

# National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2014

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

It is bittersweet for me to recognize that this letter is my last to the NAPE membership as President. It marks an additional professional passage for me since I retired from full-time probation employment in the fall of 2012.

Whether the inquiry comes from a former employee of mine here in Indianapolis or elsewhere or a NAPE colleague around the country, I am routinely asked, "How's retirement going?" or "What are you doing with yourself?" I'll get to that issue later on as it serves as a prompt for my main message.

Last holiday season, I was standing in line at the post office waiting to mail a package. I spotted a former colleague of mine who had worked directly for a former supervising judge of mine; we were mild past acquaintances. I had heard that Randy, as I will call him, had retired that previous September. As the line was long and barely moving, I broke out of queue to greet Randy, who I had not seen in over a year. After identities were once gain established, it was only naturally for me to ask "So, how's retirement going? What are you doing with yourself?"

Randy's answer stunned me as he bluntly responded: "I hate it. Some days I never get out of the recliner."

While retirement may be the furthest thing from your mind at this stage in your life and career, the concept, however vague and afar, needs to have your attention. As I have come to recognize, retirement is not a destination but a process, a transition to another life with its own ebb, flow, and design. That new life will be as secure and good as you choose to make it, but a principle ingredient in that future model needs to be established NOW.

Regardless of where you are in your administrative career, procure the services of a competent and seasoned financial manager. Start devising your fiscal strategy for retirement life now. What is going to compose your retirement income? It should consist of Social Security, retirement accounts – 401(k)s and IRA's, Roth accounts, pensions – savings accounts, and CDs, and possible other sources of

income such as part-time employment. The best fiscal decision that I ever made about retirement income was to engage in an aggressive deferred compensation model when I was in my early 40s. That simple decision has made all the difference, but I made that financial move at mid-career and not as retirement was fast approaching.

My sense is that retirement income was not Randy's problem. What Randy had failed to do was to envision life without a full-time job. What was to fill the void? He had not thought through or even imagined what life would be without full-time work in a courthouse. That vision is yours to establish, but it just doesn't happen. As Randy soon and unfortunately learned, there was no replacement focus in place, which greeted him at 8:00 AM Monday on his first day of retirement. You need to give that design much thought now and in years to come. How will you spend that time, fill that void, and I dare say, how will you maximize and enjoy life away from the stress of being a Chief?

You are being spared details of my transition to retirement, but safe to say, I still teach part-time, consult, and write. Hobbies and interests are numerous. Not surprisingly, a growing cadre of grandchildren has the proud attention of my wife and me.

Be aware that NAPE has been very active as a founding member with NIC's Community Corrections Division in the establishment and startup of a new network known as the Community Corrections Collaborative Network (CCCN). NAPE vice-president Ron Schweer and I have both attended organizational meetings of this working group which has been ably guided by NIC's Jim Cosby and Greg Crawford. The future for this initiative appears extremely bright as it serves as a representative forum to develop and work the emerging issues (i.e. Second Chance Act, dosage based probation) and goals within the community corrections field. Having been a member of a similar network from 1998-2000, I assure you that this current model already has attained superior focus and traction.



## CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Robert L. Bingham</i> .....	1
NAPE Events in New Orleans, <i>Christie Davidson</i> .....	2
At Last, A World Congress on Probation!, <i>Donald G. Evans</i> .....	3
Probation in South Sudan 2013: From Promise to Trepidation, <i>R. E. "Bob" Brown</i> .....	9
2014-2016 Officers and Directors, <i>Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.</i> .....	12
2014 Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies, <i>Lauren Glaze and Tim Smith</i> .....	13
From the Bookshelf .....	15

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE (cont'd)

I also want membership to know that I have been engaged as a trainer/evaluator with the redesign and startup of NIC's Probation and Parole Executive Orientation program. Veteran NAPE members will recall NAPE's lead participation with the previous model. While APPA and NIC are the current lead agencies for this revised program, I have done my best to provide the NAPE thumbprint to these emerging leaders, and they all have been actively recruited for NAPE membership.

A final focus for me as your outgoing NAPE President is to regenerate association membership, which has been on the decline in recent years. NAPE is not alone in this regard as a professional association, but you folks can greatly help in this cause. If everyone who reads this message were to attract at least one new member to NAPE, the issue would be resolved. So, please take the time to serve NAPE in this capacity as a proud recruitment ambassador.

Whenever I speak or write about NAPE, I always reference NAPE's prominent role in my development as a chief probation officer. Speaking to the choir here, no association and its related membership has done more for me professionally than NAPE. I especially credit Dan Beto and Ron Corbett for believing in me and challenging me during the past 20+ years. Thank you to Dan, Ron, and other NAPE members in general for your vision, inspired guidance, encouragement, and example setting. A very special thanks,

as well, is extended to NAPE Executive Director Christie Davidson for her steady stewardship and patient support during the past two years; she is simply the best.

A final comment...I spent my entire administrative career within probation as a reformer in five unique jurisdictions. I did a lot of cleaning up. Because of that role, I became more sensitive than most towards the errors and miscues, which could be displayed by chief probation officers. Unfortunately, what is an all too errant quality of many chiefs is shortsightedness in respecting their roots and probation's core functions and a regrettable tendency to drift away from the direct service role of the profession. Unless you work in a small department and actually carry a caseload, most chief probation officers do not investigate and write presentence reports, and they do not directly supervise probationers. Always respectfully remember probation's bread and butter. And in case you haven't noticed, the job today is infinitely more complex and demanding than anything we ever experienced. For those realities, stay close and most appreciative of your department's front line employees. They are the ones who do the real probation work.

In closing, until New Orleans, happy trails and, as always, thank you most kindly for your support.

**Robert L. "Bing" Bingham**  
President

## NAPE EVENTS IN NEW ORLEANS

Members of the National Association of Probation Executives are encouraged to attend organizational activities on August 2-3, 2014, at the Hyatt Regency in New Orleans, Louisiana.

### Exclusive Members Reception

On Saturday, August 2, 2014, at 5:00 PM, the NAPE Members Reception will take place at the Hyatt Regency; this event immediately precedes the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association.

This year we will be foregoing the Annual Awards Breakfast, typically held on Sunday morning. Because of this, awards will be presented during the Members Reception.

### Board of Directors Meeting

On Sunday, August 3, 2014, at 9:00 AM, the NAPE Board of Directors will meet at the Hyatt Regency to conduct organizational business.

Additional information will be forthcoming regarding specific room assignments for these two events. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at [davidson@shsu.edu](mailto:davidson@shsu.edu).

**Christie Davidson**  
Executive Director

## AT LAST, A WORLD CONGRESS ON PROBATION!

by

Donald G. Evans

This report is a combination of my personal recollections of events leading up to the convening of the world congress on probation held in London, England, in October 2013. I was not privy to any of the details of the actual planning and programming for the congress but have followed the progress over the years of the efforts to have such a congress. As Chair of the International Committee for the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), I was keenly interested in a meeting of European and North American probation leaders. Serving as a member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) and also of the American Correctional Association (ACA) gave me opportunities to keep up to date on issues and events occurring in other countries and to express my support for an international gathering of probation professionals.

What follows is a brief review of the background of the congress from my personal perspective and to explain to some degree North American probation's willingness to become involved in the congress and to host the next congress to be held in the United States in 2015. The congress will be hosted by APPA with the assistance of other organizations, including NAPE, Confederation of European Probation (CEP), International Corrections and Prison Association (ICPA), and the International Community Corrections Association (ICCA).

