning prisoners. In making the award, the police noted that a number of our clients had been high risk and also attracted significant media attention.

"Without Prisoners Abroad's support, diligence, and commitment to successfully reintegrating displaced or deported subjects, appropriate risk management processes could not have been put in place. It is important to note that no subjects referred to the police by the charity have gone on to commit serious further offences."

Alan Morgan
Violent Crime Directorate
Metropolitan Police

The work we do at Prisoners Abroad helps prisoners survive whilst inside, provides support for family members, and assists ex-prisoners in re-building their lives after imprisonment. It is absolutely vital work, for which there is an ever-growing need.

Laura Bevan is a Senior Caseworker with Prisoners Aboard in London, United Kingdom.

Stephen Nash, is the Information Officer with Prisoners Abroad in London, United Kingdom.

PROBATION IN IRELAND: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE EARLY YEARS

by

Gerry McNally

Abstract

This article traces the early years of probation in Ireland from its origins prior to the foundation of the state to the 1970s. It reviews the social, cultural and political factors at work in Ireland and reflects on their particular influences in the practice and development of the Probation Service. The article acknowledges the contribution of individual officers in their practice and in the development of the Probation Service. Comparison is made with developments in probation in Northern Ireland and in England and Wales.

Informal Beginnings

In England, a beginning was made in formalising probation and supervision in the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1879 and in the Probation of First Offenders Act 1887. 'The first Act did not apply to Ireland and the second was of very little use', according to Molony (1925, p. 184).

Prior to the enactment of probation legislation in Ireland, it was the practice to allow certain offenders out on recognisance, to come up for judgment if called on, and no difficulty had been experienced in attaching certain conditions to the recognisance, although not authorised by express enactment (Molony 1925). In a similar way, the Irish courts were also served by informal court missionaries, who operated, as other charitable bodies at the time, on a strictly denominational basis, with Catholic individuals and organisations working with Catholic offenders (Skehill 2000).

The 1907 probation legislation (see below) ended this less formalised practice only in name. Many police court missionaries in England and Wales became probation officers and carried on with their task of 'saving offenders' souls by divine grace'. In Ireland, probation was formally established only in the courts in Dublin city, with the continued assistance of church agencies. The prominent contribution and role of the church and voluntary agencies continued in a personal and visible manner in courts in Ireland into the 1970s, in a partnership with the small professional Probation Service. That contribution continues to the present day in the organisational support and contribution of bodies such as the Society of St Vincent de Paul, the Depaul Trust, the Salvation Army, the Quaker community, and other non-denominational community groups.

Probation of Offenders Act 1907 (7 Edward VII, c. 17)

The Probation of Offenders Act 1907, which applied to Ireland, effected a great reformation and provided a new official mechanism for supervising, on behalf of the court, the conduct of offenders released on probation.

In 1914, the Criminal Justice Administration Act gave further powers. Under Section 7 of the Criminal Justice Administration

Act, power was given to recognise and subsidise societies for the care of youthful offenders; Section 8 made it possible to add additional conditions to the recognisances, such as residence; and Section 9 gave power to vary the times and conditions by increasing the period and by altering the conditions or adding new conditions (Molony 1925).

The duties of the probation officer, subject to the directions of the Court, were defined in the Probation of Offenders Act 1907 as: 'To visit or receive reports from the probationer, to see that he observes the conditions of the order, to report to the Court as to his behaviour, and to advise and befriend him, and, where necessary, to try and find him employment'.

The Probation of Offenders Act 1907 continued in operation with establishment of Saorstát Éireann (Irish Free State on 6 December 1922) and has remained in Ireland as the principal legislation in the work of the Probation Service. It has been updated or replaced in all other jurisdictions.

Following the enactment of the Probation of Offenders Act 1907, the probation staff in the Dublin city courts comprised one official probation officer, Miss Cathleen Gargan, (National Archives 2008) assisted by an unpaid volunteer, Miss Mary O'Brien.

Miss Gargan was well known and very active in the Dublin Courts from the implementation of the Probation of Offenders Act 1907 at the beginning of 1908 (Irish Times 1908, 1911, 1912, 1914). There is no detailed evidence readily available of the work of the police court missionaries in the Dublin police courts, though their presence has been acknowledged, or of probation officers or police court missionaries outside Dublin city.

Until 1936, all probation officers in Ireland were female, consistent with Skehill's (2000, p. 691) claim of the predominance of women within the field of philanthropy and social work in Ireland and elsewhere in the early years of the twentieth century. In Dáil Éireann in 1936, in the course of seeking a lady probation officer for Cork District Court, Richard Anthony TD (see end note 1 for explanation of TD) for Cork Borough told the Minister for Justice that 'long before the advent of the late Government we had a lady probation officer attached to the old police courts in Cork City' (*Dáil Éireann Debates*, vol. 62, 19 June 1936). Mr. Anthony was unsuccessful in his request and nothing further was heard of the 'lady probation officer attached to the old police courts in Cork City'.

I have selected data from two years prior to the establishment of Saorstát Éireann to illustrate the volume of work managed by Miss Gargan and Miss O'Brien in the Dublin Metropolitan Police Courts following the enactment of the Probation of Offenders Act 1907.

Dublin Metropolitan Police statistics (BOPCRIS 1908) report that 'during 1908, the first year of operation of the Probation of Offenders Act 1907, 188 probation orders were made, 88 in cases of indictable charges and 100 in non-indictable matters'. This was a very substantial workload for a single probation officer and one unpaid assistant! Of the 130 males subject to probation orders, 68 were under 16 years of age, 31 were aged 16 to 21 years and 31 were over 21 years. Of the 58 females subject to probation orders,

Executive Exchange

11 were under 16 years, 16 were aged 16 to 21 years and 31 were over 21 years. In 18 cases, offenders were brought up for sentence after release on probation orders (breach or revocation): three were discharged, one was committed to industrial school, two were sentenced to imprisonment (one and two months respectively), six were committed to a reformatory school, one was sent to a place of detention, three were dealt with for fresh offences and two were otherwise disposed of.

Six years later, Dublin Metropolitan Police statistics (BOPCRIS 1914) report that 'during the year 1914, 258 Probation orders were made, 175 of the persons so dealt with being charged with Indictable Offences and 83 with Non-indictable offences'. Of the 220 males against whom probation orders were made, 42 were under 12 years of age, 57 were aged 12 to 14 years, 65 were aged 14 to 16 years, 29 were aged 16 to 21 years and 27 were over 21 years. Of the 38 females against whom probation orders were made, two were under 12 years of age, four were aged 14 to 16 years, 12 were aged 16 to 21 years and 20 were over 21 years. In 12 cases the offenders were brought up for sentence after release on probation order (breach or revocation): two were committed to an industrial school, five were committed to a reformatory school and two were dealt with for a fresh offence.

The Juvenile Court, first introduced in England and Ireland by Section 111 of the Children Act 1908, provided that when a child or young person was charged, the court would sit either in a different building or room from that in which the ordinary sittings of the court were held, or on different days or times from those at which the ordinary sittings were held. The probation officers, already engaged with younger offenders, were quickly a central part of the Dublin Juvenile Court. This was reflected in the changing profile of persons on probation in the statistics for 1909 and 1914, as well as for following years.

The Report of the Departmental Committee on the Probation of Offenders Act 1907, chaired by Herbert Samuel, recommended that Probation 'should be extended, and Courts should appoint full-time officers to be assisted by part-time paid or honorary workers.... Salaries rather than fees should be paid to probation officers.... The help of local social agencies should be enlisted' (Home Office 1910). However, the political and civil disruption, as well as the challenges to judicial order that marked life in Dublin in the decade leading up to the establishment of Saorstát Éireann in 1922, did not provide a stable or supportive environment in which the nascent Probation Service could develop.

In 1925, at the end of a paper on the Probation of Offenders Act 1907, Molony, based on his experiences in the conflicted criminal justice system prior to the establishment of the state, said that 'in Ireland the [probation] system has never had a fair chance, due to causes on which I need not dwell. Nobody knows better than I do the troubles and difficulties which have beset a law reformer in the past. Let us hope those troubles and difficulties have now disappeared' (1925, p. 195).

Probation and the Establishment of Saorstát Éireann

Miss Cathleen Gargan continued in her post with the establishment of Saorstát Éireann until her retirement in 1926 and subsequent death in 1932. Miss Kathleen Sullivan was recruited in 1926 and Miss Mary O'Brien given recognition as a probation officer. Later, in 1940, E. J. Little, senior judge of the Dublin District Court, said of these first probation officers 'these three ladies must surely be awarded the martyr's crown', having been

'overcome by work, broke down; they died of cancer, each at her post' (Molony 1940, p. 58).

In Dáil Éireann on 10 March 1925, Tomas Mac Eoin TD asked how many prisoners were brought before the Children's Court in Dublin in 1924, and how many probation officers (distinguishing between paid and voluntary officers) have been appointed to deal with such cases. Kevin O'Higgins, Minister for Justice, replied that 'the number of persons brought before the Children's Court in Dublin in 1924 was 386, of whom 70 were placed on probation'. The Minister outlined that there was one paid probation officer, who employs an assistant. There were no permanent voluntary probation officers, but two unnamed ladies had agreed to act without remuneration in any cases that may be entrusted to them by the Justices of the Court' (*Dáil Éireann Debates*, vol. 10, 10 March 1925).

