

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

WINTER 2007

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I am pleased to announce that the National Association of Probation Executives and the American Probation and Parole Association are collaborating to develop a leadership curriculum that will be presented at the APPA Summer Institute in Philadelphia. Both organizations are keenly aware that we share a common responsibility in promoting the development of our future leaders. Succession planning and providing a basic fundamental understanding of leadership should be one of our primary responsibilities as the Association that represents our current leaders. As an Association we should be asking the question, who will replace us when we fade into the retirement sunset? Even more importantly, we should be asking this same question in the agency we lead. We must not lose sight that it is our responsibility to cultivate and educate our young, aspiring, and talented employees who one day must step up to the plate and take on the challenges we will leave behind, and the new challenges that will confront probation in the future.

Dee Bell from the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice, who is chairing this project, outlined its overall goal, "the curriculum aims to increase one's critical thinking skills and analytical ability to sustain the demands of leadership and management and to further develop one's capacity to exercise leadership and authority."



During January a team of representatives from NAPE and APPA met at Sam Houston State University to develop the curriculum. The results of their efforts will be discussed at APPA Winter Institute. It is our hope that the content of this leadership curriculum will be finalized soon. Needless to say, this is a Herculean undertaking on the part of both NAPE and APPA. I am confident that the end result will produce a training experience for our profession that will be second to none. Why? As usual the secret to the success of this effort depends on the dedicated professionals working on this project. Under the leadership of the project chair, Dee Bell, and the commitment of support from APPA's President Mark Carey, his executive committee, and our NAPE representatives, Ray Wahl and Cathy Waters, all add up to an enormous talent pool that almost assuredly guarantees the creation of a great learning experience. Also I want to thank Dorothy Faust and NIC, as well as Doug Dretke and Christie Davidson from Sam Houston State University for coordinating the January meeting.

I look forward to providing more information to you in our next issue. More importantly, I will be soliciting your support to identify our future leaders and have them attend this inaugural training session in Philadelphia.

Rocco A. Pozzi
President

CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Rocco A. Pozzi</i>	1
A New Image for Probation?, <i>Robert S. Gable, Ed.D., Ph.D., and R. Kirkland Gable, Ph.D., J.D.</i>	2
Shaping Organizational Culture: Cultural Impacts of Leadership Strategy and Person-Organization Fit, <i>Brian K. Harte</i>	6
Correctional Leadership: A Return to the Basics, <i>Dan Richard Beto</i>	8
Treatment Regimes: The Need for Consistency, <i>Donald G. Evans</i>	14
Approaching the Centenary — Celebration or Commiseration? Developments in Probation in the United Kingdom, <i>David Thomas</i>	19
Technology Column: Helping Community Corrections Monitor Sex Offender's Computer Use, <i>Joe Russo</i>	21
From the Bookshelf	22
Association Activities	25
News from the Field	27

A NEW IMAGE FOR PROBATION?

by

Robert S. Gable, Ed.D., Ph.D.

R. Kirkland Gable, Ph.D., J.D.

In Rocco Pozzi's "President's Message" in the Fall 2006 issue of the *Executive Exchange*, he appropriately observed that:

Somehow, we need to be able to project a visual image of probation. We are all familiar with certain images associated with the criminal justice system, i.e., judges in robes, police and correction officers in uniforms. What is the visual image of a probation officer? Right now probation is working off a "blank screen." How do we fill in that blank screen?

The present authors believe that a visual image of probation is gradually emerging — a positive image of probation technology that can convey an innovative and effective professionalism. It is the image of electronic monitoring (EM).

Although the experimental use of location monitoring of offenders began at Harvard in the 1960s (Schwitzgebel et al., 1964), the first significant media attention in the United States came in 1983 when a New Mexico district judge, Jack Love, sentenced three offenders (convicted of petty burglary, DUI, and fraudulent check-writing) to home curfew. Judge Love wore an ankle bracelet for two weeks in order to test its functionality, and several national publications showed the judge testing the device (Horgan, 1983; Maurer, 1983). Although the system initially met with judicial and social resistance, six years later it was being used in 33 states. In 2002, an off-beat film of mediocre box office success, *Cherish*, showed a claustrophobic probationer attempting to defeat the EM technology. Her unsuccessful antics and the patience and restraint of the officer generally portrayed EM supervision as an effective form of deterrence.

The widest publicity came in 2005, when entrepreneur Martha Stewart was placed on parole from Alderson Federal Reformatory for Women. The general public tends not to distinguish probation and parole. We are aware of one case in which a probation officer was referred to as a "bailiff" and asked to fix a parking ticket. Stewart's status as a TV personality and the novelty of the technology made her story newsworthy, and it appeared in virtually every major newspaper and TV newscast (e.g., Carter, 2005). Also, the ankle, as a tangible piece of equipment, could be photographed in order to add visual interest to the reports. Nellis (2004, p. 9) noted that "a close-up photograph of a tag-on-an-ankle [monitoring unit] has become the visual equivalent of a key turning in a celldoor lock — the first time community supervision has ever had such an equivalent."