### Background

From my travels, speaking at conferences, and reviewing authors from outside North America, I became convinced that we needed a worldwide focus on probation for quite some time, and such a focus has been a long time in coming. It was in Budapest, Hungary, in 1999 at the inaugural conference of the ICPA that I first met the late Martin Tansey from the Irish Probation Service and the President of CEP, and recall having conversations about the state of probation in Europe and North America and feeling that there was much we could learn from each other as well as reaching out to Asia, Africa, Australia and New Zealand, as well as other countries that were developing probation services and grappling with increased correctional populations.

The conversation about the need for and the value of a world summit meeting of probation leadership continued, and when Martin Tansey and I met in Cape Town, South Africa, at the ICPA meeting in 2000, we continued to discuss and support the idea of such a meeting. The original idea was to have a select group of probation leaders from around the world convene to create a statement, manifesto, or other such document that would explain probation and its worth to the criminal justice system and to the reduction of victimization in our respective countries. As a result of my discussions on probation with Martin, I was invited by him to attend and speak at the CEP General Assembly and International Conference held in Malta in the Spring of 2001. This was the final year of Martin Tansey's term as CEP President. I remember his opening remarks to the General Assembly that year, remarks that I subsequently reported in *Executive Exchange*:

He stressed the need to encourage private/public partnerships, partnerships with other criminal justice agents...and reminded the assembly that there is a need to expand our associates if CEP is to grow and develop. He noted that CEP was at a crossroads and it needs new members and new ideas if it is to prosper. With this as background, he challenged the group to think of joining forces with North American probation associations to attempt a world congress on probation (Evans, 2001).

In the summer of 2002, I met with John Walters, Secretary General of CEP, in London, England, to learn more about CEP and what might be possible. We discussed possible affiliations and methods of exchanging information (Evans, 2002). As a result of these interchanges I became an individual member of CEP and encouraged APPA to become an affiliate of CEP, which occurred in time for the next General Assembly held in Lugano, Switzerland, in 2004 (Evans, 2005). ICPA also affiliated at this time and this would prove to be helpful in expanding CEP throughout Europe.

At the Lugano General Assembly the first official discussion of a world congress was raised. The affiliation arrangement between APPA and CEP included a mutual commitment to organize a worldwide probation event.

In 2007, Dan Beto, Chair of NAPE's International Committee, and I attended the 9th General Assembly of CEP held in Tallinn, Estonia. NAPE and CEP entered into an affiliation agreement during this Assembly (Beto & Evans, 2007). This marked the beginning of exchanges between NAPE and CEP that was followed up by our attendance at other CEP hosted conferences and the 10th General Assembly in Malaga, Spain (Evans & Beto, 2008; Beto & Evans, 2010). These exchanges and conference attendances led to my writing a short column stating it was "time for a world congress on probation" in an effort to alert my North American colleagues to the possibilities and the necessity of a wider discussion of the merits of probation as a legitimate sanction and service (Evans, 2011).

During this 15 year span there emerged, especially in Europe, a vibrant and serious scholarship devoted to probation and to the forms of service that had developed as a result of the importing from North America the research and assessment technologies crafted in the search for "what works" and what is subsequently now known as "evidence based practice" (EBP). Awareness of this trend occurred when attending a CEP conference on resettlement of adult offenders held in Glasgow, Scotland, in collaboration with the Universities of Glasgow and Strathclyde in April 2008 (Evans & Beto, 2008). The research outputs during this period have furthered our understanding of effective practice and contributed to the development of enhanced supervision models. Themes such as desistance, compliance, offender/officer alliances, and restorative programming were all being explored. This research development and the close working together of academia and probation services help shaped the approach to the content and form of the first annual world congress.

One other development occurred in Mexico City at the ICPA conference (October 2012) when the then President-Elect of APPA Carmen Rodriguez met Marc Ceron, President of CEP, thus closing the circle that began in Budapest in 1999 when I met with Martin Tansey, then President of CEP at the ICPA conference!

Finally, the time had come and CEP announced that a world congress on probation would be held in London, England, in conjunction with the 11th General Assembly in October 2013 (Evans, 2013). The congress was convened and coordinated by CEP in collaboration with the National Offender Management Service, the London Probation Trust, The West Yorkshire Probation Trust, and Probation Chiefs Association of England and Wales. The event attracted 336 participants from over 50 countries. The proceedings were held in an excellent venue, the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Center in the center of London.

What follows is my recall of the sessions I attended during the two day conference and reflects what I took from the presentations; it is not intended to be or could be an exhausted recount of the events and proceedings. Since there were parallel sessions that necessitated choice there are interesting presentations that I could not cover but hopefully what I am able to recount will encourage readers to plan to attend the second annual world congress to be held in the summer of 2015 in the United States.

### The Congress: Day One

Marc Ceron, President of CEP, opened the congress by welcoming the delegates and acknowledging the assistance and support of all the individuals and agencies who had worked to make the congress a reality and an excellent networking and learning environment. His thanks extended to the probation organizations of England and Wales, the staff of CEP, private sector companies engaged in community corrections and to CEP affiliates: APPA, NAPE, ICPA, and the European Forum on Urban Security (EFUS). President Ceron then declared the congress officially in session and introduced the opening plenary speaker, the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice, Chris Grayling.

#### *Opening Session: Transforming Rehabilitation in England and Wales*

Grayling began his speech by giving a brief history of probation in England and Wales and the reforms and reorganizations that have occurred during the past 100 plus years. His speech centered on the current proposals that would take place early in 2014. Although the crime rate has been declining in England and Wales, he noted that re-offending rates have barely changed in the last ten years. This, he said is the prime reason for seeking to reform rehabilitation services in England and Wales. The highlights of the reform include:

- Introducing a minimum 12 months supervision and rehabilitation for all offenders released from prison regardless of sentence length;
- Creating a nationwide network of 70 resettlement prisons thus releasing most offenders into the areas where they live and are supervised;
- Creating a new public sector National Probation Service for the protection of the public from the most dangerous offenders; and
- Opening up the market for delivering rehabilitative services to a broader range of providers. This initiative will see providers receiving full pay only if they are successful in reducing re-offending (payment for results).

To assist with these reforms Grayling talked about changes to how offenders will be managed in prison that will include, for example, revisions to the “incentives and privileges” scheme. Privileges will be linked to offender’s progress in actively working towards their own rehabilitation, failure to do so will result in loss of privileges such as television sets in their cells and being allowed to wear their own clothes rather than prison garments.

Another, area that cause a lot of discussion at the breaks and visits to the “marketplace” by the delegates was the “opening up the market” to competition from public, private, and voluntary sectors for provision of rehabilitative services. Grayling suggested that the government will provide tools and assistance to help smaller agencies compete as well as a “justice data lab” to help providers assess the impact of their work and programs on reducing re-offending. He stressed that “at the heart of probation services is public protection” and as a result the new public sector probation service with experienced probation officers will be responsible for management of offenders who pose a high risk of causing serious harm and who have committed serious offenses. Grayling concluded his remarks by stating that the whole system will be up and running in 2015. I hope so, because an up-date on the benefits of these reforms would make for a good presentation at the second annual world congress on probation, especially since the reforms have engendered much discussion and controversy.