On 1 May 1925, Minister O'Higgins, in moving Vote 32 (District Court) before the Committee on Finance, included the sum of £400, provided under sub-head A, for a probation officer, which, he considered, might attract some attention, explaining that the duties of probation officers are set forth in the rules made under Section 7 of the Probation of Offenders Act 1907. It is the first note in Dáil Éireann of financial provision in respect of Probation activities following the passage of the Courts of Justice Act 1924, under which the Dublin Metropolitan Police Courts were abolished and one District Court was set up for the whole Saorstát (*Dáil Éireann Debates*, vol. 11, 1 May 1925).

Despite their limited numbers and lack of resources, the probation officers exercised significant influence and authority, not just in court but also in wider policy and practice arenas. Kathleen Sullivan, one of the probation officers attached to the District Court, interested in the case of Mary Cole, approached the Minister for Justice 'concerned to suggest some treatment which might be more calculated to transform this wretched girl than detention in Mountjoy Female Prison'. Mary Cole had been convicted of the murder of two children. She was found guilty at the Central Criminal Court on 23 March 1928 but was not subject to the death penalty under the terms of the Children Act 1908, which stated that persons under the age of sixteen found guilty of murder shall be detained at the pleasure of the governor general rather than being sentenced to death. Instead, Mary Cole was sent to Mountjoy Female Prison. A memorandum from the Department of Justice, dated 28 August 1928, laid before the President of the Executive Council, reported that the Minister for Justice had issued a licence discharging Mary Cole from Mountjoy Female Prison, having been advised that the sister superior of the Sisters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul, Henrietta Street, Dublin was prepared to take Mary Cole into her care. Under the care of the Sisters of Charity, the memorandum states, Mary Cole 'will be under proper reformative influences and at the same time the community will be protected from a person of the gravest criminal tendencies' (National Archives 1928).

Probation in Ireland in the 1930s

Kathleen Sullivan died in 1936, (Irish Times 1936) in the circumstances noted by Justice Little above. Following the first Civil Service Appointment Commission for a probation officer, Evelyn Carroll was appointed and took up duty in March 1937. Miss Mary O'Brien, the last surviving of the first probation officers, died in June 1937 (Irish Times 1937).

In February 1938, the Minister for Justice, Patrick Rutledge, in replying to a question in Dáil Éireann from Sean Brady TD for Dublin County, advised that two additional probation officers, both women, were recently appointed (Bridget Murphy and Mary E. Ryan had been appointed in November 1937), bringing the number of female probation officers in Dublin to three. These appointments were made following a recommendation from the Dublin justices that there should be four female probation officers attached to the metropolitan courts. The Minister provided an additional note, detailed here, on the official history of probation in Saorstát Éireann:

Until the year 1926 there was only one probation officer in Dublin, a woman. In 1926 the number was increased to two women. One of these officers died in March, 1936, and while the filling of the vacancy was under consideration, the Minister for Justice suggested to the then senior justice that in addition to two women, it would be well to have a male probation officer to deal with male adults and older boys.

The then senior justice accepted the suggestion, although expressing some doubt as to whether there was full-time work for such an officer. A male probation officer was appointed accordingly in October, 1936, and in March, 1937, the vacant post of female probation officer was filled and the staff brought up to two women and one man. The number of female probation officers was again reduced to one in May, 1937, by the death of one of these women, and shortly afterwards a recommendation was received from the Dublin justices that a staff of four female probation officers was necessary.

The Minister for Justice was not satisfied that there was sufficient suitable work for four female officers, and came to the conclusion that it would be more prudent to appoint only two female officers on a temporary basis in addition to the existing one (bringing the staff up to three women and one man) and to review the situation generally after a reasonable interval. The present staffing, therefore, viz., three women and one man, may be considered as more or less experimental.

The following table gives particulars as to age and sex of the persons under supervision according to a recent return: —

Sex	Under 14 Years	From 14 to 16 Years
Males	35	40
Females	3	7
Totals	38	47
Grand Total	289	

(*Dáil Éireann Debates*, vol. 70, 16 February 1938).

In October 1936 Joseph McDonnell, the first male probation officer, was appointed and assigned to look after boys and adult male offenders. He was appointed chief probation officer in 1938. Denis Morrissey was appointed as probation officer in 1938 and John C. Ryan in 1940. The number of probation officers was further supplemented in 1945 with the appointment of Mary Dooley and Evelyn Flanagan. Between 1936 and 1945, the fledgling Probation Service had expanded significantly from two probation officers to a chief probation officer and four probation officers, all assigned to Dublin courts. There was no development of the service in

courts outside Dublin. However that decade of expansion was the high-water mark in the development of the Probation Service for nearly twenty years as the changing social and political climate in Ireland influenced social and penal policy and impacted directly on the role and direction of the service.

Quadragesimo Anno and the Principle of Subsidiarity

A most significant development for the Probation Service and social policy in Ireland generally, though not immediately evident at the time, was the publication in 1931 by Pope Pius XI of *Quadragesimo Anno*. This papal encyclical stressed harmony between social groups as the Christian answer to class war. It also advocated the restoration of the state, burdened by excessive duties, to its rightful place, which was not to do everything itself, but to direct, watch, urge and restrain subsidiary organisations. This described the principle of subsidiarity or subsidiary function: it is a disturbance of right order to assign to a higher association (government) what lesser and subordinate organisations can do (Whyte 1971, p. 67).

The principle of subsidiarity, as reflected in the narrow and rigid interpretation by the Irish hierarchy, proved to be a major influence in the development of social policy and service delivery, including probation, in Ireland until the 1970s (Cooney 1999, McNally 1993). A renowned example of that influence can be seen in the Mother and Child Scheme controversy in March 1951 and the resignation of Dr. Noel Browne as Minister for Health at the insistence of his party leader, Seán MacBride, in April 1951 (Browne 1986; Adshead and Millar 2003). Catholic social thinking and its sway over government policy had been seen increasingly in the late 1930s and early 1940s to exercise influence and to direct developments and practice in probation and social services generally, that trend was to continue over the three decades following the publication of *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Probation and the Role of Organised Voluntary Workers

From the early 1940s, there was a strengthening explicit preference in government for the engagement of voluntary denominational organisations in the provision of probation supervision and related services rather than for the development of a full-time state service. On 5 May 1942, Gerald Boland, Minister for Justice, introducing the 1942 District Court Vote in Dáil Éireann, said he had succeeded in 'enlisting the services' of a group of volunteers 'through the assistance of the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. McQuaid'. With the help of the Archbishop, the Legion of Mary, as a recognised society under Section 7 of the Criminal Justice Administration Act 1914, had been able to do, in his view, 'very good work' and he did not think that even if the number of permanent officers was multiplied by three 'that you would do near as much good as we hope to do now with the help of the voluntary social workers. They are devoting a lot of time to the work and belong to a social service organisation that I think will give good results' (*Dáil Éireann Debates*, Vol. 86, May 1942).

The missionary commitment and role of voluntarism in probation, then in decline in England and Wales in the face of the new scientific social work approach (McWilliams 1983), actually underwent a resurgence and strengthening in Ireland from the late 1930s, during World War II (known as 'the emergency' in Ireland) and on into the 1960s. It was an Ireland where society was

Executive Exchange

marked by strong clerical influence, conservatism and increasing distrust of 'foreign ways'. John Charles McQuaid, Archbishop of Dublin, was 'a master at harnessing state resources to social and educational initiatives which were run by clergy or lay Catholic organisations. He was particularly adept at persuading the state authorities to finance Church involvement in the voluntary sector, while retaining ecclesiastical control of projects' (Cooney 1999, p. 140). During the 1940s, Archbishop McQuaid expanded the Church's role in social service provision and, in particular, in working with offenders and managing institutions. Rather than employing probation officers, denominational 'volunteers' carried out many of the functions, with as many as 46 Legion of Mary volunteers in Dublin said to be engaged in probation work.

Conditions of Employment in the 1940s

In 1940, E. J. Little, Senior Dublin District Court Justice, reported that (quoted in Molony 1940, p. 58):

... the Probation Officer must be present in the Custody and Juvenile Courts to note the names, addresses and occupations of the persons charged; later visit the home of each party and prepare a report for the Justices. In Court he must also produce at a moment's notice the record, if one exists, of each case and advise the Justice as to the best course to be taken. His afternoon visits to the homes of the parties under probation supervision must be followed up by visits to clergymen, school attendance officers, relieving officers, employment exchanges, employers, Garda stations and to the offices of charitable societies to check up on his information.

All this meant persistent work and fatigue of both body and mind. At the end of each day's work he must be ready at his own home for visitors, parents, young people, one or other, sometimes both, of married couples, and informants come to lay complaints. He must find time also to run to the Circuit Court for the hearing of Appeals with particulars of which he is familiar.

In 1937, according to Justice Little, the number of cases under probation supervision was 287 (a slight difference from the figure of 289 cited by the Minister for Justice in his February 1938 statement above). In 1938, that number had increased to 481 and in 1939 the number had again increased to 940. Of these, 757 were males and 138 female. At the end of 1939, 741 remained on probation supervision. He claimed that 'Probation properly used would save thousands who might otherwise drift into one or other of the currents or backwaters of the twin rivers of Unemployment and Crime' (Molony 1940, p. 59).