The introduction of electronic monitoring to the general public was obviously fortuitous. No advance focus groups, media consultants, or paid commercials were used to shape public opinion. The fact that Ms. Stewart's home detention was extended three weeks because of a violation (for attending a nearby yoga class) added credibility to the sentence. She complained that the transmitter was somewhat uncomfortable, and cautioned viewers on a live web chat: "I hope none of you ever has to wear one" (Stewart, 2005). Another widely publicized

case involved Robert Blake, star of the 1970s detective drama "Baretta." He was accused of murdering his wife, Bonnie Lee Bakley, and spent two years under pre-trial monitored home confinement. When talking to a crowd outside the courthouse after his acquittal was announced on March 16, 2005, Blake cut off the ankle, and his attorney held it up as a symbol of Blake's freedom. Ironically, his wife had been wearing a monitoring bracelet when they were married in 2000 because she was on probation for mail fraud.

It appears that EM has now achieved status as an effective technology capable of helping enforce court-ordered sanctions. An estimated 110,000 to 120,000 monitoring units, both radio frequency and global positioning satellite (GPS), are now deployed on a daily basis (Conway, 2006). The general perception of EM is so favorable that at least eight state legislatures have mandated routine electronic surveillance of high-risk offenders, most notably the requirement of life-time GPS monitoring of some types of sex offenders (e.g., Indiana Code section 11-8-8-19). Several monitoring service companies predict a 50% growth rate in the coming years. From a commercial perspective, business is good.

Truth in Advertising

Because there is no legal requirement for pre-market testing of EM equipment — as there is for medical or safety equipment — objective information about important issues of functionality (e.g., battery life or violation rates among offenders as a result of technical problems) are not usually available from vendors prior to signing a contract. In some cases, the vendor's description of system functions, though accurate, are extremely difficult for agency personnel to understand. The brochure of one service provider included the following description of their GPS software: "Hosted on redundant server farms, users are ensured 99.9% availability and 24/7 rights-managed secure access to an intuitive Web-based dashboard."

Some popular media terminology is also less than helpful. Terms such as "electronic handcuffs" or "electronic jail cell" imply a physical deterrence that does not exist. These fanciful descriptions have appeal to the public that generally wants a quick-fix or at least a "get tougher" policy toward offenders. Defense attorneys may also have an interest in exaggerating the deterrence capacity of EM.

Probationers typically have a curfew and perhaps exclusion zones where they are not permitted to enter; otherwise, they are out-and-about going to work, school, shopping, attending NA/AA meetings, and so forth. Some individuals may be under home detention, but leave for pre-approved activities and appointments. The plain fact is that most probationers are not, in the colorful words of Marc Renzema (2006, p. 5), "sitting at home and praying for forgiveness." At least seven homicides have been committed by monitored offenders in the United States. More are inevitable.

Unrealistic expectations increase the probability of a backlash of public opinion. The favorable image of EM that has been built thus far has involved primarily low-risk offenders — often highly publicized cases of company executives, elected officials, actors or TV personalities who are first-time offenders and who are not likely to abscond or re-offend. They are not representative of higher-risk repeat offenders customarily assigned to EM programs or of the individuals who participated in the initial development of location monitoring. Also, as the length of EM is increased for offenders to years or even life-time, the rate of absconding and violations are likely to increase. Probation has the obligation to provide accurate information to judges, legislators, and the public about the limitations of the technology. Although some standardized risk assessment instruments can help make predictions about certain types of offenders, the risk of a violent reaction by a given individual changes over time, place, and circumstance. Assigning an offender to an EM program is a matter of playing the odds.

Another uncomfortable truth about EM is that, at the present time, long-term reduction of recidivism has not been proven. Research data indicate that EM can reduce re-offending *while offenders are under surveillance* (Padgett, Bales, & Blomberg, 2006). Offenders in EM programs are less likely to be revoked than offenders in customary probation or parole programs as long as relatively minor violations are ignored by probation line staff. Unfortunately, after EM ends, there may be a rebound (or celebration) effect that causes criminal activity to increase. The case of Freddie D. Nash is a good example of a bad outcome. Mr. Nash was an offender with a long history of regular drug use who admitted cutting off his electronic bracelet and throwing it away (Mitchell & Dodenhoff, 1998). He disappeared from his house for 20 days after giving police false identification when they broke up a fight. Incarcerated briefly, he was again placed on monitored supervision. Just nine days after he was taken off monitoring for the second time, Nash reportedly confessed to shooting and killing a man outside a tavern.

An extremely comprehensive and rigorous review of 154 EM evaluation studies “failed to find any convincing evidence that EM is superior to other prison diversion programs” (Renzema & Mayo-Wilson, 2005, p. 17). This disappointing outcome is particularly evident over a follow-up period of three years. The reviewers conclude:

...It is hardly surprising that recidivism has not been reliably reduced by an intervention that is typically quite short, applied in a standard fashion, and applied to a diverse group of offenders for whom it may or may not have any relevance to their motives for offending. Extant EM programs seem akin to giving aspirin to a mixed group of hospital patients and then wondering why their underlying diseases have not been cured (Renzema & Mayo-Wilson, 2005, p. 18).

EM might be effectively used, the reviewers point out, to gather evidence, to disrupt association with criminal associates, to return high-risk offenders to prison, or to reduce the number of face-to-face meetings with supervising officers. But these tactical changes do not produce a reduced prison population or cost-effective rehabilitation.

A few bright spots among EM programs have been documented when monitoring has been combined with a well-defined treat-

ment programs for moderate- to high-risk offenders (Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, & Rooney, 2000). EM technology is uniquely capable of supporting rehabilitation programs having a cognitive-behavioral orientation. This potential synergy between behavior modification and EM is outlined below.