#### *Plenary: Community Justice Services in the Age of Austerity*

Dr. Frank Porporino, a criminal justice consultant and a Board member of ICPA who hails from Canada, delivered the keynote address. In my introduction of Dr. Porporino to the congress delegates I noted that three themes have guided his work: concern for what works; what matters; and what else is possible. His presentation emphasized the three themes supported by examples and evidence. He began his address by sketching out the issues facing corrections today, notably issues of austerity, prison populations, and practice modalities. Porporino noted that as a result of the economic climate and past policy decisions a number of jurisdictions had reached a “tipping point” that has fueled the search for strategies to reduce imprisonment and to expand community correctional programs. To emphasize the work being done on strategies to reduce the use of imprisonment he outlined and commented on seven strategies developed by Rob Allen (*Reducing Use of Incarceration*, 2012):

- Greater quasi-judicial prosecutorial discretion to dismiss charges and divert offenders, including wider application of restorative justice options and use of community services even with some relatively serious cases, where there is no public interest in conviction;
- Greater reliance on suspended sentences;
- Purposeful replacement and use of alternatives for short prison sentences;
- A more widely available provision of treatment options for individuals with drug dependency and mental health issues;
- A rise in the use of early conditional release;
- A higher threshold for invoking breaches or recalls to prison; and
- Greater government acceptance of and respect for the views and expertise of non-governmental organizations, scholars, and practitioners in formulating crime policy.

Porporino had earlier noted that “if there is a revolution to be had...it will not be led by government foresight or design, it will hinge on the solidarity we find for continued refinements of our practice expertise – keeping our compass pointed steadily towards what matters, and what can make the most lasting difference.”

In order to make his point, Porporino raises a “what if” question, namely that if you go to sleep and wake up the next morning you discover that probation has become phenomenally effective! What would this probation practice look like? He suggests that this effective probation practice would be:

- Purposefully integrating validated principles of practice within an overall framework for engendering pro-social influence;
- Eliminating the social-structural barriers that undermine and counteract our possible influences;
- Applying our interventions to support and influence change – not to force it;
- Expanding our spheres of influence through partnerships, collaborations and cooperative arrangements with a broader base, including family, faith communities, volunteers, and other pro-social influencers; and
- Engaging and mobilizing our communities to support our work.

He closed his presentation by reminding us that in the age of austerity the road ahead will be difficult with government expecting more but giving less. He is hopeful that we will find ways to follow our own agenda: to do what’s right instead of constantly adjusting to short-sighted policies and quick-fix ideas that come to us. He reminded professional associations of their need to play a stronger role and collectively exercise more gumption!

#### *Plenary: Restorative Justice*

Professor Ivo Aertsen of the Leuven Institute of Criminology in Belgium addressed the congress delegates on the developments in restorative approaches in European jurisdictions. Over the past 30 years restorative justice has undergone a lot of experimentation involving various approaches. There has emerged a set of principles and values to guide and inform practitioners and probation services. He described three basic restorative approaches in current use: mediation, conferencing, and community justice panels. He discussed the barriers to widespread adaptation of this approach by probation (government), given the current government stress on reducing re-offending and the professional neutrality of probation. He attributed this disconnect to restorative justice approach to repairing the harm and a concern for both victim and offender and the community. A way out of this dilemma, he said, would be to a wider involvement of community agencies and restorative justice to become a helpful partner to probation. Restorative justice provides, he noted, probation with a mechanism to improve credibility and build confidence in the community.

Aertsen’s presentation helped place restorative justice as a meaningful contribution towards developing a much broader appreciation for social justice through its emphasis on encouraging stronger bonds between offenders, victims, and the larger community.

#### *First Parallel Sessions*

The first group of parallel sessions covered the theme of courts and restorative justice and was divided into three sections covering:

- Courts and the judiciary, with a presentation on the community court in Vancouver, Canada, and one on the role of judges and attorneys in France;
- Restorative justice, with presentations on the effects of European international cooperation on regional developments in the field of restorative justice and on the engagement of long-term prisoners in preparing for resettlement in Northern Ireland; and
- Values and principles that included a presentation on social values in the Belgian Houses of Justice and another on research in progress on the topic of a working alliance in one-to-one supervision.

I attended the session on working alliance in one-to-one supervision presented by Anneke Menger and Andrea Donker from the Research Centre for Social Innovation, Faculty of Society and Law, at HU University of Applied Sciences in Utrecht, The Netherlands. I found this to be a very interesting presentation due to my interest in developments in the field regarding “therapeutic alliance” as an important aspect of supervision of offenders. The presenters discussed a research design and data collection methods of an ongoing research into a study to inform our understanding of what is the relevance of a good quality working alliance. Two major theoretical concepts are being explored: relation (attitude and behavior of professionals such as empathy, warmth, and support) and working alliance (conscious contributions of both the professional and the offender, including such constructs as bond, goal, and task). This was a very technical presentation, but the results, when the study is complete, should add measurably to our understanding of the importance of and the content/context of a quality working alliance

#### *Plenary: Desistance Research and “Evidence-Based Probation”*

A panel discussion presented by Steve Farrall of the University of Sheffield, Shadd Maruna of Queen’s University Belfast, and Fergus McNeill of the University of Glasgow on desistance research and evidence-based probation was for me one of the highlights of the congress. The panelists discussed four topics: evidence and purpose; rethinking what works; desistance and what works; and desistance-based principles and practices.

In attempting a response to the question as to why practitioners should be following the progress of desistance research and practice, I have relied on the information shared by the panelists at the world congress as a starting point for future discussions on the value of this line of inquiry. The presenters noted that desistance research currently consists of:

- Learning from success stories;
- Understanding how and why individuals who were at one time frequent offenders were able to cease from criminal activity and remain crime free;
- Methodology is basically science based and longitudinal and/or introspective and often qualitative; and
- Focuses on the person, not the program, and looks at individual lives over time.

The presentation also considered what factors were known to relate to desistance from crime and the following factors

appeared universal: stable relationships; stable employment; moving away from same age and gender peers; feelings of responsibility, hope, and self-efficiency; and lastly, an increase in concern for others. These factors are generally impeded by incarceration! Another area that this research is informative is in the area of stigmatization and labeling processes and the impact on an individual's efforts to desist from crime. Understanding this process can assist practitioners in their work with individuals and in using the process to help create new identities and a pro-social narrative. Also examining the role rituals can have in furthering an individual's cessation of criminal activity and the creation of a new identity.

Another by-product of the current research on desistance is the revisiting of how community supervision works and a renewed interest in core correctional practices, which include the approach of befriending, advising, and assisting individuals in practical ways. We know the value of developing a relationship and provision of practical help and talking out issues assists:

- The practitioner building trust;
- In engaging the client; and
- In creating compliance in the longer term since it allows for problem to be solved more effectively.

Other lessons that can be gleaned from the research on desistance related to supervision are summarized by the panel presenters as follows:

- Supervision as a starting point for change;
- Advice given is used as circumstances change even if not used when given but is stored and used later;
- There are aspects of the once disparaged social work model that appear to be effective;
- Suggests consideration of different research designs for understanding the value and effectiveness of supervision in relation to reduction of reoffending such as: longer period for evaluation, acceptance of periods of low impact, recognition that other social and personal factors perform a mediating role in supervision; and
- Development of more rigorously designed studies.

The panelists definitely left me feeling comfortable that practitioners can profit from becoming familiar with this growing body of research. In terms of future directions, the presenters noted that we might want to have a clearer and more critical account of re-integration as distinct from re-assimilation or re-socialization to assist us in moving beyond the current pre-occupation with re-offending, including desistance! They also suggest that this research might edge us towards a more positive community supervision that examines, articulates, and advances the social goods that justice exists to promote. Given the response by participants it was clear that this presentation was one of the highlights of the congress.

### *Second Parallel Sessions: Probation in England and Wales*

This section was divided into three general themes with the focus on developments and programs in the host country, England and Wales. The themes and the workshops supporting them were:

- Tackling the health needs of offenders in the community: mapping the health needs of offenders on probation with implications for service delivery and intensive ser-

vices for high risk offenders released from prison with mental and personality disorders;

- Public protection and managing risk: discussion of the how risk assessment and public protection are practiced in England and Wales; and
- Service user engagement: engaging offenders to reduce re-offending through a presentation of a model for effective practice and engaging with service users to support their desistance journey.