Justice Little explained that justices in 1937 were 'faced with a dilemma, either suspend the system or kill the Probation Officers'. He estimated that in 1939 each probation officer supervised 148 cases whereas in England the Home Office would not permit any probation officer to have more than 70 on supervision. Justice Little outlined that the times were 'tragic and with unemployment and social and civic disorganisation, the number was increasing at an alarming rate'. He said that 'the status of the Probation Officers was that of non-established Officers, without pension rights, whose services may be dispensed with at a week's notice; but these circumstances did not affect their devotion to their work. It was a life of sacrifice' (Molony 1940, p. 59).

Justice Little also regularly made his views on the need for additional probation officers clear in Court and at public meetings (Irish Times 1937b, 1938, 1939, 1940).

Fahy (1943, p. 79) referred to the fact that 'since the birth of our State no official investigation of the Probation System has ever been conducted, and to the further fact that the closest secrecy is maintained regarding that System'. He had met, he said, 'a point blank refusal to supply either the Statistics or any other information requested'. In his view there was 'strong evidence of a complete failure on the part of the authorities to appreciate the principles upon which the Probation system is based and to understand the universality of its application'. In the same paper, Fahy noted that the circumstances and lack of development in Northern Ireland at the time was similar but that 'no attempt was made to conceal the defects of the present system, and those defects, together with recommendations for putting the Probation Service on a sound basis were in the process given fullest publicity' (p. 76).

A memorandum to the Department of Justice from Probation Officers in October 1943 sought improved conditions of employment and described how 'one must always be ready to deal with anything that might crop up unexpectedly even during normal "off" hours' (Probation Officers 1943). The officers also pointed out that:

'The diverse nature of the work calls for persons of very wide experience of life. A Probation Officer is expected to be able to cope with any type of person or any offence that a Justice in these courts has powers to deal with. In addition there is the more serious Court work which has to be attended to in the Circuit and Central Criminal Courts, entailing very heavy responsibility and capacity for good judgement...

... Risks to health are very considerable, considering that all types of homes are visited and all manner of persons encountered, many of them suffering from highly and dangerously infectious diseases...

... Attendance at meetings of voluntary workers and supervision of night-school classes etc. entails being on duty some evenings until 9 or 10pm....

... No provision, other than the goodwill of the Dublin Transport Co., is made for travelling expenses. No allowance for the use of bicycle, no allowances for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in the payment of fares etc. for probationers travelling with an officer, is made. Also the wear and tear of clothes is very considerable in view of the requirement when visiting certain homes where disease is rife' (Probation Officers 1943; also *Irish Times* 1937a).

A supporting letter for a further Probation Officers' memorandum in 1949 seeking improved conditions was signed by the principal justices of the District Court (Hannan, O'Sullivan, Mangan 1949) and described how the task of probation officer 'requires a breadth of worldly experience, an integrity of character and a development of moral and social sense which are infrequently found combined in one person'. The justices went on to say that 'the criminal business of the Metropolitan District could not be disposed of in a manner calculated to serve the highest interests of both the individual and the community without the services of the Probation Officers'. Perhaps a little too

optimistically, they suggested that 'the Minister for Justice, and the Government... will merely need to have the memorandum brought to their attention in order to realize the justice of the claims made therein and implement these claims at the earliest available opportunity'.

The claims were unsuccessful and brought no improvement of conditions, earnings or tenure.

Conditions of Employment in the 1950s

For probation officers in the early 1950s, there had been no real improvement over the previous decade. In 1951, for example, the small cohort of probation officers provided 2,390 reports to courts and made 4,941 visits, but still had not been established as civil servants, remained without security of tenure or pension rights and had an extremely poor salary scale, as mentioned by Justice Little in 1940.

In 1953, Evelyn Carroll, a probation officer, was assigned to work full-time with the recently established Adoption Board. The rationale, it appears, was that as the Adoption Board was constituted as a court, and probation officers provided a form of social work service to the courts, it would be most appropriate that a probation officer should fulfil that task with the Adoption Board.

In September 1954, after the failure of another memorandum to the Minister for Justice requesting improved pay and conditions for probation officers, the group of now long-serving officers formed a staff association and affiliated to the Institute of Professional Civil Servants, a forerunner of IMPACT which is the present probation officers' trade union. This became the vehicle of the first changes in circumstances and conditions achieved by the probation officers during the 1950s, though progress was still exceedingly slow.

At an early stage, recompense for out-of-pocket travel and some related costs was achieved. In May 1955, establishment — tenure as civil servants — was offered by the Department of Justice in negotiation with the Institute of Professional Civil Servants for the chief probation officer and four, but not all, of the existing probation officers. A salary of £600 per annum was agreed for male probation officers and £508 per annum for female officers, a marginal improvement.

Changing Social Climate in Ireland

For many in Ireland, the 1960s were to emerge as a period of rapid economic and social development arising from the changed approach to economic planning exhibited by government in the Programme for Economic Expansion authored by T. K. Whitaker and launched in 1958. The Programme proved to be a watershed marking the end of Ireland's traditional policy of economic isolationism and the adoption of the view that the only way forward lay in modernisation and the development of an export-driven economy. Luckily the 1960s were a boom period for the world economy and the new approach in Ireland benefited.

The 1960s saw many other changes: the influence of Vatican II and the leadership of a reforming Pope in a gradual relaxing of the overt controlling instinct of the Catholic hierarchy, the advent in Ireland of a national television broadcasting service in 1961, the introduction of free second-level education, the arrival of a consumerist culture and a greater emphasis on individualism, the 1960s-inspired winds of change in terms of music and

protest, and the beginning, to some extent, of post-Civil-War politics (Mac Einri 1997).

The changing social climate in Ireland, in influencing change in social and political attitudes, expectations and actions, also had an impact on government and institutions in the delivery and operation of services.

Based on these evidence sources and on recollections of retired officers familiar with the work of their predecessors, probation practice in Ireland changed little in form and content from the earliest years of the service until the 1960s. Understanding of practice in the early years is largely dependent on third-party comment in papers and reports cited elsewhere in this article. Some examples of papers, reports and other documentation remain from the 1940s onwards. Practice was governed by the original 'assist and befriend' mandate outlined in the memorandum issued with the Probation of Offenders Act 1907. Reports to court, though not provided for in legislation, were a major task and took a great proportion of the time of the probation officer as outlined in Justice Little's 1940 commentary.

From the 1960s onwards, there was increased recruitment of graduates and trained social workers into the Probation Service. This was in line with a new valuing and a prioritising of social services generally, as well as the influence of planning, research and international experience in government decision-making. This contributed to a rapid pace of change and development never before seen in the service.

In England and Wales, the professionalisation and development of the Probation Service had accelerated from the 1930s onwards (McWilliams 1983, 1985). The service in Ireland, as it developed in the 1960s, had the benefit of their experience, in many instances learning from it. Ireland began a process of catching up with international best practice, rejoining that mainstream and, in due course, becoming an active contributor.

Social Work Training and Probation Practice

From 1960 onwards there was an evident 'changing of the guard' as many of the long-serving probation officers retired, with minimal entitlements despite a career of service and social commitment.

Increasingly the Probation Service and its practice, in common with Irish society in general, was beginning to take greater cognisance, and exercise less distrust, of developments elsewhere.

Ironically, while the prevailing attachment to the professional social work model of practice in probation elsewhere was approaching its nadir (McWilliams 1986), Ireland, coming late to the model (established in England and Wales since the 1930s), explicitly adopted that approach, just as social work principles and practice in probation were increasingly being challenged in research and effectiveness-based management internationally.

The professionalisation of social work in general in Ireland had been delayed and very limited, despite the aspirations of some, such as the non-denominational Civics Institute of Ireland. Among the universities, University College Dublin was the first to establish a social science degree in 1954. Trinity College Dublin introduced its degree in social studies in 1962, and University College Cork established a social science degree in 1968. As late as 1970, the skills requirement for a welfare officer, the then title, was described as 'training in or experience of social work'. It was not until 1975 that a degree in social science was required for recruitment as a welfare officer.

During the late 1960s, increasingly professional and assertive probation officers raised concerns and complaints in letters to the Department of Justice, the Department of Education and the courts regarding the ill-treatment of children at Marlborough House (Raftery and O'Sullivan 2000, p. 238). As evidence at the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse later confirmed, the concerns were regrettably not followed up (Ryan 2006, pp. 114–115).

The level of frustration, upset and disquiet in the Probation Service in 1968 can be gauged in a highly critical column in *The Irish Times* on 22 April 1968 entitled 'Our Hopelessly Inadequate Probation Service'. The article was based on the detailed commentary and experience of a recently resigned probation officer. It articulated many accumulated concerns from her experiences and those of her colleagues. The lack of a Probation Service outside Dublin, deficits in training of probation officers, gaps in social services generally and poverty in the community were cited as sources of frustration and disillusionment (O'Brien 1968).

Prison Welfare Officers and the Beginnings of Change

An interdepartmental committee was established in 1962 by Charles Haughey, Minister for Justice, to address issues such as aftercare for young men discharged from reformatories, industrial schools, St Patrick's Institution (see end note 2), and prison (Ryan 2006). Arising from the unpublished report of that committee, Charles Haughey, at the Law Students Debating Society of Ireland in February 1964, announced the appointment of two prison welfare officers (Martin Tansey and Noel Clear) 'responsible for advising ordinary prisoners on personal and domestic problems, for helping them to secure employment and for giving of after-discharge counsel and guidance' (quoted in Mansergh 1986, p. 40).