Protecting the Image: Reducing Long-term Recidivism

Decades of research indicate that the best way to reduce long-term recidivism is to supplement the almost exclusive use of punitive sanctions with positive reinforcement of behaviors that are 1) incompatible with criminal acts and 2) likely to be rewarded in the individual’s natural social environment (Clark, 2006; Marlowe, in press). The social interactions of typical, law-abiding citizens are not primarily an effort to avoid punishment. Rather, their behavior is maintained by a mix of positive incentives such as the need for social approval and affection, the search for pleasure, economic improvement, and hope for a better life for themselves or at least for their children. People who buy lottery tickets, investors in the stock market, and the millions of folks who go faithfully to work anticipating a promotion are examples of individuals motivated by potential and unpredictable rewards.

A common lament of spouses, parents, teachers, and employers of offenders is “we have tried everything.” To the contrary, a careful analysis of many of the interactions of these people with the offender will show that in the past they have often given threats, punishment, promises, bribes, and “lectures” when trouble occurs. On the other hand, good behavior is “just expected” and generally ignored. Unfortunately, waiting for an offender to “get motivated” is seldom a winning strategy. Although the threat of sanctions, when combined with EM, can be used to improve attendance at treatment sessions, the long-term reduction of criminal behavior usually requires personal initiative on the part of the offender.

A better way to prompt personal motivation and encourage post-EM behavior change is to institute a system of variable positive incentives *during* monitoring. Consider the example of a coach teaching a sport. The coach will quickly admonish mistakes but will also give praise for small improvements while the person is learning a complex skill. The key is to give incentives for gradual improvements regardless of the skill level at which the training is taking place. This is also what an instructor does when teaching an adult to play a musical instrument. Incentives are given contingent on gradual, small improvements. This process is termed “shaping” in behavioral psychology. Successful coaches also tend to front-load incentives by giving rewards most frequently early in the instructional process. Eventually the activity itself becomes rewarding.

When rewards are used in traditional probation programs, the recognition is typically given *after* an offender has met a pre-determined standard of performance (e.g., an awards ceremony after completing a training program). Unfortunately, a substantial proportion of the offenders may have dropped out of the program before the ceremony. A few innovative community-based programs have successfully administered a variety of rewards as part of a strength-based practice (Clark, 1988; Marlow & Kirby, 1999). The incentives have included letters of commendation, food coupons, decreased curfew hours, transportation tokens, and clothes.

EM technology provides a novel means of verifying behavior and sending an immediate message that a reward is available.

Executive Exchange

The message may be simply a recording on a home answering machine, but some monitoring devices now have voice and text messaging capacity. In an early experiment, young adult offenders were sent coded vibrotactile messages while at school or work (Schwitzgebel, 1969). The goal was to develop a positive mental association with crime-free locations.

Incentives have not been used extensively in probation for at least a couple reasons. First, the idea of “rewarding criminals” seems ethically repugnant. Offenders may indeed deserve punishment, not rewards, for their criminal acts, but such acts do not constitute the entire range of the individual’s behavior. Sanctions can be combined with incentives to develop or strengthen a pro-social identity that diverts the offender from a life-long criminal career. The increased safety of the community, derived from the offender’s change in behavior, is what the community “deserves” regardless of the blameworthiness of the offender. Too often, the excessive use of sanctions or restrictions prompts a rebound (as previously noted) and causes harm to future victims. Intervention strategies should be judged objectively by the long-term benefits, or lack of benefits, to the community.

A second barrier to using a variety of incentives in probation programs is that such a process will be viewed as unfair by probationers who do not immediately receive incentives. In our experience, EM participants *do* initially complain about fairness — until *they* receive two or three unexpected incentives. Varying the amount and the timing of incentives — the way the “real” world works — eventually becomes an accepted characteristic of the program. No physician would give the same medicine to all patients; no probation officer should give the same incentives to all probationers.

The most powerful incentives are individualized, and have their reinforcing effect because they take into account the particular situation and personality of the recipient. Form letters are less effective than personalized letters because personalized

letters vary for each probationer. Even if an identical incentive is given (e.g., free tickets to a sports event donated by the athletes), some recipients might highly value the gift while other recipients would find it meaningless. When it comes to administering sanctions or incentives, “fairness” usually turns out to be a subjective perception.

Because the use of positive incentives is not part of customary probation procedures, EM officers should “start small.” The procedure should be tried with just one or two probationers. The risk of an unfavorable outcome is much less with rewards than it is with punishment. Let the incentive program grow or shrink based on feedback regarding recidivism and other important outcome variables. In this way, an evidence-based practice can be prudently developed.

As data from evidence-based EM programs accumulate in the coming years, probation should take the initiative, if appropriate, to enhance its public image. For example, first-person EM success stories by parolees and families might be published in local media, accompanied by photographs of the successful ex-offender as well as the ankle, home base unit, and possibly an alcohol testing unit. Additionally, a core of local citizen volunteers, approved by the court, might assist in GPS monitoring from home-linked computers, and help deliver incentives under the direction of probation line staff. These citizens, rather than probation officers, could gradually become the normal source of variable rewards for pro-social behavior. They can become community-based cheerleaders for probation services.

Portable wireless devices used with offenders will expand their capacity to include voice recognition, biosensors, graphics, and so forth. These enhancements will facilitate rapid and precise intervention. Probation now has the opportunity of being a standard-bearer for a new and positive mobile persuasive technology. That’s an image we like.

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.