Out of the choices presented, I choose to attend the workshop on "Engaging Offenders to Reduce Re-offending" presented by Martin Copsey, Deputy Director of Commissioning and Competitions, Rehabilitation Programmes for the Ministry of Justice, and Sue Rex from the National Offender Management Service. In this presentation they stressed that "quality matters" and the quality of the rehabilitation support is critical to reducing re-offending. Copsey and Rex also noted that "practice skills matter." They then discussed how they were attempting to improve practice skills in England and Wales through a program called SEEDS (Skills for Effective Engagement, Development, and Supervision: that is a skills-based practice framework supporting effective engagement with offenders. This program is based on action learning that develops the pro-social modeling skills of the "engaging practitioner" and encourages reflective practice. The general model for one-to-one supervision revolves around four concepts: structured sessions; cognitive behavioral techniques; pro-social modeling; and the risk, need, and responsibility (RNR) principles. This program is currently in a pilot stage with plans to roll it out to ensure accessibility to all service providers in England and Wales. This was a very interesting presentation, especially to those of us familiar with the work of James Bonta, Ed Latessa, and Chris Lowenkamp.

### **The Congress: Day 2**

The last day of the congress began with welcoming remarks from Willem van der Brugge, the newly appointed Secretary General of CEP. This was followed by a brief presentation facilitated by Mike Seal of the Revolving Doors Agency who interviewed Gary Moran, a former service user who had been supervised by the Bedfordshire Probation Trust. Moran discussed his experiences on probation and what he felt contributed to his reintegration. This was a good reminder of what all our efforts in probation should be about.

### *Plenary: Evidence-Based Practice*

Following this, the congress moved into its last plenary session which comprised two presentations on evidence-based practice. The first presentation was a literature review on the effectiveness of probation presented by Ioan Durnescu, a Senior Lecturer at the University of Bucharest in Romania, and the second was a presentation on evidence-based practices in the United States by William D. Burrell, Editor of *Perspectives*, the journal of the American Probation and Parole Association, and a corrections management consultant.

Is Probation Effective? Yes, but. In a fairly extensive literature review, albeit a work in progress, Durnescu described the method employed and the data sources used and discussed preliminary findings from the review. He started by employing a definition of effectiveness that asks "does the intervention achieve its intended objectives?" But, as he pointed out this raises another

question, what objectives? He presented a chart outlining probation objectives in Europe based on the stated purposes of the various probation services. The result, as one would expect, was varied thus making comparisons more difficult. The review to date has drawn the following conclusions:

- There is a complex relationship between prison and probation (probation serves both an alternative to prison and as a net-widener of carceral control);
- Probation can influence decision-making if pre-sentence reports are realistic and coherent; and
- Post-release supervision seems to make a difference but not a large difference.

Revocation processes need to differentiate between formal compliance and substantive compliance. Substantive compliance is active involvement and engagement to solve problems and change lifestyle for long term improvement.

Other conclusions noted included the finding that interventions based on RNR can significantly reduce re-offending but the reduction depended on the age of offenders, criminal history, type of offence and specific contextual factors (access to social capital and opportunities). Also professional relationship and practical help seems to be essential according to Durnescu. This latter statement led him to suggest that the next “revolution” in our field is not “what works” but “who works.” This would certainly underscore the importance of training and development and provide guidance to professional associations as to the content and delivery of their conferences and services.

Burrell began his presentation with a brief history that indicated that in the United States the awareness of RNR is about 25 years old, discussions and research on “what works” is 20 years old, and the efforts to have an evidence-practice is an occurrence of the last decade. However, he said we do not have much to show for the length of time we have been aware of the research other than lots of activity and talk resulting in EBP fatigue. This led to him concluding that in the United States there is little in the way of comprehensive, quality implementation in probation.

Fortunately, for the delegates, he did not stop there but explained the factors and barriers leading to this situation. He attributed some of the problem in implementation to the size and structure of the probation system in the United States. Other aspects creating barriers included how the probation system is governed (many levels of jurisdictions from county to federal), resulting in a lack of a unified philosophy and mission for probation. Some of the other factors inhibiting implementation of EBP included: resource issues, various EBP models, and a general “anti-science” bias.

Burrell then explored further the issues related to implementation which he called “the Achilles heel of evidence-based practice.” He told us that what is needed for a successfully planned change is: a good model, good implementation; and strong and committed leadership. He described examples of model efforts to implement EBP, with particular emphasis on the work being done within the Maryland Division of Parole and Probation.

Burrell then turned his attention to prospects for the future and noted the following issues or trends:

- The continuance of the fiscal crisis making it necessary to manage better with less resources;
- Waning support for mass incarceration in most jurisdictions;

- Growth of non-partisan advocacy groups and efforts;
- The emergence of conservative political support for less imprisonment;
- Increasing support for probation and other community-based treatment options;
- The development of a science of implementation that could provide guidance to probation;
- Need for a sustained and committed leadership who understand and accept the difficulty of the necessary transformation required; and
- Receiving policy, legislative and fiscal support for community supervision and increased community awareness of what we do and support for our efforts.

The honesty and forthright approach taken in this presentation, judging from discussion among delegates, was well received and was in my view much appreciated.

### *Third Parallel Sessions: Working with Offenders in the Community*

These supporting workshops were divided into three sections dealing with various aspects of offender groups being supervised in the community. The sections and the workshops were:

- Effective interventions that included what works with women offenders and implementing what works in the community that featured a discussion of the challenges of researching probation policy and practice;
- Sex offender supervision provided workshops on developments in sex offender supervision and expanding circles of support and accountability in Europe; and
- Community justice and civil participation featured presentations from Japan and Thailand.

I selected the workshop led by three Japanese professors – Hiroshi Shojima, Kayo Konagai, and Ayako Sakonji – who presented on how the Japanese Rehabilitation System had been created to supervise offenders based on a close collaboration between professional probation staff and volunteer probation officers. Research has been undertaken in Japan in an effort to discover what conditions need to be met in order to have higher risk offenders supervised by volunteer probation officers. I found this workshop informative, especially as it related to desistance from crime and the role of the probation officer. Some of the findings from their research indicated the following interesting points:

- The rehabilitation process was not a smooth one;
- Offenders need practical and emotional support for rehabilitation;
- Realistic appreciation for life and the development of problem-solving skills are crucial for their rehabilitation; and
- Offenders have a need for hope, dreams and a positive self image which can be developed through social interaction.

It seems from their presentation that desistance pathways could be facilitated by the volunteer probation officers, even in terms of higher risk offenders. Future plans will include more training and support for these volunteers who are residents of a local community and have a key position in the social capital

of that community thus are able to support offenders regarding their rehabilitation needs.

### *Fourth Parallel Sessions: Developing Probation Worldwide*

The workshops in this session were divided into three sections dealing with Africa (Uganda and Kenya), Eastern Europe (Albania and Moldova), and emergent probation services (Dutch Caribbean and Jordan), and dealt with issues and challenges of creating and maintaining a probation service. I attended the discussion led by Leo Tigges, former Secretary General of CEP and now Liaison Officer to the Dutch Caribbean of the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice. He told us about the issues in trying to develop a probation service as an alternative to custodial sanctions in a harsh penal climate. The Dutch Caribbean has an incarceration rate of 700 per 100,000 population, putting it up there with the United States and Russia! The local probation service is reasonably developed and capable with links to the Dutch Probation Service. The issue is finding ways to shift from overuse of imprisonment and building credibility and legitimacy with the local community for a greater use of probation as a sanction. This was a very interactive workshop led by Tigges and there were many interesting and informative suggestions made regarding cost/benefit issues, increase public relations and communications strategies, development of policy and legislative levers including developing alternative custodial options. This was a very interesting and informative workshop and makes explicit the difficulties in establishing community supervision in a harsh penal environment.