A significant point in this development (influenced by a similar development in England and Wales in 1953) and the work of the interdepartmental committee was that cognisance was now been taken of developments in probation and criminal justice outside Ireland.

Consideration was also being given at a policy level to appropriate tasks and roles for the Probation Service in the criminal justice system in place of the previous apparent drift and absence of policy or planning.

Probation Administration Officer

A recommendation of the interdepartmental committee in 1962 provided for a probation administration officer, who should be someone of high executive ability (McGowan 1993, p. 46). This does seem to be the first specific reference to 'control and administration' or management in the service's activities.

Joseph McDonnell, chief probation officer since 1938, had died suddenly in September 1962 (*Irish Times* 1962). An opportunity for change presented itself. During his time as chief probation officer, McDonnell had performed duties similar to other probation officers including reports to courts and supervision of offenders. He had not, it appears, exercised significant policy and management functions beyond basic administrative tasks.

The first appointment as probation administration officer in 1964 proved unsuccessful, with the appointee subsequently withdrawing within two years and later returning to another post in the service. For a brief period then, the Probation Service was

managed by an official from the Department of Justice, giving rise to renewed disquiet among the officers.

1969 Review of the Probation Service: A Springboard for Development

The administration problems contributed to a management and strategic hiatus in the service which, in hindsight, had the benefit of prompting or contributing to the commissioning of a further review of the Probation Service by Mícheál O'Móráin, Minister for Justice, in January 1969. This was to be the second review of the service during the 1960s, whereas there had not been any examination or review in the previous sixty years. In the following years the service would be known at different times as the 'Welfare Service of the Department of Justice' and the 'Welfare and Aftercare Service' before settling as the 'Probation and Welfare Service' in 1979.

Change in the Probation Service in the 1960s or progress to a full-time professional service was not always consistent or assured. In 1962, Charles Haughey had expressed hope that societies throughout the country interested in youth welfare would apply for recognition as supervisors of young people placed on probation, as he gave formal recognition to three societies in Dublin. And on 19 November 1968, Mícheál O'Móráin, replying to a question from Michael O'Leary, Labour TD for Dublin Central, on the provision of probation officers, stated in the course of an exchange following his official reply 'In my view, the work done by the voluntary service is more effective than can be done by the official service'. However, the work of the 'official' Probation Service in prisons, in supervising offenders on release and on orders from courts was to play an important role in the expansion and development that followed from the consideration of the 1969 review of the service.

Prisons Bill 1970 and the Probation Service Review

On 26 May 1970, opening the second stage debate of the Prisons Bill 1970 in Dáil Éireann, Desmond O'Malley, Minister for Justice, said (*Dáil Éireann Debates*, vol. 247, 26 May 1970):

... last year the existing probation and after-care service was thoroughly investigated. As a result of that investigation I am satisfied that the service is inadequate and that it needs to be expanded considerably and thoroughly reorganised. The expansion will call for a big increase in the present staff in Dublin and for an extension of the official probation and after-care service to the country generally. New senior supervisory posts will be created and extra clerical assistance provided to improve the efficiency of the service.

For the Probation Service, rebranded as the Welfare Service of the Department of Justice, operating since the foundation of the state on an ad hoc basis with little direct management, little changed practices or tasks, little developed policy or practice guidelines and a hitherto apparent disregard and disinterest in the operation or practice of probation elsewhere, this period represented a major break with the past and the first evidence of a new, planned and structured approach.

By 1973, service numbers had reached 47, almost six times the total four years previously. Posts were established in Athlone,

Cork, Dundalk, Kilkenny, Limerick, Sligo and Waterford and additional officers were assigned to prisons and detention centres. The establishment of a service headquarters provided a focus and a point of engagement for the service with the Department of Justice, the other criminal justice agencies and the wider community. The expansion of the service was managed by Martin Tansey, the first principal welfare officer, following his appointment by the Minister for Justice in 1971.

From the 1970s to the Present

Martin Tansey continued, until his retirement in 2002, to lead the Welfare Service, renamed the Probation and Welfare Service in 1979, through periods of change and expansion, from a small cohort of eight officers in cramped premises at Dublin District Court to a nationwide service with more than 330 personnel in over thirty-four locations.

While new legislation and new responsibilities were to arise over the following years, the Probation of Offenders Act 1907 remained, and still remains, the core mandate of the service. The Act, reflecting the social, political and judicial values of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was increasingly interpreted in its broadest terms to facilitate innovation and developing practice as well as to accommodate and support evolving government and service priorities.

Having changed relatively little from its earliest years, the Probation Service began its belated development in the context of the rapid social, economic, and political change in Ireland in the 1960s. Like change and development throughout Irish society, that development has proved to be a complex, and sometimes challenging, rollercoaster-like process which continues today. The period of exponential growth, changing practice and evolving priorities in Ireland, in the Irish criminal justice system and in the service since the 1970s is a further fascinating story that merits in-depth examination and treatment in a separate article.

End Notes

1. The official Irish title of a Member of Dáil Éireann, the principal House of the Irish Parliament is "Teachta Dála", shortened in practice to TD, which in English means "Deputy to the Dáil". The Taoiseach, Prime Minister in English, is leader of the Government. He or she is an elected TD and selects the Ministers, in most instances, from Members of Dail Eireann. Ministers are always attributed as TD as well as their specific ministerial responsibility.
2. St. Patrick's Institution was, and is, the Detention Centre managed by the Prison Service catering to boys between the ages of 16 and 21 years sentenced by the court to detention in custody. Between the ages of 16 and 18 years boys could only be sentenced to detention.

References

Adshead, M., & Millar, M. (2003), "Ireland as Catholic corporatist state: A historical institutional analysis of healthcare in Ireland." *Limerick Papers in Politics and Public Administration*, no. 5, Department of Politics and Public Administration, University of Limerick: www.politics.ul.ie/db/old%20db/resources/content/tracey.gleeson/195-A.doc.

BOPCRIS (1908). "Statistical Tables of the Dublin Metropolitan Police for 1908." *Sessional Papers 1909*, vol. lxxiii, Cd.4785: www.bopcris.ac.uk/eppi/ref14814.html.

BOPCRIS (1914). "Statistical tables of the Dublin Metropolitan Police for 1914." *Sessional Papers 1914-16*, vol. liv, Cd.8065: www.bopcris.ac.uk/eppi/ref15679.html.

Browne, N. (1986). *Against the tide*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Cooney, J. (1999). *John Charles McQuaid: Ruler of Catholic Ireland*. Dublin: O'Brien Press.

Dáil Éireann Debates can be accessed at www.oireachtas.ie.

Fahy, E. (1943), "Probation of offenders," *Hermathena (Trinity College)*, 62, November, pp. 61–82.

Hannan, M. J., O'Sullivan, T. G., & Mangan, F. J. (1949). Unpublished letter in support of probation officers' memorandum to the Department of Justice, 5 April.

Home Office (1910). *Report of the Departmental Committee on the Probation of Offenders Act, 1907*, Cd.5001. London: HMSO.

Irish Times (1908). *Probation of Offenders Act 1907*. Friday, August 14, p. 4. Available at www.ireland.com.

Irish Times (1911). *Children's Inquiry Court, Dublin*. Monday, Feb 20, p. 3.

Irish Times (1912). *Probation work in Dublin*. Monday, Feb 19, p. 2, and *Untitled and Boys on probation*. Friday, Feb 23, p. 6 and p. 9.

Irish Times (1914). *Juvenile street trading in Dublin*. Saturday, Jan 10, p. 9.

Irish Times (1936). *Death of probation officer*. Saturday, March 28, p. 10.

Irish Times (1937). *Probation officer's death*. Thursday, June 3, p. 2.

Irish Times (1937a). *Tramway company thanked*. Saturday, August 28, p. 3.

Irish Times (1937b). *Misdirected economy*. Thursday, August 19, p. 2.

Irish Times (1938). *When justice is blind*. Friday, November 11, p. 2.

Irish Times (1939). *Why probation officers are scarce*. Tuesday, Jan 10, p. 2.

Irish Times (1940). *Juvenile crime*. Thursday, October 23, p. 4.

Irish Times (1962). *Obituary: JF McDonnell*. Wednesday, September 12, p. 7.