References

- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Rooney, J. (2000). "A quasi-Experimental Evaluation of an Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision Program," *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(3), 312-329.
- Carter, B. (2005, August 26). "Issues of Past Not Off Limits in TV Return, Stewart says." *New York Times* on-line business section. Retrieved December 3, 2006, from www.nytimes.com/2005/08/26/business/media/26martha.html.
- Clark, M. D. (1988). "Strength-based Practice: The ABCs of Working with Adolescents Who Don't Want to Work with You." *Federal Probation*, 62(1), 46-53.
- Clark, M. D. (2006, Spring). "Motivational Interviewing and the Probation Executive: Moving into the Business of Behavior Change." *Executive Exchange*, 17-22.
- Conway, P. (2006, March 1), editor of the *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, personal communication with R.S.G.
- Horgan, J. (1983). "Electronic Cuffs for Criminals Traced to IEEE Publication." *The Institute*, 7(9). New York, New York: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Marlowe, D. B. (in press). "Strategies for Administering Rewards and Sanctions," In J. Lessenger and G. Roper (Eds.), *The Drug Court Handbook*. New York, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Marlowe, D. B. & Kirby, K. C. (1999). "Effective Use of Sanction in Drug Courts: Lessons from Behavioral Research." *National Drug Court Institute Review*, 2(1), 1-32.
- Maurer, A. (1983, December). "Electronic Handcuff." *Omni* magazine, p. 60.
- Mitchell, G. A. & Dodenhoff, D. (1998, March). "The Truth about Sentencing in Wisconsin: Plea Bargaining, Punishment, and the Public Interest." *Policy Research Report*, 2(2). Thiensville, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Policy Research Institute.
- Nellis, M. (2004, October). "The Electronic Monitoring of Offenders: Images and Arguments in the English Media." Paper presented at ElmoTech *Tenth Anniversary of EM in Europe Conference*, Neroloa, Italy.
- Padgett, K. F., Bales, W. D., & Blomberg, T. G. (2006). "Under Surveillance: An Empirical Test of the Effectiveness and Consequences of Electronic Monitoring." *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5(1), 61-92.
- Pozzi, R. A. (2006, Fall). "President's Message: The Probation Challenge." *Executive Exchange*.
- Renzema, M. (2006). "How to Use Electronic Monitoring Intellegently in Pretrial Services." *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, 18(2), 4-6, 25-26.
- Renzema, M. & Evan Mayo-Wilson, E. (2005). "Can Electronic Monitoring Reduce Crime for Moderate to High-risk Offenders?" *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(1), 1-23.
- Schwitzgebel, R. K., Schwitzgebel, R., Pahnke, W. N., & Hurd, W. S. (1964). "A Program of Research in Behavioral Electronics." *Behavioral Science*, 9(3), 233-238.
- Schwitzgebel, R. (1969). "A Remote Instrumentation System for Behavior Modification: Preliminary Report." In C. Franks & R. D. Rubin (Eds.), *Advances in Behavior Therapy* (pp. 1-9). New York, New York: Academic Press.
- Stewart, M. (2005, March 14). "News from Martha." Accessed May 28, 2005 from www.marthastewart.com/page.jhtml?type=learn-cat&id=cat19846.

Robert S. Gable, Ed.D, Ph.D., is Professor Emeritus at Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, California.

R. Kirkland Gable, Ph.D., J.D., is Professor Emeritus at California Lutheran University in Thousand Oaks, California.

SHAPING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: CULTURAL IMPACTS OF LEADERSHIP STRATEGY AND PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

by

Brian K. Harte

Introduction

Exploring the interplay between and among multiple actors within any organization may prove important in understanding both person-organization fit and organizational culture development. The attainment of person-organization fit may prove to be linked to specific factors relating to organizational commitment, job satisfaction and intent to leave the organization (O'Reilly, et al., 1991). Likewise, the observance of an organization's past history, values, strategy and leader influence may be necessary to describe the impact of culture on employee behaviors. This paper will examine the impacts of the concepts of culture development, person-organization fit and leadership impact on organizational culture. This may prove equally essential within criminal justice practice.

The Development of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture may be viewed as a socially constructed reality that develops through interactions between employees, supervisors, and the organizations they serve. Organizations seeking to maintain their current culture should strive to actively recruit, select and maintain employees that embrace, without reservation, the values, customs, norms, traditions, and practices that embody the organization.

Organizations attempting to change their current culture may seek to introduce cultural value changes through the introduction of leaders or key employees to transcend cultural changes. Moreover, these new leaders should be cautious in the strategies utilized to rationally implement cultural changes. They should also strive to create punctuated evolution of cultural changes when possible (Wilkins and Bristow, 1987).

Person-Organization Fit

The concept of person-organization fit can be viewed as an important consideration for both employees and organizations alike. Person-organization fit may prove to be an essential consideration in employee development, morale, commitment and loyalty (to both the organization and the leader). Additionally, specific factors may contribute to an applicant's decision to seek employment within a particular organization. Backhaus (2003) purports that dispositional as well as situational factors may provide predictive capabilities in accessing a job seeker's willingness to work for a specific organization (i.e. past experiences and desire for control). She also reports that further research is needed in the areas of employee tolerance of ambiguity, tolerance of frustration, and an employee's openness to their relationship to the importance of fit. Moreover, understanding the necessity of person-organization fit may prove vital in the selection, development and retention of organizational employees.

Employees with values consistent with the organizations they represent may prove to have higher levels of morale, commitment and trust in the organization's mission, purpose and goals. An employee or applicant's personality characteristics may also be an important consideration in assessing person-organization fit.

Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith (1995) found that homogeneity of personality of organizational members is a necessary component in the person/organization relationship. They report that overtime organizations become relatively homogeneous in regards to the composition of the personality characteristics of the people within them. Although, as homogeneity of personality in organizations increases, organizational effectiveness may decrease (Schneider, et al., 1995). Their research supports the basic premise that the socially constructed reality of culture may be a combination of not only the organizations themselves, but also the people that comprise them.

Several boundary conditions may exist that affect an employee's ability to "fit" within an organization. First, employees should be suitably matched in terms of their organizational choice based on specific trait characteristics including personality, attitude (Schneider, et al., 1995) and specific dispositional characteristics (Backhaus, 2003). Second, traits such as attitude and disposition may change overtime based on multiple factors such as employee age, level of maturity, perceived opportunities and position held within the organization. Third, employees do not arrive at organizations as "blank slates," therefore their perceptions of an organization's culture may be based on past experiences. This perception may be inconsistent with the organization's actual culture and may change overtime if an employee's overall expectations are unmet (Cable, et al., 2000).

Leadership Influence on Organizational Culture

Leaders may prove to be highly influential in shaping an organization's cultural values. Based on their implementation of strategy, leaders are in a key position to invoke both subtle and extreme changes that may either positively or negatively impact an organization's culture. Likewise, leaders are also actively involved in the hiring and selection of employees, and thus, play a vital role in assessing an applicant's perceived abilities to adapt to and support an organization's current culture. Leaders shape organizations by transcending change and communicating what values are important. Understanding the importance of determining an applicant's current values may prove an important consideration in assessing the person-organization fit relationship.

O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) posit that values provide the starting point for both the selection and socialization processes for employees within organizations. They purport that "congruency between an individual's values and those of an organization may be at the crux of the person-culture fit"

(O'Reilly, et al., 1991, p. 492). Leaders that support the current organizational culture act in a manner consistent with organizational values. They often role model the behaviors they expect from their employees.

The induction of new members (leaders and other key employees) into organizations with values differing from the majority may sometimes prove necessary to change an organization's existing culture. This may be advantageous when a significant deviation is needed in the current direction of the organization or firm. For example, if a company has a culture of values promoting low risk taking activity and cautious decision making by leaders, but fails to produce desired results, a cultural change may be required. The cultural environment could be changed by introducing a leader that promotes high risk-taking activities including taking calculated risks when making decisions.

Several boundary conditions may exist that affect a leader or key employee's ability to impact effective cultural changes within organizations. First, new leaders may attempt to imitate successes of competitors through mirroring their practices (Wilkins and Bristow, 1987). Although, this may superficially appear to be a well founded strategy, this strategy will likely fail due to the fact that organizations are unique entities in and of themselves. Therefore, their cultures may also be specific to each particular organization. Second, organizational life is an important consideration when assessing an organization's culture. Organizations that are relatively new (less than 5 years) may be in a state of cultural development. The culture may rapidly shift due to factors such as leader and employee turnover, strategy implementation and decision making that occurs within the first 5 year period. Third, organizational size is likely an important consideration for a leader attempting to implement change. The impact of culture and its influences would not likely be as profound in a firm or organization with less than 10 employees as it would in an organization with over 1,000 employees. Fourth, there may be a clear distinction in the implementation of strategies utilized to invoke cultural changes in both private and public organizations. Private industries may be less bound by specific rules, guidelines and practices as public organizations. Therefore, risk-taking and revolutionary change efforts may be more profound in the private sector. Furthermore, the need for revolutionary change can also be viewed within the context of criminal justice organizational cultures.

Organizational Partnerships Shaping Culture

During the past several years, both nationally and in Texas, there has been a healthy interest in revitalizing adult and juvenile probation services so that they play a significant role in the promotion of public safety within communities (Harte, 2003). A unified effort on the part of both local probation and police departments was established in response to this need. Several communities have benefited through police-probation partnerships that have been developed based on the need for increased community safety. Moreover, the revitalization effort identified has sparked the need for criminal justice agencies to promote organizational activities that actively strive to create effective community partnerships. One such example of this type of community collaboration is a local community project within the State of Texas known as Operation Flashlight.

Operation Flashlight is a program developed and implemented within Bell County Texas. This program was designed as an initiative based on the premise of Project Spotlight — to

provide effective community supervision through cooperation between juvenile and adult probation departments and local law enforcement agencies.

Since 1998 juvenile probation officers in Bell County, riding with area law enforcement officers, have been making home and field visits to probationers during non-traditional hours. The department has entered into formal agreements with the Killeen Police Department, the Temple Police Department, and, to a limited degree, the Bell County Sheriff's Department.

Unmarked vehicles are used by the Killeen Police Department and the Temple Police Department for Operation Flashlight, and the Bell County Sheriff's Department uses marked vehicles while working with probation officers within communities.

In Killeen, the police officer devotes six hours a week — two three hour shifts — to the ride-along program, for a total of 24 hours per month. During the three hour shift, the police officer and the juvenile probation officer make a minimum of 12 face-to-face contacts. They have made as many as 60 contacts per month during unscheduled field visits. In Temple, the field visits are scheduled between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m., and the police officer and probation officer ride together 16 nights a month. The Bell County Sheriff's Department devotes between six and eight hours a month to the ride-along program.

Operation flashlight provides a working example of how police-probation collaborations have significantly impacted the duties of traditional juvenile probation officer practice. Partnerships, such as those fostered by Operation Flashlight, have also greatly improved working relationships between police departments and the local probation department in Bell County, Texas.