### *Fifth Parallel Sessions: Probation and Resettlement*

Three workshops comprised these parallel sessions: the resettlement needs of foreign national prisoners; developing community justice (prisoner resettlement in Chile and challenges for probation in South Asia); transition management and re-entry of prisoners into the community (between prison and community

in Germany; and the mandatory aftercare scheme of the Singapore Prison Service).

The session I choose to attend was conducted by a team from the Centre for Studies on Public Security at the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Chile. The team was comprised of three presenters: Olga Espinoza, a lawyer; Fernando Martinez, a human rights lawyer; and Carolina Villagra, a psychologist. They presented a resettlement program that had been developed by an interdisciplinary group from the University of Chile and was implemented with the collaboration of different state and community agencies in 2008-09.

The program was called "To Trust Again" that worked with 31 released offenders from two of the largest prisons in Chile and returned to a vulnerable community on southern Santiago. The session looked at the challenges, role of families, case management, and the participants' view of the processes they underwent. Important areas were involved in the program: education, work, health, rights and citizenship, family, accommodation, and community integration, all viewed as critical to resettlement. The actions taken by program staff involved one-to-one support and interventions at the individual, family and community levels. The lessons gleaned from this effort suggest the importance of engaging and mobilizing the community, using a desistance approach facilitated by user engagement. Interestingly, recidivism proved to be a limited indicator to resettlement. The team discussed with the delegates issues and challenges related to cultural context in theory and practice, what is the place of academia in applied criminology, and are penitentiary systems in a period of transition.

It was stimulating to listen about the efforts of another country and culture in addressing similar issues that we face in attempting to implement practice and theory developed in a Euro-American framework.

## NAPE LISTSERV AND WEBSITE

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

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

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

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



### Conclusion

CEP President Ceron closed the congress by introducing Carmen Rodriguez and Scott Taylor, APPA President and Immediate Past President respectively, who invited the delegates to make plans to attend a planned second congress on probation on the East Coast of the United States in the summer of 2015.

This congress by all accounts was an overwhelming success, from the number of countries represented, the quality of the presentations, the excellent venue, and the opportunity to exchange knowledge and share experiences.

### References

- Allen, Rob (2012). *Reducing the Use of Imprisonment: What Can We Learn from Europe?* London: Criminal Justice Alliance.
- Beto, Dan Richard, & Donald G. Evans (2007). "Conference Permanente Europeene De La Probation (CEP): A Report on the Ninth General Assembly and Conference." *Executive Exchange*, Fall.
- Beto, Dan Richard, & Donald G. Evans (2010). "The European Organization for Probation: Report on the Tenth General Assembly and Conference." *Executive Exchange*, Fall.
- Evans, Donald G. (2001). "Probation in a Changing Europe." *Executive Exchange*, Spring.
- Evans, Donald G. (2005). "Autumn Reflections: The State of Probation through International Eyes." *Executive Exchange*, Winter.
- Evans, Donald G. (2011). "Time for a World Congress on Probation." *Executive Exchange*, Fall.
- Evans, Donald G. (2013). "Report of the Eleventh CEP General Assembly Held in London, England." *Executive Exchange*, Fall.
- Evans, Donald G., & Dan Richard Beto (2008). "Life After Prison: Resettling Adult Offenders." *Executive Exchange*, Summer.

**Donald G. Evans** is a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association. A member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives and a Contributing Editor of *Executive Exchange*, Mr. Evans served as NAPE's representative at the congress.

## PROBATION IN SOUTH SUDAN 2013: FROM PROMISE TO TREPIDATION

by

R. E. "Bob" Brown

The end of a calendar year, under normal circumstances, allows us to look back at the year that just past and to look forward with eager anticipation to the many challenges on the horizon that would require both our individual and collective attention. Clearly 2013, which commenced with such promise for both the young nation of South Sudan and their corrections reality ended with a significant degree of trepidation.

To adequately reflect on 2013 and to address the challenges in South Sudan for 2014 it would be appropriate to briefly set an historical context.

From 1955 to 2005 two devastating civil wars took place in Sudan between the north and south.

On January 9, 2005, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed between the north and the south and eventually the National Prison Service of South Sudan (NPSSS) was established from the prisons staff in the garrison towns of the south.

On July 9, 2011, South Sudan gained its independence from the north and became Africa's 54th state.

Fast forward to the current reality – as reported on December 29, 2013, by Thomson Reuters via CBCNews World<sup>1</sup> "two weeks of fighting have left at least 1,000 dead and has split the oil-producing country barely two years after it won independence from Sudan. It has also raised fears of an all-out civil war between the main Dinka and Nuer ethnic groups which could destabilize fragile East Africa".

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/south-sudan-5-000-strong-white-army-clashes-with-government-forces-1.2478350> Accessed 2013 12 30.

Heightened concern was reported in a January 10, 2014, Sydney Morning Herald article "South Sudan: new estimate puts death toll at 10,000" (Kulish 2014).

Every country where peacekeeping operations are established, there is a penitentiary system. The prison infrastructure, however, is dilapidated or completely destroyed and the systems are in great need of "reprofessionalizing" and reform (Titov, 2011). South Sudan has made significant progress in an extremely challenging environment both in relation to custodial services and to the reintroduction of probation. From September 1, 2006, to August 2, 2010, a collaborative Southern Sudan Prison Service<sup>2</sup> (SSPS) and United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) training effort involving a number of international partners occurred. Although SSPS and UNMIS were directly responsible for 77.5 percent of the training days provided, a "sustainable bridge" was built with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform (ICCLR) based in Vancouver, Canada. This duo, supported by UNMIS provided 12.75 percent of the training days and the bordering country of Kenya provided 4.25 percent. It is this later combined 17 percent that contained the majority of community corrections focused training (Brown, et al., p. 42).

As it relates to community corrections the above breathes life into Rule 23.1 of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measure (Tokyo Rules). Rule 23.1 reads in part "Efforts shall be made to promote scientific cooperation between countries in the field of non-institutional treatment. Research, train-

<sup>2</sup> SSPS prior to independence and NPSSS post independence.

## Executive Exchange

---

ing, technical assistance and the exchange of information among Member States on non-custodial measures...”

Again let us fast forward, this time from 2010 to a review of the activities of 2012/13. In September 2013 the following highlights were shared by Isak Enstrom, Corrections Officer/Probation Advisor with the Correction Advisory Section (CAS), United Nations Mission In South Sudan (UNMISS)<sup>3</sup>.

- In June 2012 a two week basic probation training course was held for 25 new Probation Officers. The training was made possible through funding from UNODC and a UNMISS CAS/NPSSS partnership.
- A three day workshop titled Effective Supervision in Probation and Aftercare was held in Juba in October 2012. The training was funded by UNODC in cooperation with ICCLR and UNMISS. 17 Probation Officers, 12 male officers and 5 female officers participated.
- In November 2012 a National Workshop on Alternatives to Imprisonment took place. Issues related to probation, community service and the use of paralegals were addressed and “best practice” presentations were made by Kenyan Probation and Malawi Prison Services.
- A two week Probation Training of Trainers Course for NPSSS Probation Officers was held at the Training Academy in May 2013.
- A plan was developed to train 50 new Probation Officers over 2013/2014. As of September Probation Officers were only present in state capitals and planning was underway for the deployment of officers to county prisons

The year 2013 also saw a collaborative effort involving the Judiciary, the UNMISS Justice Advisory Section, and the U. S. International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Agency resulting in the establishment of a Juvenile Justice Remand Review Board at the Juba Prison. The Board met every two weeks at the prison to review warrants and follow up cases of juveniles in custody. This has contributed to a reduction in the detention period for many pre-trial juvenile detainees (Brown, et al. p. 42).