Executive Exchange

- Mac Einri, Piaras (1997). *Some recent demographic developments in Ireland*. Available online at <http://migration.ucc.ie/etudesirlandaises.htm#15>.
- Mansergh, M. (1986). *The spirit of the nation: The speeches of Charles J. Haughey*, Cork: Mercier Press.
- McGowan, J. L. (1993). *The origins and development of the probation and welfare service in the Republic of Ireland from 1907 to the present day*. Unpublished MSSc (Social Work) dissertation, University College Dublin.
- McNally, G. (1993). "Probation in Ireland — The early years." *The Probation Journal*, 2.
- McWilliams, W. (1983). "The mission to the English police courts." *The Howard Journal*, 22, pp. 129 – 147.
- McWilliams, W. (1985). "The mission transformed: Professionalisation of probation between the wars." *The Howard Journal*, 24, pp. 257–273.
- Molony, T. F. (1925). "The probation of offenders." *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, 14, pp. 181–196.
- Molony, T. F. (1940). "New methods for offenders." *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, 16, pp. 49–62.
- National Archives (1928). "Women in 20th-century Ireland, 1922–1966," record 1629. Department of the Taoiseach, Dublin.
- National Archives (2008). "Census of Ireland, Dublin 1911." Available at <http://www.census.nationalarchives.ie/>
- O'Brien, E. (1968). "Our hopelessly inadequate probation service," A social sort of column, *The Irish Times*, Monday, April 22, p. 12. Available at www.ireland.com.
- Probation Officers (1943). unpublished memorandum to the Department of Justice, October.
- Raftery, M., & O'Sullivan, E. (2000). *Suffer the little children: The inside story of Ireland's industrial schools*, Dublin: New Island.
- Ryan, S. (2006). Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse. Public Hearing Transcript Day 227A. Retrieved from www.childabusecommission.ie.
- Skehill, C. (2000). "An examination of the transition from philanthropy to professional social work in Ireland," *Research on Social Work Practice*, 10(6), pp. 688–704.
- Whyte, J. H. (1971). *Church and state in modern Ireland*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Gerry McNally is Assistant Director (Operations) in the Irish Probation Service based at Smithfield Chambers, Smithfield, Dublin. His email address is gpmcnally@probation.ie. An earlier version of this article appeared in the *Irish Probation Journal* (Vol. 4, No. 1, September 2007).

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.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

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

Contributors to this issue include Dan Richard Beto, Editor of *Executive Exchange* and Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute, and Donald G. Evans, President of the Board of the Canadian Training Institute.

The Wisdom of a Corrections Leader

A review of *Don Evans: The Musings of a Community Corrections Legend*, edited by the staff of the American Probation and Parole Association. Lexington, Kentucky: American Probation and Parole Association, 2008, pp. 383, \$40.00 (leather), \$14.00 (paper).

Perhaps no person has had a greater impact on correctional organizations than Donald G. Evans, President of the Board of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, who has served as President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association. Moreover, he has served on various boards and committees of the American Correctional Association, National Association of Probation Executives, and a host of other corrections organizations. Too, he has traveled the world for the purpose of studying other justice systems and to participate in international corrections conferences.

In addition to his involvement in professional organizations, Don has recorded an impressive history of government service in Canada that spans four decades. As a result of his career in criminal justice, coupled with his unquenchable thirst for knowledge and a commitment to disseminating what he has learned, Don has been a prolific contributor to criminal justice literature. From 1982 to the present, Don has published over 150 articles and book reviews in journals peculiar to the criminal justice profession. His scholarship has appeared in such publications as *Executive Exchange*, *Corrections Today*, *Correctional Options*, *Perspectives*, *Journal of Community Corrections*, *The Police Governor*, *Corrections Management Quarterly*, *CEP Bulletin*, *Texas Probation*, *The Volunteer Newsletter*, *Coast to Coast*, and the *Canadian Journal of Sociology*.

This year the American Probation and Parole Association, with the assistance of the National Association of Probation Executives, American Correctional Association, and the International Community Corrections Association, published a collection of most of Don's writings. In the book's foreword, Carl Wicklund, Executive Director of the American Probation and Parole Association, writes:

This collection of articles, interviews, and essays written by Don Evans was created to honor and record his role in the development of a variety of community corrections practices and policies that serves as a lasting legacy of a respected and valued professional.

Canadian Don Evans has served as a leader, historian, sounding board, arbitrator, confidant, mentor, voice of reason, ambassador, harbinger, keynote presenter, scribe and a number of other roles for myriad permanent and ad hoc groups concerned with community corrections

in the United States, Canada and throughout the world. He is internationally recognized for his insights, knowledge, worldview and forward thinking that have been presented through his speeches, training programs, consultations and writings. Most people who have paid attention to the evolution of community corrections over the past thirty plus years know of Don Evans or have read some pieces he has written on a subject related to community corrections.

The book is divided into a number of sections: book reviews; criminal justice collaborations; specific issues; offender supervision; reentry; substance abuse; what works; youth violence; and the American Probation and Parole Association. Information on successful correctional practices and initiatives, a historical perspective of trends in the criminal justice system, and insights in leadership may be found in this volume.

Carl Wicklund and the staff at the American Probation and Parole Association are to be commended for producing this lasting tribute to a wise correctional leader. Likewise, we are indebted to Don Evans for his willingness to share his wisdom and experiences with us. *Don Evans: The Musings of a Community Corrections Legend* is an excellent resource that should be in the personal libraries of all serious corrections practitioners.

As a closing thought, because Don remains active and continues to contribute to the scholarship of the corrections profession, the American Probation and Parole Association would be well advised to plan for a Volume II.

Dan Richard Beto

Crime Prevention: Should Probation Have a Role?

A review of *Crime Prevention in America*, by Dean John Champion. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 2007, pp. 543, \$71.20 (paper).

Public fear of crime, whether real or imagined, continues as a major subject of public discourse and informs political responses to crime. In his 2006 book *Liquid Fear*, Zygmunt Bauman describes fear as "the name we give to our uncertainty: to our ignorance of the threat and of what is to be done." Nowhere is this more evident than in the realm of crime and the issues surrounding the prevention and management of criminal behavior. Elaborate efforts are developed to assure communities of their safety, including efforts to make individual's responsible for their own safety. Gated communities, surveillance cameras, more police and security staff in certain sectors of our cities are all part of the

new landscape of fear that is causing many citizens to become hostages to fear and to forgo evening activities in our cities.

One positive result of this trend has been the emphasis placed on the prevention of crime and efforts at improved security measures in all aspects of urban life. At the same time, there has developed an interest in evidence-based policy making and this is driving both the academic and practitioner communities to evaluate programs contributing to preventing crime. This trend to crime prevention programming raises a question for me relative to the role probation might or might not play in the alleviation of a community's sense of fear. Just within the caseload of most of our probation agencies are opportunities to prevent the next generation of criminal behavior. Many of us who have served as probation officers for long enough can recall the siblings, relatives, and other family members of specific offenders who have also become "clients" of probation services. Have we explored adequately enough the literature of crime prevention and have we developed effective, evidence-based approaches to preventing repeat crime or new offenders? There is much we can and should do that would assist in reducing the public's fear of crime and also reducing re-offending, and if we work with families and other community institutions we can reduce the likelihood that a new predictable generation of offenders will come to the attention of the criminal justice system. Hidden away in many low circulation journals and newsletters address to a limited audience of professional practitioners are accounts of crime prevention activities by the various agencies that make up the criminal justice system. These articles deserve a wider audience and a way to cross disciplines and practices.

In this regard I draw your attention to the effort of Dean John Champion from Texas A & M International University in Laredo, who has created a very interesting and useful collection of articles dealing with crime prevention. His book is divided into six sections, covering the history of crime prevention, law enforcement, courts, corrections, and juvenile justice efforts related to the prevention of crime and delinquency. The last section of the book is comprised of a number of evaluations of prevention programs. This is a large volume comprised of 51 chapters and well over half of the chapters are devoted to the critical area of program evaluations and the policy implications for future programming. Champion makes a major contribution by revealing what was tucked away in professional journals and making available to all practitioners in the field of criminal justice the work being done in other sectors.

Each section begins with an informative introduction that assists the reader to contextually place the articles that follow. The author's contribution on the history of crime prevention in the United States is a concise and careful overview that is a worthwhile read for anyone new to this topic. In the section on law enforcement efforts, the article by Byrne and Hummer on the role of police in reentry partnerships is a good examination of this issue. The article on listening to victims in the court section is a thought-provoking critique of restorative justice policy and practice. Two articles in the correctional section caught my attention. The first is an article on understanding and responding to the need of parole violators. This is a subject that needs more examination, especially with the expected increase in the use of parole in some jurisdictions. The second article deals with offender resistance in counseling and is a useful and practical introduction to engaging offenders in treatment. The article on what works in juvenile justice outcome measurement in the sec-

tion on delinquency prevention is another article worthy of a close and careful reading.

The last section, dealing with program evaluations, is the largest section in the book and it covers a significant number of program areas. The result is that there is plenty of material that can be used in classroom settings and in various agencies that cover the justice field. Present are a number of program evaluations, including evaluations of electronic monitoring, problem-solving probation, and the effectiveness of parole. Two other good pieces worth reading are Byrne and Taxman's piece on targeting for reentry, and Cullen, Eck, and Lowenkamp's examination of environmental corrections as a paradigm for effective probation supervision. It is this section that probation practitioners can usefully mine for ideas and concepts that would inform their crime prevention activities. In answer to the question posed in the title of this review — should probation have a role in crime prevention? — I would most certainly answer in the affirmative.

I believe this book will be very useful — in either a college classroom or agency staff training settings, as well as for individual probation officers — for three reasons. First, the book is exhaustive, covering every facet of the criminal justice system. Second, the introductory preface to each section and the questions for review and discussions that follow each article serve as a springboard for further examination. And finally, the majority of the articles have been culled from the journals and newsletters of practitioner associations or organizations, such as *Federal Probation*, *Corrections Today*, and *Perspectives*, a further indication that probation and corrections more generally have developed an interest in crime prevention.

Champion has done a great service to the probation profession by gathering together this collection and making the articles readily available to a much larger audience than the authors of the articles in their original published form could ever hoped to have reached. This transfer of crime prevention knowledge should enhance the efforts of criminal justice agencies, and probation in particular, to contribute to the lessening of fear in the communities they serve.