Criminal justice agencies should strive to promote a culture of evolutionary change through exploring the long-term benefits of such partnerships. Likewise, the integration of community based services emphasizing these partnerships could prove to provide more cohesive and comprehensive services within communities. Criminal justice entities should promote a culture conducive with not only individual employee and organizational health, but also healthy networks through partnerships and collaborations at local, state and national levels. Leaders recognizing the profound need for revolutionary organizational change should consider strategies that can effectively tie these entities into all aspects of their existing and future services.

Discussion

There are several noted advantages of striving to recruit, select and retain employees with values conducive with an organization's existing culture. Most notably, perhaps, is the finding that every organization has a specific culture. Therefore, the strategies utilized to attain a strong employee person-organization fit should be considered carefully. Likewise, employees that have values that are consistent with the organization may prove to have higher morale, commitment and loyalty to both the organization and the leader.

Circumstances may exist that make revolutionary cultural change necessary. In situations where an organization's current culture promotes values counterproductive to its mission, goals and purpose, radical change may be required. This change may best be implemented by the introduction of new leadership or key employees to reshape the cultural values of the organization. This process may be accomplished by the leader/key employee by overseeing all aspects of organizational growth, rewarding

Executive Exchange

efforts of employees for developing new skills, creating punctuated evolution, experimentation, understanding the current structure, utilizing selective surgery and making revolutionary changes (Wilkins and Bristow, 1987).

References

- Backhaus, K. (2003). "Importance of Person-Organization to Job Success" [Electronic Version], *Career Development International*, 8(1), 21-26.
- Cable, D. M., Aiman-Smith, L., Mulvey, P. W., & Edwards, J. R. (2000). "The Sources and Accuracy of Job Applicants' Beliefs about Organizational Culture" [Electronic Version], *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1076-1085.
- Harte, B. K. (2003). "Operation Flashlight: A Low Cost Alternative for an Enhanced Supervision Model," *Project Spotlight: News in Brief* (Spring).
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). "People and Organizational Culture: Assessing Person-Organizational Fit" [Electronic Version], *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). "The ASA Framework: An Update" [Electronic Version], *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 747-774.

Wilkins, A. L. & Bristow, N. J. (1987). "For Successful Organization Culture, Honor Your Past" [Electronic Version]. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), 221-228.

Brian K. Harte, MCJ, LBSW, is an Instructor in Criminal Justice in the School of Business and Public Service at the State University of New York at Canton. He was previously Program Administrator of the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) for the Bell County Juvenile Probation Department in Killeen, Texas.

CORRECTIONAL LEADERSHIP: A RETURN TO THE BASICS

by

Dan Richard Beto

An abbreviated version of this paper was presented at the IV Penitentiary Congress in Kalisz, Poland, on November 22-24, 2006.

On October 12-18, 1870, the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline was held in Cincinnati, Ohio. Rutherford B. Hayes, then Governor of Ohio and who would later be elected President of the United States, served as president of this national meeting, the forerunner of the American Correctional Association. That meeting served as the birth of corrections in America as a profession.

During the congress a number of papers were presented on such topics as prison discipline, sentencing, institutional conditions, dietary standards, the use of volunteers, the role of religion in prisons, prison education, society's responsibility for the causes of crime, convict clothing, juvenile facilities, visiting procedures, training for officers of prisons and reformatories, the special needs of juveniles, programs for offenders, pardons, and criminal statistics. At the conclusion of the congress the delegates adopted a "Declaration of Principles" relating to the operation of prisons and reformatories and the treatment of offenders (Wines, 1871; see Appendix for a list of the 37 principles adopted).

Unfortunately, the topics discussed and the resolutions passed more than 136 years ago are still being discussed today. Other

than for more sophisticated delivery systems, the correctional issues of today are not that much different than those identified in 1870. In an opinion piece that appeared in the *Houston Chronicle* on May 10, 1987, Sam Houston State University Distinguished Professor George J. Beto, who served as Director of the Texas Department of Corrections for ten years, wrote:

A review of the literature on corrections reveals little that is new today. Those portions of the literature periodically devoted to corrections dating back to 1901 could well have been dated 1986. There is an inevitable and stultifying sameness involved in the care and custody of society's deviants. Apparent innovations are hailed in this hour and rejected in the next (Beto, 1987).

While the correctional literature of today is, as my late father suggests, similar to that found a century ago, and while the dialogue of criminal justice practitioners continues to revolve around the same subjects year after year — although not as in depth or intellectually stimulating — we have, nevertheless, witnessed a significant change in American corrections.

America's Challenges: Changes in the Correctional Landscape

It is my sense that the corrections profession in the United States — and when I use the term corrections I am referring to both institutional and community corrections — is facing several challenges.

The Leadership Void

For the one hundred years following that meeting in Cincinnati, the corrections profession was blessed with leaders who skillfully crafted correctional policy with vision and courage. Unfortunately, commencing in the late-1960s or early-1970s and continuing through the remainder of the century, America witnessed a change in the character of correctional leadership. With deaths, retirements, and departures caused by the vagaries of politics, many of the giants of the corrections profession's first one hundred years have been replaced by competent but unimaginative managers, who are more interested in doing things right, rather than doing the right things (DiIulio, 1987; Pozzi, 1999; Burns, 1979). Put another way, they are more interested in doing what is required of them — meeting minimum standards imposed by governmental regulatory agencies — rather than excelling in what they do. For many of them, corrections has become merely a job, rather than their life's work for which they have considerable passion (Morris, 1971). And with these changes, the correctional leader of the early to mid-1900s became an endangered species (Beto, 2001).