Tokyo Rule 23.1 is also in evidence with the collection and distribution of criminal justice books and journals to corrections entities in Africa. Supported by the international community the following highlights contributions to both South Sudan and Zambia (Brown, 2013).

- While in Juba, Southern Sudan, in May 2010 and with the support of Robert Leggat of UNMIS, I presented the SSPS Director General Abel Makoi Wol a box containing 27 American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) publications for its library. The support of the APPA Executive Director Carl Wicklund was key to this successful international initiative.
- While in attendance at the APPA 2011 Winter Training Institute held in Orlando a follow up initiative was concocted with Terry Marshall, the now former Executive Director of ATTIC Correctional Services, based in Wisconsin, and a past President of the International Community Corrections Association. With Terry’s support, the cooperation of a number of donors in Canada and the agreement of the Executive Director of the Solon

Foundation, headquartered in Lucerne, Switzerland, a shipment containing nine boxes (317 criminal justice books and journals) for Africa left Victoria, Canada, in February 2013.

- On August 13, 2013, in Juba, the six boxes of books were presented to the NPSSS Director General for their Training Academy Library by UNMISS colleague, Robert Leggat.
- On October 10, 2013 Solon Foundation Executive Director delivered three boxes of books collected in Victoria to Commissioner Chato (formerly with UNMIS in 2008/2009), Zambia Prisons Service (ZPS), at the ZPS Headquarters for the ZPS Staff Training Library in Kabwe, Zambia.
- With the support of the Zambia Mission Fund Canada a further eight boxes of books were included in a container that left Victoria on November 29, 2013, with an estimated delivery date to the Zambia Prisons Service of early spring 2014.

The promising journey and the constructive involvement of the international community with our colleagues in South Sudan highlighted above has tragically been rerouted by a phenomena described by some as “South Sudan destroying itself from within” (*Economist*, 2014, p. 36).

For just under seven years Robert Leggat has tirelessly made a contribution to the corrections reality prior to independence in Southern Sudan and to South Sudan post July 9, 2011. Robert left his position as Prison Programmes Manager, CAS, Rule of Law and Security Institutions Support Office with the UNMISS at the end of February 2014. He left with mixed emotions. During a conversation with Robert in late January 2014 he provided the following parting comments.

In addition to the general development challenges facing many emerging nations, South Sudan also must quickly resolve its internal conflict issues and establish a sound economic base for sustainable future development. The justice arena, like other government sectors, operates within a framework of poor infrastructure, low staff literacy, limited annual operating budgets and limited operational, administrative and managerial competence. In addition, the prison system operates within a generally rigid military structure, with much of its operation still entrenched in traditional work practices. Through assistance from the international community, senior management are supportive of modernising the system and developing innovative concepts such as human rights in prison management, compliance with international standards and introducing alternatives to imprisonment. However, this requires changing the perceptions of many prison staff, the government and the general public. This is a lengthy and often slow process. Much has been accomplished, but much still needs to be achieved. NPSSS can embrace innovation and change and this will require continued international support.

---

<sup>3</sup> UNMIS prior to independence and United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) post independence.

Consistent with Robert's reflections the *Economist* concludes that "if peace is to break out, a new power sharing arrangement will have to be negotiated" within South Sudan. It is sincerely hoped that when this article goes to print and is accessible, South Sudan will have stabilized, the trepidation will have subsided and our colleagues will once again be facing the many challenges of a "post" conflict reality. Returning to a stable work environment will allow them to continue to evolve as a young but promising community corrections entity within NPSSS and once again within a young and promising state. International support consistent with the UN Minimum Standards will remain an operational necessity.

### References

- Brown, R. E. "Support for Corrections in Africa One Book at a Time" *Journal of Community Corrections*. Volume 23, No. 01(Fall, 2013), p. 9, 10 & 19, 20.
- Brown, R. E., R. Leggat, & R. Victorio. "National Prisons Service South Sudan: Emphasis on Collaborative Staff Training & the Re-introduction of Probation." *Perspectives*. Volume 37, No. 03 (Summer, 2013), p. 40-46.

*Economist* "Destroying itself from within". January 4<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014. New York: *The Economist* newspaper limited. p. 35-36.

Kulish, N. "South Sudan: new estimate puts death toll at 10,000". *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 2014 01 10.

<http://www.smh.com.au/world/south-sudan-new-estimate-puts-death-toll-at-10000-20140110-hv82f.html> Accessed January 19, 2014.

Titov, Dmitry. "The degree of civilization in a society can be judged by entering its prisons". *Corrections Update* United Nations Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, (September, 2011). Volume 03, p. 1-2.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. *Compendium of United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice*. New York: United Nations (2006).

**R. E. "Bob" Brown** is an independent criminal justice consultant based in Victoria, British Columbia, and working internationally in Africa and China. He is the former Director of the Corrections Programme at the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy and a former District Director of the Vancouver Island Parole District.

## 2014-2016 OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Following solicitations and nominations received, the Nominations Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives has developed an impressive slate of officers for 2014-2016. Since no position was contested, the officers and directors will assume their positions on July 1, 2014. The new officers and directors are as follows:

### President

**Marcus M. Hodges** is Community Corrections Regional Administrator for the Virginia Department of Corrections, headquartered in North Chesterfield, Virginia.

### Vice President

**Ronald Schweer** is Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the District of Kansas, headquartered in Kansas City, Kansas. Mr. Schweer is returning to this position.

### Secretary

**Francine M. Perretta** is Deputy Commissioner of the Westchester County Probation Department in White Plains, New York. Ms. Perretta previously served as Treasurer.

### Treasurer

**Javed Syed** is Director of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Corpus Christi, Texas. Mr. Syed previously served as an At-Large Director.

### Past President

**Robert L. Bingham** is the retired Chief Probation Officer for the Marion Superior Court Probation Department in Indianapolis, Indiana.

### New England Region

**Harriet Beasley** is a Regional Supervisor of the Office of the Commissioner of Probation in Boston, Massachusetts. She represents the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

### Mid-Atlantic Region

**Patricia Buechel** is Director of the Tompkins County Department of Probation and Community Justice in Ithaca, New York. She represents the states of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Ms. Buechel is returning to this position.

### Central Region

**Linda Brady** is Chief Probation Officer of the Monroe Circuit Court Probation Department in Bloomington, Indiana. She represents the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Ms. Brady is returning to this position.

### Southern Region

**Tobin Lefler** is Director of the Cameron/Willacy Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Brownsville, Texas. He represents the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

### Western Region

**Rebecca A. Brunger** is Chief Probation Officer for the State of Alaska, headquartered in Palmer, Alaska. She represents the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Ms. Brunger is returning to this position.

### At-Large

**Thomas N. Costa** is Eastern Regional Director of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Mr. Costa is returning to this position.

### At-Large

**Todd Jermstad** is Director of the Bell-Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Belton, Texas.

We are grateful that these probation leaders have stepped forward to assume a leadership role in the organization.

**Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.**  
Chair, Nominating Committee

## 2014 CENSUS OF ADULT PROBATION SUPERVISING AGENCIES

by

Lauren Glaze and Tim Smith

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, is conducting the Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies (CAPSA), a special nationwide project that will describe the varying structures and nature of adult probation both across and within states. BJS is collaborating with Westat and the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) to conduct the census. The data collection phase of the project – consisting of a national survey of public agencies that supervise adults on probation for a felony (or those that supervise felons and misdemeanants) and private companies that supervise adult probationers – will be conducted by Westat and APPA on behalf of BJS in the summer of 2014.

Current and comprehensive data on the organization and administration of adult probation supervision are not available at the national and state levels. The data that do exist are not based on standardized definitions that can be used to compare probation across the nation. In addition, the last census of probation agencies was conducted by BJS in 1991; since then, the nature of probation has changed in many significant ways. For example, Community Corrections Acts (CCAs) expanded beyond the original three states that developed CCAs in the 1970s (i.e., Minnesota, Iowa, and Colorado); independent, state-level community corrections boards were created in some states; more private companies are being used to provide probation supervision; and the use of community-based correctional facilities – some of which offer an alternative to incarceration – provide programs and treatment intended to meet offender needs and reduce the risk of recidivism.

CAPSA will address current information gaps identified by the community corrections field by providing a clear picture of how adult probation in the United States is currently organized, the supervision policies and practices agencies have established to administer adult probation, the various types of functions agencies perform, and the different types of individuals supervised by probation agencies. In addition, the study will produce a comprehensive listing of public agencies that supervise adult felons (or felons and misdemeanants) and private companies that supervise adult felons and misdemeanants. CAPSA also has the potential to enhance the utility of the probation population data that BJS collects through its Annual Probation Survey by examining the associations between the operations of probation agencies and their supervision policies and practices relative to population changes, such as the size of the probation population, the types of probationers supervised, movements onto and off of supervision, and outcomes of supervision. This type of analysis will provide a better understanding about factors related to population changes.

CAPSA will survey public agencies and private companies nationwide that supervise adult probationers. The project team has used several sources to assemble a preliminary roster of agencies and companies that are believed to supervise probationers. To date, approximately 2,000 entities are included in the roster.

Efforts to identify other available sources, agencies, and companies are ongoing.

All agencies and companies on the preliminary roster will be asked to participate in the study; additional agencies and companies will be asked to participate if they are identified during the collection period. The head of each agency or company will be asked to designate appropriate staff that can complete a study questionnaire. The questionnaire for public agencies will be web-based, and the designated staff will be provided instructions on how to access the questionnaire online. The secure website will allow respondents to save and close the questionnaire at any time and re-open it later to continue or edit entries until they are ready to submit their answers. A different questionnaire will be used to collect information from the private companies, which will be mailed to the designated private company staff.

The CAPSA survey is designed to meet several objectives: 1) to screen agencies and companies on the roster to determine whether they meet the CAPSA eligibility criteria; 2) to assess and validate the roster of agencies by relying on respondents to identify additional agencies within their jurisdiction that may be missing from the roster; and 3) to collect information from the CAPSA-eligible agencies that describes the organization and current nature of probation at the national level, as well as across and within states. In 2013, nearly 50 public agencies and private companies participated in a pilot test of the CAPSA survey. The findings were used to assess the level of burden placed on respondents and to evaluate and revise the survey questions to help ensure the utility and quality of the data to be collected in the national study. Topics addressed in the national study include the following:

- Policies and practices
  - Methods of supervision (e.g., electronic supervision, intensive supervision, or programs and services for special populations);
  - Party/venue responsible for supervision (e.g., agency, third party, private company, or community-based correctional facility)
  - Risk and needs assessment
  - Firearms/arrest powers of supervision officers (public agencies)
- Supervision authority (public agencies)
  - To impose conditions
  - To grant early positive discharge
  - To impose a period of incarceration
- Functions performed
- Populations served; size of populations
- Funding sources for adult probation supervision (public agencies)
- Sector (i.e., public agency or private company)

## Executive Exchange

---

- Branch/level of government (public agencies); private companies will be asked branch/level of governments for which they supervise adult probationers
- Type of oversight by governmental agencies (private companies)
- Number of states for which they supervise adult probationers (private companies)

To minimize burden on agencies and companies, the questionnaires include only a few questions that ask for aggregate counts (e.g., number of probationers under supervision and number of supervision officers). Completing the public agency questionnaire is estimated to take about 65 minutes; the private company questionnaire should take about 30 minutes to complete.

CAPSA will have direct implications on policy and practice of adult probation supervision. It is also critical to help understand correctional systems nationwide, and for policy development and criminal justice planning at all levels of government. Adult probation is an amorphous field that manages a large and diverse population. The CAPSA findings will provide essential information to move the field forward with a clearer picture of the structure of adult probation in the United States and of the type and prevalence of policies and practices that are currently in place. For example, the CAPSA information could be used to answer the following questions:

- How is adult probation organized in the United States? How does the organization vary within and across states?
- What are the various functions that adult probation agencies perform? How do they differ within and across states?
- What sources of funding do agencies receive for adult probation? How do funding sources vary by structure, within and across states, and by population size of agencies?
- What are the various types of populations that adult probation agencies supervise? Is there a relationship between the size of agencies' adult probation populations and the types or varieties of individuals (e.g., juveniles, parolees, or pretrial) they supervise? What is the nature of that relationship?
- How do the characteristics of agencies' adult probation populations vary by structure and state? How are the population characteristics related to supervision practices?
- What methods and practices of supervision do agencies have in place to manage the adult probation population? How do they differ by structure, within and across states, and by adult probation size and characteristics?
- Do agencies have any supervision authority to administer adult probation without approval from a judge or court (e.g., to impose conditions, grant early positive discharge, or impose period of incarceration)? If so, what type of supervision authority do they have? What is the extent of their authority? Does this vary by structure or state? If so, how does this vary?

- How many private probation companies exist in the United States? Which states use private companies to supervise adult probationers?
- What is the size of the U.S. adult probation population supervised by private companies? What is the size by state, and how does it vary?
- Which types of governmental agencies use private companies to supervise adult probationers? How does that vary by state?
- To what degree do governmental agencies conduct various types of oversight of private companies' adult probation supervision activities? Does that vary by state? If so, how does it vary?
- What are the various functions that private probation companies perform? How do they differ by state?
- What methods and practices of supervision do private companies have in place to manage the adult probation population? How do they differ by state and adult probation size and characteristics?

Statistical products will provide data that can serve as a benchmark, and the standardized questionnaire and definitions will permit states and localities to rely on the CAPSA data to assess their probation agencies relative to all probation agencies nationwide, as well as among those with similar characteristics. For example, agencies could compare their supervision authority or practices of supervision with other agencies of similar population size or characteristics (e.g., branch, level, and type of government) within their state or in other states.

To learn more about Westat's role in CAPSA and other community corrections projects, contact:

Tim Smith  
CAPSA Project Director  
Westat  
(240) 314-2305  
[TimSmith@westat.com](mailto:TimSmith@westat.com)

For more information about BJS's Community Corrections Statistical Program, including CAPSA, contact:

Lauren Glaze, Statistician  
Bureau of Justice Statistics  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC 20531  
(202) 305-9628  
[Lauren.Glaze@usdoj.gov](mailto:Lauren.Glaze@usdoj.gov)

As noted in the article, **Lauren Glaze** is a Statistician at the Bureau of Justice Statistics and **Tim Smith** is CAPSA Project Director at Westat.

## FROM THE BOOKSHELF

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

The book review found in this issue of *Executive Exchange* has been contributed by Todd Jermstad, Director of the Bell-Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Belton, Texas.