Donald G. Evans

A New Source of Scholarship

A review of the *Journal of Court Innovation*, edited by Greg Berman, Robert Keating, and Michelle S. Simon (Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter 2008).

Shortly before Easter 2008 I received an electronic version of the inaugural edition of the *Journal of Court Innovation*, a scholarly publication produced jointly by the Center for Court Innovation, New York State Judicial Institute, and Pace Law School. Serving as Executive Editors of this new publication are: Greg Berman, Director of the Center for Court Innovation; Robert Keating, Dean of the New York State Judicial Institute; and Michelle S. Simon, Dean of Pace Law School. In their introduction of this first issue, the Executive Editors write:

We created this journal for a simple reason: to promote new thinking about how to initiate and implement change in courts.

The *Journal of Court Innovation* will publish writings by leading academics and practitioners in the field. You will find longer, in-depth examinations of complex topics. You will also find shorter pieces describing discrete experiments, as well as roundtable transcripts, interviews, and book reviews.

This eclectic format is purposeful. We have created this journal in an effort to bridge the worlds of theory and practice. We hope to address a broad audience that includes attorneys, judges and court administrators, and also scholars, researchers, policymakers, non-profit executives and others.

Considering the contents of this publication, it appears that the editors are on their way to accomplishing their objective. Found in this issue are the following articles:

- "Crossing the 'Digital Divide': Using the Internet to Impanel Jurors in Travis County, Texas," by Mary R. Rose, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Law at the University of Texas, and Michelle Brinkman, Chief Deputy of the Travis County District Clerk's Office;
- "Risky Business: New Hampshire's Experience Inviting Citizens to Examine the State Courts," by Laura Kiernan, Communications Director of the State of New Hampshire Judicial Branch;
- "A SLAPP in the Fact: Why Principles of Federalism Suggest that Federal District Courts Should Stop Turning the Other Cheek," by Lisa Litwiller, Professor of Law at Chapman University School of Law;

- "Learning from Failure: A Roundtable on Criminal Justice Innovation," by Greg Berman, Director of the Center for Court Innovation;
- "ComALERT: A Prosecutor's Collaborative Model for Ensuring a Successful Transition from Prison to the Community," by Charles J. Hynes, District Attorney for Kings County, New York;
- "Two Places at Once: How the Virginia Supreme Court Uses Technology to Improve Efficiency and Safety," by Bob Kelley, Magistrate Team Video Engineer, and Jim Scorzelli, Magistrate Team Technical Writer, both with the Supreme Court of Virginia; and
- "Law as Therapy: What Impact Do Drug Courts Have on Judges? An Interview with Judge Peggy Fulton Hora," by Robert V. Wolf, Director of Communications at the Center for Court Innovation.

While all the articles have value, a particularly interesting one is Berman's "Learning from Failure," which carries the discussion of a roundtable involving a number of prominent individuals, including Domingo Herraiz, Frank Hartmann, Michael Jacobson, Theron L. Bowman, and NAPE's own Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.

The *Journal of Court Innovation* is an excellent publication that represents a new source of scholarship for justice system practitioners. This inaugural edition may be accessed at <http://www.courtinnovation.org/journal.html>.

Dan Richard Beto

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

NEW OFFICERS ELECTED

Commencing in October 2007 and continuing through March 2008, members of the Nominations and Elections Committee earnestly solicited nominations for the various offices in the National Association of Probation Executives. As of the end of March, a slate of candidates had been developed. Since there were no contested races, in accordance with the Association's constitution, the Secretary cast a single vote for the slate of candidates. The new Officers and Directors of the Association, who will take office June 1, 2008, are as follows:

President

John Tuttle, Deputy Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, formerly an At-Large member of the Board of Directors, will serve as President.

Vice President

Ellen Fabian Brokofsky, State Probation Administrator in Lincoln, Nebraska, is a newly elected member of the Board of Directors.

Secretary

Javed Syed, Director of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Corpus Christi, Texas, will assume the position of Secretary. He replaces Melissa Cahill, who did not seek reelection. Mr. Syed previously served on the Board of Directors as the Southern Region representative.

Treasurer

Martin Krizay, Chief Probation Officer of the Yuma County Adult Probation Department in Yuma, Arizona, is returning to this position.

Past President

Rocco A. Pozzi, Commissioner of Probation and Corrections in Westchester County in White Plains, New York, will serve on the Board of Directors as immediate Past President.

New England Region

Bernard Fitzgerald, Chief Probation Officer of the Dorchester District Court Probation Department in Dorchester, Massachusetts, is returning to this position. He represents the states of

Executive Exchange

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Mid-Atlantic Region

Francine M. Perretta, Director of the St. Lawrence County Probation Department in Canton, New York, is returning to this position. She represents the states of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Central Region

Gregory E. Werich, Chief Probation Officer of the Wells County Probation Department in Bluffton, Indiana, is returning to this position. He represents the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Southern Region

Vicki Spriggs, Executive Director of the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission in Austin, Texas, is a newly elected member of the Board of Directors. She represents the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Western Region

S. Kaye Adkins, Family Services Administrator of the Washington State Department of Community Corrections in Tumwater, Washington, is returning to this position. She represents the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

At-Large

Ronald Schweer, Deputy Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the Easter District of Missouri in St. Louis is a newly elected member of the Board of Directors.

Brad Barnes, Director of Bartholomew County Court Services in Columbus, Indiana, is a newly elected member of the Board of Directors.

EXECUTIVE ORIENTATION PROGRAM HELD

On March 2-7, 2008, another Executive Orientation Program for New Probation and Parole Executives was held at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. This highly successful program – a joint initiative of the National Association of Probation Executives, National Institute of Corrections, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas – has been offered since 1997 and provides new probation and parole executives with both the immediate knowledge and the long-term skills needed in the areas of budgeting, personnel, planning, dealing with special interest groups, working with the media, and other organizational development issues.

The NAPE faculty included: **Dot Faust**, a Correctional Programs Specialist with the National Institute of Corrections; **Marcus Hodges**, Chief Probation and Parole Officers in Fredericksburg, Virginia; **Martin J. Krizay**, Chief Adult Probation Officer for Yuma County, Arizona; **Rocco A. Pozzi**, Commissioner of Probation for Westchester County, New York; **Cherie Townsend**, Director of the Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services in Nevada; and **Christie Davidson**, NAPE Executive Director.

Participants in this program included: **Richard R. Baca**, Chief Probation Officer for Graham County, Arizona; **Patricia H. Bass**, Chief Probation and Parole Officer in Franklin, Virginia; **Craig A. Berry**, Chief Probation Officer for Lake County, Ohio; **Rebecca A. Brunger**, Chief Probation Officer for Region 1 of the State of Alaska; **Clete Buckaloo**, Director of the 216th Judicial District Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Kerville, Texas; **Gregory R. Crawford**, Director of Probation Services for King County, Washington; **Jason Garnett**, Deputy Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections; **Scott Glueckert**, Director of the Delaware County Probation Department in New York; **Mary D. Knight**, Chief Probation and Parole Officer in Hampton, Virginia; **Kathryn J. Liebers**, Chief Probation Officer in Norfolk, Nebraska; **Anne Martin**, Director of Probation for Erie County, New York; **Primitivo Romero, III**, Chief Probation Officer for Santa Cruz County, Arizona; **David Simental**, Chief Probation Officer for the 10th Judicial District in Pueblo, Colorado; **Lisa D. Stapleton**, Chief Probation Officer in Alexandria, Virginia; **Mark Wilson**, Director of the Lancaster County Adult Probation and Parole Services in Pennsylvania; and **Cherie Wood**, Chief Adult Probation Officer for Vanderburgh County, Indiana.

In addition to being exposed to meaningful training, the 16 participants received a one year free membership in NAPE.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

NEW HEAD OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS IN WASHINGTON

Department of Corrections (DOC) Secretary **Eldon Vail** announced on February 5, 2008, the appointment of **Karen Daniels** to direct the agency's efforts to supervise offenders in the community while keeping the public safe.

As the new Assistant Secretary for Community Corrections, Daniels will oversee more than 1,400 DOC employees responsible for supervising nearly 29,000 offenders in com-

munities across the state. Prior to her appointment, Daniels served as DOC's Director of Operations in the Health Services Department.

"Community corrections is hard work and one that requires the highest commitment to public safety," Vail said. "Karen's years of experience in law enforcement and corrections will help us to ensure that offenders abide by community supervision requirements and are held accountable when they don't."

Before joining DOC last year, Daniels served as Chief Deputy of the Corrections Bureau in the Thurston County Sheriff's Office

from 1991 to 2007. She was a commissioned corrections deputy in the Sheriff's Department.

Daniels' previous work in the community corrections field included service as Chief of Adult Parole Services and Administrator of Adult Community Services in the Arizona Department of Corrections.

The current head of the Community Corrections Division, **Mary Leftridge Byrd**, will now lead a new Offender Programs Division within DOC. As Assistant Secretary for Offender Treatment and Re-entry Programs, Byrd will be responsible for overseeing a variety of prison and community programs that are aimed at disrupting the cycle of repeated criminal behavior. Those programs include offender re-entry, education, chemical-dependency treatment, sex-offender treatment, and family.