The Lack of a Thoughtful and Courageous Response to the Crime Problem

While we continue to talk about the same or similar topics as our predecessors once did, the dialogue is focused more on discussions about operational issues and service delivery systems than about critical policy issues and the challenges we must confront.

A perfect example of this is found in my home state of Texas, where during the 1980s we embarked on a massive prison construction program, resulting in 70 new prisons coming on line between 1990 and 1997, increasing the number of prison facilities to 105. During that same period of time our offender population increased by 186.9%, from 48,320 to 138,641. We successfully built ourselves out of a prison overcrowding crisis. And having done that, our politicians and correctional leaders sat back and complacently watched as our prisons filled up again. They did not seriously engage in discussions about how we might better address the crime problem through sentencing reform, by developing alternative programs and strategies, by engendering support for a revised correctional policy, or by investing more funds in basic probation and parole services. And as the Texas Legislature is about to reconvene in January 2007, one of the issues to be considered, and will likely pass, is the allocation of funds to build three new prisons.

It does not take intelligence to build prisons — constructing prisons is a simplistic, yet expensive response to the crime problem. It does, however, require a collective intelligence, thoughtful consideration, compromise, and courage to develop alternatives to incarceration and to craft rational correctional policies, and that is something we in Texas have been less than successful in doing. Unfortunately, we are not alone, as many other states are struggling with the same or similar problems.

The Privatization of Corrections

Throughout the United States we have witnessed, in varying degrees, the privatization of correctional services. One only need attend the annual conferences of the American Correctional Association, the American Jail Association, or the American Probation and Parole Association to see the significant influence the private sector exerts on corrections in America.

While there is a place for the private sector in corrections, I fear that many correctional administrators, unduly influenced by decisions made in corporate boardrooms and in the back halls of statehouses, have embraced privatization as an avenue to avoid conflict with politicians or as an opportunity to reduce or eliminate many of their responsibilities.

The Personnel Crisis

At present, throughout the United States prisons, probation and parole offices, and other social service agencies have unfilled positions because they cannot attract qualified candidates for employment. In Texas alone our prison system has over 2,500 vacancies for correctional officers.

In addition, compounding our personnel problem is the change in the demographics of our state and that found in a number of others, where people being sent to prison or placed on probation speak only Spanish. This population is not being adequately served because our criminal justice system has been less than successful in attracting Spanish speaking employees.

And finally, we have not done a particularly good job of succession planning by identifying, developing, and nurturing potential leaders to assume greater responsibility.

The Reintegration Issue

Approximately 650,000 prisoners are released from American prisons each year, most of whom were released on parole, and more than 12 million offenders cycle through local jails annually (Solomon, et al., 2006). And each year — for the past five years — more than 200,000 offenders were returned to prison as parole violators (Harrison and Beck, 2006).

As the data reflects, many offenders released on parole are ill-equipped to deal with the complexities of urban life. They experience difficulty in finding suitable employment, managing limited financial resources, arranging for transportation, maneuvering the social service system, avoiding persons with criminal records, and reestablishing themselves as a member of a family. Compounding the challenge of starting a new life is that many of them are saddled with questionable value systems, and as such they find it difficult to refrain from engaging in behaviors that cause their entry to the criminal justice system.

The issue of prisoner reentry, while appreciated as important by criminal justice practitioners and academics, has, until recently, received woefully inadequate attention by policymakers. One of the leaders in the prisoner reentry movement is Jeremy Travis, former Director of the National Institute of Justice and now President of John Jay College in New York, who, along with Professor Joan Petersilia of the University of California at Irvine, the Urban Institute, Community Resources for Justice, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the U.S. Department of Justice, and a number of advocacy groups are drawing attention to this serious problem. In addition, several governmental agencies that have not interacted previously with the criminal justice system are becoming involved in the process.

Those involved are attempting — recalling the words of Myrl Alexander, a former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons — to “blur the lines between the institution and the community.” They have taken up the challenge to “ease the inmate’s transition from the most unnatural society known to man — prison society — to the free world” (Beto, 1971).

A Prescription for the Future of Corrections

How can we reverse the trend we have witnessed in American corrections — where there is a lack of meaningful leadership and an absence of intellectually stimulating dialogue about criminal justice policy? This question has no empirical answer, but a body of knowledge does exist to provide a suggested prescription to remedy our problems.

Revisiting the Initial Principles

First, from a practitioner perspective, it would be wise for the American Correctional Association, the largest correctional organization in North America, to convene a special “congress of corrections” to reexamine the initial Declaration of Principles adopted in 1870 to determine responses to the following questions:

- Are these principles still relevant today?
- Do current correctional practices measure up to the expectations of these principles?
- How might we improve on these principles?
- How might we improve on existing correctional policy?
- What would assist us in improving on the delivery of correctional services?
- What must we do to improve our profession?

In convening this special congress, it would be prudent for the American Correctional Association to reach out to several other professional organizations for the purpose of enriching the discussion, generating a consensus on issues, crafting rational correctional policy, and developing a common vision for the future. More specifically, the American Correctional Association should, at a minimum, invite representatives from the National Association of Probation Executives, American Bar Association, American Probation and Parole Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the American Jail Association to participate in this congress. In addition, members of academia from the major criminal justice programs in North America should be invited to participate.