## THE BENEFITS OF MENTAL ILLNESS

*Review of A First-Rate Madness: Uncovering the Links Between Leadership and Mental Illness, by Nassir Ghaemi, Penguin Books, New York, 2011, pp. 352, \$16.00 (Paperback).*

Nassir Ghaemi, M.D., is an academic psychiatrist specializing in mood illnesses. He is a Professor of Psychiatry at Tufts Medical Center in Boston and is also a Clinical Lecturer at Harvard Medical School. In *A First-Rate Madness* he has written a fascinating book exploring the relationship between mental illness and extraordinary leadership. He examines political, military and business leaders who suffered from mood disorders, i.e., depression, mania, and bi-polar disorders. His thesis is quite simple: in times of peace one probably wants a leader who is normal; in times of crisis one wants a leader who is mentally ill.

It has always been well known that certain great leaders, such as Lincoln and Churchill, suffered from depression or other mood related disorders. However, there has never been a study linking their mental illness with their ability to lead in times of crisis. Their mental illnesses, instead of being seen as an asset, have invariably been regarded as an impediment that they had to overcome in order to succeed. In addition to Churchill and Lincoln, *A First-Rate Madness* offers case studies on William Tecumseh Sherman, Mahatma Gandhi, Ted Turner, Martin Luther King, Jr., Franklin D. Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy.

The author explains that mental illness does not mean that “one is simply insane, out of touch with reality, or psychotic.” Instead the author explains that mood illnesses, such as depression, mania, and bi-polar disorder, usually have nothing to do with thinking. Moreover, the author explains that these disorders can be either mild or severe, episodic or long term. Finally the author contends that the mental illnesses of depression and mania appear to cultivate four positive traits: a realistic perspective of the world, resiliency to adverse circumstances, empathy toward others, and creativity.

In examining the link between creativity and mental illness, Dr. Ghaemi studied the lives of General William Tecumseh Sherman and the media giant Ted Turner. The author argues that creative thinking involves finding novel problems and solving them. The author states that for leaders in any realm, “creativity is not just about solving old problems with new solutions but is about finding new problems to solve.” The author notes that divergent thinking is a daily experience in mania. Thus the author concludes that mania enhances both aspects of creativity: the divergence of thought allows one to identify new problems and the intense energy keeps one going until the problems are solved.

Concerning realism, Dr. Ghaemi explores the lives of Churchill and Lincoln. The author notes that studies on “normal” individuals show that they tend to overestimate themselves. This is especially true for successful individuals who have not had to face adversity in their lives, especially in their younger lives. Thus the author states that this creates an illusion about life that renders a person unable to respond properly to the world’s challenges. Moreover, the author observes that early failure repeatedly experienced by a person predisposed to depression, such as Churchill and Lincoln, inoculate against a future illusion. Hence the author concludes that “the unlucky, who, early in their lives, endure hardship and tragedies – or the challenge of mental illness – seem to become, not infrequently, our greatest leaders.”

When examining empathy, Dr. Ghaemi discusses the lives of Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The author states that psychologists divide empathy into four parts: 1) cognitive – thinking another person’s thoughts; 2) affective – feeling an emotion that another person feels; 3) motor – moving the way another moves; and 4) sensory – feeling a physical sensation that another person feels. The author argues that there is a correlation between depression and empathy. Moreover he asserts that the greater the depression the greater the empathy. The author maintains that depression deepens natural empathy and produces someone, such as a King or Gandhi, for whom “the inescapable web of interdependence is a personal reality.” Thus the author concludes that “depression cultivates empathic experience, ripens it, until, in a select few, it blooms into exemplary abilities.”

The final case studies for the trait of resilience examine the lives of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. Psychologists define resilience as “good outcomes in spite of serious threats to adaption or development.” Dr. Ghaemi observes that when people experience harmful events, some are injured psychologically, but others are not. He also notes that sometimes people even get stronger after such events, a “steeling” effect that protects them against future stresses. Finally he states that some people are just born resilient; it is an inherent part of their personality. Nevertheless the author concludes that research suggests that resilience emerges from a combination of social support, hardship, and certain personality traits.

Dr. Ghaemi states that both Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy had mildly manic or hyperthymic personalities. In addition both suffered from debilitating illnesses. Roosevelt was stricken by polio at the age of 39 and left unable to use his legs; Kennedy suffered from a number of physical ailments, including Addison’s disease, that were life threatening on several occasions. Dr. Ghaemi concludes that having a hyperthymic personality allowed both Roosevelt and Kennedy to be open to new ideas and enhanced their charisma. In addition this personality

trait also enabled them to be resilient and to rise above and better understand human suffering.

This book concludes with an examination of the treatment for mental illness in two leaders, Kennedy and Adolf Hitler. John F. Kennedy's ailments were less psychological and more physical. He was a very ill man who almost died in the first year of his presidency. Because of his physical condition he consumed (and abused) a significant amount of drugs, including anabolic steroids. Dr. Ghaemi contends that these drugs, prescribed by several different physicians who were unaware of what other drugs were being prescribed by other physicians, adversely affected his judgment, especially early in his presidency. Later when the drugs he was prescribed were adjusted and better controlled, the author contends that Kennedy's judgment and hence leadership qualities vastly improved.

As for Adolf Hitler, Dr. Ghaemi argues that he suffered from a bi-polar disorder. In addition the author states that Hitler was treated with amphetamines beginning in 1937 and that this treatment actually worsened his manic and depressive episodes and impaired his leadership. Toward the end, Hitler was constantly taking three kinds of psychoactive drugs: opiates, barbiturates, and amphetamines. Thus the author concludes that a study of the dramatically divergent trajectories of Hitler and Kennedy show how important it is to factor in the role of drugs when assessing the nature and effects of anyone's mental illness. As Dr. Ghaemi states, "mental illness can product great leader, but if the illness is too severe, or treated with the wrong drugs, it produces failure or sometimes, evil."

Dr. Ghaemi has written a provocative book on a subject matter that bears further exploration. Although I am not totally con-

vinced as to his argument, there is no question that some of our greatest leaders, artists, writers, thinkers, and composers have all suffered from mood disorders. Moreover, it seems reasonable to assume that these mental illnesses had some impact on these individuals' achievements and in all likelihood contributed to them. As for leaders who fall within the statistical range of "psychological normality," the author describes these types of persons as suffering from hubris, rarely admitting failure, and not being able to learn from their mistakes. These are not traits one would like to see in a leader during a time of crisis.

On a final note, there is a movement in the field of treatment that looks at the positive aspects of mental illness. This is especially true for those individuals suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. Part of the reason for this new perspective is that there is a much better understanding that many psychological conditions affected by changes in brain chemistry or changes to parts of the brain are natural and therefore expected responses to outside stimuli. Thus depending on the environment and context of the occurrence, a psychological condition may be beneficial. For example for soldiers involved in combat operations, the characteristics of PTSD are essential survival skills even though in a civilian setting these same characteristics would be viewed negatively. This does not mean that an individual's mental illness should be ignored or not treated but it does mean that mental illnesses should be recognized as part of the human condition and that these illnesses can be life affirming. In providing treatment, it matters enormously if the patient has an understanding that the affliction that the person has carries both great insights as well as burdens.

**Todd Jermstad, J.D.**

---



# 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	Organizational	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 250 / 1 year
	Membership	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 95 / 2 years	Corporate	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 500 / 1 year
	Desired	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 140 / 3 years		

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

---

# NAPE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES  
*www.napehome.org*



**Sam Houston State University**

MEMBER THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM™

*www.shsu.edu*

---