"Mary understands the absolute importance of using the time we have with offenders to improve their chances of leading productive, crime-free lives," Vail said. "Consolidating these programs under a single administrator will allow us to get maximum benefit from every taxpayer dollar spent for these purposes."

Before joining DOC in 2006 as the head of Community Corrections, Byrd served as Deputy Secretary for Specialized Facilities and Programs in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections.

PEW REPORT FINDS MORE THAN ONE IN 100 ADULTS BEHIND BARS

For the first time in history more than one in every 100 adults in America are in jail or prison — a fact that significantly impacts state budgets without delivering a clear return on public safety. According to a new report released on February 28, 2008, by the Pew Center on the States' Public Safety Performance Project, at the start of 2008, 2,319,258 adults were held in American prisons or jails, or one in every 99.1 men and women, according to the study. During 2007, the prison population rose by more than 25,000 inmates. In addition to detailing state and regional prison growth rates, Pew's report, *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*, identifies how corrections spending compares to other state investments, why it has increased, and what some states are doing to limit growth in both prison populations and costs while maintaining public safety.

As prison populations expand, costs to states are on the rise. Last year alone, states spent more than \$49 billion on corrections, up from \$11 billion 20 years before. However, the national recidivism rate remains virtually unchanged, with about half of released inmates returning to jail or prison within three years. And while violent criminals and other serious offenders account for some of the growth, many inmates are low-level offenders or people who have violated the terms of their probation or parole.

"For all the money spent on corrections today, there hasn't been a clear and convincing return for public safety," said **Adam Gelb**, director of the Public Safety Performance Project. "More and more states are beginning to rethink their reliance on prisons for lower-level offenders and finding strategies that are tough on crime without being so tough on taxpayers."

According to the report, 36 states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons saw their prison populations increase in 2007. Among the seven states with the largest number of prisoners — those with more than 50,000 inmates — three grew (Ohio, Florida and Georgia), while four (New York, Michigan, Texas and California) saw their populations dip. Texas surpassed California as the nation's prison leader following a decline in both states' inmate

populations — Texas decreased by 326 inmates and California by 4,068. Ten states, meanwhile, experienced a jump in inmate population growth of 5 percent or greater, a list topped by Kentucky with a surge of 12 percent.

A close examination of the most recent U.S. Department of Justice data (2006) found that while one in 30 men between the ages of 20 and 34 is behind bars, the figure is one in nine for black males in that age group. Men are still roughly 13 times more likely to be incarcerated, but the female population is expanding at a far brisker pace. For black women in their mid- to late-30s, the incarceration rate also has hit the one-in-100 mark. In addition, one in every 53 adults in their 20s is behind bars; the rate for those over 55 is one in 837.

The report points out the necessity of locking up violent and repeat offenders, but notes that prison growth and higher incarceration rates do not reflect a parallel increase in crime, or a corresponding surge in the nation's population at large. Instead, more people are behind bars principally because of a wave of policy choices that are sending more lawbreakers to prison and, through popular "three-strikes" measures and other sentencing laws, imposing longer prison stays on inmates.

As a result, states' corrections costs have risen substantially. Twenty years ago, the states collectively spent \$10.6 billion of their general funds — their primary discretionary dollars — on corrections. Last year, they spent more than \$44 billion in general funds, a 315 percent jump, and more than \$49 billion in total funds from all sources. Coupled with tightening state budgets, the greater prison expenditures may force states to make tough choices about where to spend their money. For example, Pew found that over the same 20-year period, inflation-adjusted general fund spending on corrections rose 127 percent while higher education expenditures rose just 21 percent.

"States are paying a high cost for corrections — one that may not be buying them as much in public safety as it should. And spending on prisons may be crowding out investments in other valuable programs that could enhance a state's economic competitiveness," said **Susan K. Urahn**, managing director of the Pew Center on the States. "There are other choices. Some state policy makers are experimenting with a range of community punishments that are as effective as incarceration in protecting public safety and allow states to put the brakes on prison growth."

According to Pew, some states are attempting to protect public safety and reap corrections savings primarily by holding lower-risk offenders accountable in less-costly settings and using intermediate sanctions for parolees and probationers who violate conditions of their release. These include a mix of community-based programs such as day reporting centers, treatment facilities, electronic monitoring systems and community service — tactics recently adopted in Kansas and Texas. Another common intervention, used in Kansas and Nevada, is making small reductions in prison terms for inmates who complete substance abuse treatment and other programs designed to cut their risk of recidivism.

Pew was assisted in collecting state prison counts by the Association of State Correctional Administrators. The report also relied on data published by the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Association of State Budget Officers, and the U.S. Census Bureau.

To view the entire report, including state-by-state data and methodology, visit the Pew Center on the States Public Safety Performance Project's website at www.pewcenteronthestates.org/initiatives_detail.aspx?initiativeID=31336.

PIRO NAMED PROBATION CHIEF FOR WOBURN COURT IN MASSACHUSETTS

According to an article appearing in the *Woburn Daily Times Chronicle*, long-time probation officer **Vincent Piro** has been named the Chief Probation Officer for the Woburn District Court. The court serves the Massachusetts communities of Burlington, Reading, Woburn, Winchester, Stoneham, North Reading, and Wilmington.

Piro, the Assistant Chief Probation Officer at the Woburn Court, was named the Acting Chief Probation Officer on March 30, 2007, when Chief Probation Officer **Charles Winchester**, 79, stepped down after 41 years on the job. He officially became the Chief Probation Officer on February 12, 2008.

A native of Somerville, Piro is a long-time resident of Medford. The naming of Piro comes as only the second person to hold the job since September 1966. He is a graduate of Matignon High School in Cambridge and has a bachelor's degree from the University of Lowell as well as a master's degree from Anna Maria College.

MANHATTAN INSTITUTE PRODUCES REPORT ON REENTRY

In March 2008, the Manhattan Institute, known among community corrections practitioners for advocating a "reinvented" probation, released Civic Bulletin No. 51 — *Moving Men into the Mainstream: Best Practices in Prisoner Reentry Assistance* — written by **Stephen Goldsmith** and **William B. Eimicke**. Goldsmith, a former mayor of Indianapolis, is the Daniel Paul Professor of Government and Director of the Innovations in American Government Program at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government; Eimicke is Deputy Commissioner of the New York City Fire Department and founding Director of the Picker Center for Executive Education at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. As the authors point out, as many as 700,000 inmates will be released from U.S. correctional facilities this year, and if current recidivism rates hold, two out of three will be rearrested within three years. Corrections departments, criminal justice officials, and judges make costly bets when deciding how to help inmates reintegrate themselves into their communities.

In this civic bulletin, the authors present a variety of public and private prisoner reentry approaches that have worked, including enhanced and targeted supervision; a special focus on job placement and retention; preparation for release; and connection to community resources. Goldsmith and Eimicke conclude with recommendations for a national criminal justice reform and reentry effort.

Persons interested in downloading this report are encouraged to visit http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cb_51.htm.

CONSERVATOR APPOINTS SENIOR OFFICIALS

On March 4, 2008, Texas Youth Commission (TYC) Conservator **Richard Nedelkoff** announced the hiring of five senior executives to help lead the agency out of conservatorship. In making the appointments, Nedelkoff stressed that he is looking both in Texas and nationwide to select the most qualified experts in the juvenile justice field that can immediately assist the agency in its reform efforts. The new appointments are:

Dianne L. Gadow has been appointed to serve as the agency's Deputy Commissioner of Programs and Treatment. Gadow formerly served as the Deputy Director of Operations for the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections, where she oversaw the department's secure schools, community corrections, mental health programs, classification and assessments, education programs, and partnerships with community resources. Previously she served as the Superintendent of the Ferris School for the State of Delaware, Department of Children, Youth and Families Division of Youth Services. She also held a variety of positions with the State of Colorado, Department of Human Services Division of Youth Services. Gadow has a history of successfully establishing major reforms and enhancing educational and mental health components in youth correctional facilities and the community. She is currently the Chair of the American Correctional Association's Juvenile Corrections Committee.

James D. Smith, the new TYC Deputy Commissioner of Residential and Parole Services, will oversee all facility operations and parole services at the agency. Prior to his appointment, Smith served as the Assistant Secretary of Residential Services at the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services in Baltimore, where he oversaw 15 state-operated and 17 contracted residential facilities, about the same number of major facilities in the Texas Youth Commission. He also developed and implemented the plan for the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services to settle a Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (CRIPA) agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice. TYC recently entered into a similar agreement with the DOJ over its operation of the Evins Regional Juvenile Center in Edinburg, Texas. In total, he has more than 15 years experience working at various levels in the juvenile justice field. In Georgia, he also brought facilities in compliance with a memorandum of agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and negotiated an earlier-than-expected exit from a consent decree imposed on the Marietta Regional Youth Detention Center in Georgia.

Leticia Peña Martinez assumed the role of TYC Deputy Commissioner of Planning and Policy. Martinez was the Director of Family Initiatives, Child Support Division at the Office of the Attorney General which focused on programs and initiatives that strengthen families and promote responsible parenthood. She has extensive experience in juvenile justice issues having managed juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs and serving as the Juvenile Justice Specialist for Texas at the Governor's Criminal Justice Division (CJD). In her last role as the Deputy Director and Director of Strategic Planning of CJD, she helped in leading the development and administration of innovative grants and programs that involve juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, criminal justice, law enforcement, victims' services and community programs. Martinez also led major initiatives such as the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders Initiative, the Texas School Safety Center Initiative, the Texas Mentoring Initiative, and many other statewide prevention and juvenile justice efforts.

Alfonso Royal joined TYC as Chief of Staff. Royal has been with the Office of the Governor as a budget and policy advisor since 2004. In this capacity, he was responsible for issues including tax policy, public safety and criminal justice issues. In addition to providing fiscal policy analysis, Royal worked with state and local elected leaders and oversight board members in the development of legislation, policy and rules. From 2002 to 2004,

Royal was a budget and performance analyst with the Legislative Budget Board and, from 2000 to 2002, was Budget and Planning Supervisor for the Texas Department of Public Safety.

Alan "Chip" Walters was selected to serve as the deputy to Smith. Walters, who has worked for TYC for nearly 23 years, began his career as a juvenile corrections officer. He worked his way up through TYC also serving as a case worker, program specialist over dorm life, Director of Security, and Assistant Superintendent before being named a Superintendent. Prior to this appointment, he was Superintendent of the Giddings State School, but has held that post at four other campuses in the past decade. Walters filled the position that was vacated when **Billy Humphrey** resigned in January 2008.

"I'm excited these public servants have accepted these challenges," said Nedelkoff. "Their experiences, expertise, and varied perspectives will be valuable assets as we move forward with reform. This combination of leaders blends outside and internal TYC knowledge, which should prove very beneficial."

TYC Deputy General Counsel **Wade Phillips**, who has managed residential operations on a temporary basis since October 2007, has returned to the General Counsel Division full time.

"I greatly appreciate Wade's willingness to serve as the director of residential services on an interim basis during this difficult time," Nedelkoff said. "He made tremendous sacrifices to fill in for this position. I'm confident that the experience he gained while acting as residential services director will be of great value to our Office of General Counsel."

SECOND CHANCE ACT PASSES

The U.S. Senate passed the Second Chance Act of 2007 on March 11, 2008. This landmark bill, introduced by Senators **Joseph Biden** of Delaware, **Sam Brownback** of Kansas, **Patrick Leahy** of Vermont, and **Arlen Specter** of Pennsylvania, provides critical resources designed to reduce recidivism and increase public safety. The legislation passed the Senate by unanimous consent and now proceeds to the President's desk for signature.

The Second Chance Act includes key elements of the Prisoner Reentry Initiative announced by President **George W. Bush** in his 2004 State of the Union address, which provides for community and faith-based organizations to deliver mentoring and transitional services. The bill will also help connect people released from prison and jail to mental health and substance abuse treatment, expand job training and placement services, and facilitate transitional housing and case management services.

"It is vitally important that we do everything we can to ensure that, when people get out of prison, they enter our communities as productive members of society, so we can start to reverse the dangerous cycles of recidivism and violence," said Senator Leahy. "I hope that the Second Chance Act will help us begin to break that cycle."

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, an estimated 95 percent of all state prisoners will be released — with half of these individuals expected to return to prison within three years for the commission of a new crime or violation of their conditions of release. This cycle of recidivism not only compromises public safety, but also increases taxpayer spending. A February 2007 report from The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that if federal, state, and local policies and practices

do not change, taxpayers are expected to pay as much as \$27.5 billion on prisons alone from 2007 to 2011 on top of current corrections spending.

"The Second Chance Act will provide an opportunity for realistic rehabilitation for the more than 650,000 inmates who return to their communities each year," said Senator Specter. "The bill's focus on education, job training, and substance abuse treatment is essential to decreasing the nationwide recidivism rate of 66 percent."

"I am pleased that my Senate colleagues were able to pass legislation that will help combat the high rates of prisoner recidivism in America. Everybody — the ex-offender, the ex-offender's family, and society at large — benefits from programs that equip prisons with the proper tools to successfully reintegrate individuals into life outside of the prison walls," said Senator Brownback. "I am hopeful that with this legislation we will begin to see tangible results as governments and non-profit organizations work together to help ex-offenders."

On April 9, 2008, President Bush signed the Second Chance Act, saying the legislation will help prisoners "reclaim their lives."

WICKLUND ELECTED VICE CHAIR OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Carl Wicklund, Executive Director of the American Probation and Parole Association, was recently elected Vice Chair of the U.S. Department of Justice's Global Advisory Committee (GAC). The GAC was created by the U.S. Attorney General to advise the U.S. Department of Justice in the establishment of the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative. The mission of the GAC is to act as the focal point for justice information systems integration activities. The GAC includes representatives from local, tribal, state, and federal agencies.

Wicklund has been a member of the GAC for many years and has served in the following capacities: Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative Advisory Committee, 1998 to present; Executive Steering Committee, 2004 to present; Privacy and Information Quality Working Group, 2004 to present and Chair 2006 to present; Intelligence Working Group/Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council, 2005 to present.

He is the sole remaining inaugural member of the Advisory Committee since his appointment by former U.S. Attorney General **Janet Reno**. As a member of GAC, Wicklund has strived to bring probation and parole issues to the attention of the global criminal justice community.

To read more about GAC, visit <http://www.iir.com/global/committee.htm>.

JUSTICE POLICY INSTITUTE RELEASES REPORT ON GROWING JAIL POPULATION

According to a report released on April 1, 2008, by the Justice Policy Institute (JPI), communities are bearing the cost of a massive explosion in the jail population which has nearly doubled in less than two decades. The research found that jails are now warehousing more people — who have not been found guilty of any crime — for longer periods of time than ever before. The research shows that in part due to the rising costs of bail, people arrested today are much more likely to serve jail time before trial

Executive Exchange

than they would have been twenty years ago, even though crime rates are nearly at the lowest levels in thirty years.

“Crime rates are down, but you’re more likely to serve time in jail today than you would have been twenty years ago,” said report co-author **Amanda Petteruti**. “Jail bonds have skyrocketed, so that means if you’re poor, you do time. People are being punished before they’re found guilty – justice is undermined.”

The report, *Jailing Communities: The Impact of Jail Expansion and Effective Public Safety Strategies*, found jail population growth (22 percent) is having serious consequences for communities that are now paying tens of billions yearly to sustain jails. Jails are filled with people with drug addictions, the homeless and people charged with immigration offenses. The report concludes that jails have become the “new asylums,” with six out of 10 people in jail living with a mental illness.

The impact of increased jail imprisonment is not borne equally by all members of a community. New data reveal that Latinos are most likely to have to pay bail, have the highest bail amounts, are least likely to be able to pay and, by far, the least likely to be released prior to trial. African Americans are nearly five times as likely to be incarcerated in jails as whites and almost three times as likely as Latinos. Further exacerbating jail crowding problems is the increase in the number of people being held in jails for immigration violations — up 500 percent in the last decade.

In 2004, local governments spent a staggering \$97 billion on criminal justice, including police, the courts and jails. Over \$19 billion of county money went to financing jails alone. By way of comparison, during the same time period, local governments spent just \$8.7 billion on libraries and only \$28 billion on higher education.

“These counties just cannot afford to invest the bulk of their local public safety budget in jails, and we are beginning to see why — the more a community relies on jails, the less it has to invest in education, employment, and proven public safety strategies,” says **Nastassia Walsh**, co-author of the report.

Research shows that places that increased their jail populations did not necessarily see a drop in violent crimes. Falling jail incarceration rates are associated with declining violent crime rates in some of the country’s largest counties and cities, like New York City.

“The investment in building more jail beds is not making communities safer,” says **Derrick Johnson**, NAACP National Board member. “Instead these investments serve only to unfairly target communities of color and waste taxpayer dollars.”

The report recommends that communities take action to reduce their jail populations and increase public safety by:

- Improving release procedures for pretrial and sentenced populations. Implementing pretrial release programs that release people from jail before trial can help alleviate jail populations. Reforming bail guidelines would allow a greater number of people to post bail, leaving space open in jails for people who may pose a greater threat to public safety.
- Developing and implementing alternatives to incarceration. Alternatives such as community-based corrections would permit people to be removed from the jail, allowing them to continue to work, stay with their families, and be part of the community, while under supervision.
- Re-examining policies that lock up individuals for nonviolent crimes. Reducing the number of people in jail for nonviolent offenses leaves resources and space available for people who may need to be detained for a public safety reason.

- Diverting people with mental health and drug treatment needs to the public health system and community-based treatment. People who suffer from mental health or substance abuse problems are better served by receiving treatment in their community. Treatment is more cost-effective than incarceration and promotes a positive public safety agenda.
- Diverting spending on jail construction to agencies that work on community supervision and make community supervision effective. Reallocating funding to probation services will allow people to be placed in appropriate treatment or other social services and is a less costly investment in public safety.
- Providing more funding for front-end services such as education, employment, and housing. Research has shown that education, employment, drug treatment, health care, and the availability of affordable housing coincide with lower crime rates.

The mission of the Justice Policy Institute is to promote effective solutions to social problems and to be dedicated to ending society’s reliance on incarceration. For more information about JPI and this report, visit www.justicepolicy.org.

The full report may be accessed by visiting www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/08-04_REP_JailingCommunities_AC.pdf.

VIVA LAS VEGAS!

Plan to attend the NAPE events in Las Vegas, Nevada, on August 2-3, 2008. The NAPE events will be held immediately prior to APPA’s 33rd Annual Institute.

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

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