Replicating the Efforts of the Johnson Administration

In 1965 American President Lyndon B. Johnson created the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, commonly referred to as the President’s Crime Commission, to examine all facets of the criminal justice process, including the police, prosecution, courts, sentencing, corrections, organized crime, drug and alcohol abuse, control of firearms, science and technology, and research. In 1967, the Commission produced a comprehensive report on the criminal justice system containing a number of thoughtful recommendations, some that were implemented, other that were not.

It has now been close to 40 years since that Commission was created and issued its report. In my view it is time for the federal government to revisit the crime problem by creating a similar Commission to study the many criminal justice systems of the

United States — their structures, laws, policies, and practices — and to make recommendations on how they might be improved. To ensure the success of any initiative involving significant changes to existing systems, the full support of the federal government is essential.

Reaching Out Beyond Our Borders

We Americans tend to think we have most of the answers when it comes to responding to society’s problems. Unfortunately, we don’t, and in many cases we not only do not have the answers, we don’t have a full understanding of the relevant questions. We have much to learn from our correctional colleagues in Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world.

As our world grows smaller, as we witness an increase in the transnational crime problem, and as we begin to share common crime and justice issues, corrections professionals in America need to reach out to other countries to exchange information, to discuss common concerns, to create meaningful coalitions, and, ultimately, to learn from the countries of our ancestors.

A Focus on the Fundamentals

In the title of this paper I suggest a “return to the basics” and in several of the prescriptive remedies I recommend revisiting the past for guidance into the future. But the term a “return to the basics” also means providing a focus on the very basic fundamental principles in administering a confinement facility.

A number of years ago the now departed corrections scholar John Conrad made the statement that “prisons ought to be lawful, safe, industrious, and hopeful.” In expanding on that deceptively simple but powerful statement, Conrad further defined his four elements of a successful administered prison (Beto, 2001):

Lawful: “The lawful prison is one in which it is the first goal of policy to prevent unlawful actions and conduct by staff and prisoners.”

Safe: “The safe prison is one in which enlightened architecture, and the training and supervision of staff for the maintenance of personal safety, combine to achieve personal security for both prisoners and staff.”

Industrious: “The industrious prison keeps all prisoners occupied at full-time constructive work, in training, prison industry, or maintenance of the facility.”

Hopeful: “In the hopeful prison appropriate educational, training, and medical services will be provided so that each prisoner can reasonably expect that his or her condition will be better than before incarceration.”

In addition to “educational, training, and medical services” identified by Conrad as elements of a hopeful prison, I would add “meaningful religious programs” as another essential element of a hopeful prison.

If we give thoughtful consideration to Conrad’s vision, almost everything that occurs or should occur inside a prison or residential facility may be assigned to one of his four elements.

In 1990 my father and I visited a number of adult and juvenile correctional facilities in Japan, and during that trip we were favorably impressed with what we observed. In one of the prisons we visited my father conveyed to the director that one could

judge the quality of the administration of a confinement facility by five “absences.” He believed that if there was an absence of unnecessary noise, an absence of clutter or trash, an absence of odor, an absence of idleness, and an absence of violence, then the prison’s administration was focusing on quality of life issues and had embraced Conrad’s vision of creating a “lawful, safe, industrious, and hopeful” facility.

Cultivating Correctional Leaders

Perhaps the most difficult challenge facing the American criminal justice system is developing leaders to successfully move the profession through the 21st century.

A good perspective on correctional administration comes from John J. DiIulio, Jr., who, in his seminal work *Governing Prisons*, suggests that “...order, amenity, and service are three ends of good prison government.” In identifying the type of person required to achieve these ends, DiIulio writes (1987: 242):

First, successful prison directors and institutional managers are not here today, gone tomorrow. They are in the office long enough to learn the job, make plans, and implement them. Second, they are highly “hands-on” and pro-active. They pay close attention to the details and do not wait for problems to arise but attempt to anticipate them. While they trust their subordinates and do their share of paperwork, they keep themselves focused on the prisons and what is actually happening inside of them. At the same time, they recognize the need for outside support. In short, they are strangers neither to the cellblocks nor to the aisles of the state legislature. Third, they act consciously to project an image of themselves that is appealing to a wide range of people both inside and outside of the organization. Fourth, they are dedicated and fiercely loyal to the department and see themselves as keepers engaged in a noble and challenging (if mostly thankless) profession.

As DiIulio (1987) and others suggest (Beto and Brown, 1999; Jacobs and Olitsky, 2004), we need to have a renewed emphasis and a sustained effort in identifying and cultivating potential leaders to assume responsibility for crafting correctional policy and administering our criminal justice systems. And the type of people we need to assume leadership roles must be ethical, value-driven, courageous, decisive, and who possess and communicate a clear and constant vision for the agency and its personnel.

Possible solutions to the leadership crisis are: 1) improved recruitment and retention of correctional administrators; 2) the removal of correctional administration from the political arena; 3) greater cooperation between higher education and correctional systems, not only in terms of advancing research that informs policy, but identifying, mentoring, and advising promising students for careers in institutional and community corrections; and 4) creating non-traditional training and development programs that focus more on policy development, management skills, and influencing the organizational culture.

Perhaps the most promising and urgent of these four suggested solutions, and the one with the greatest possible return, lies in the identification, recruitment, and retention of visionary and courageous correctional leaders. In selecting administrators to lead correctional systems, the hiring authority should be careful to avoid the “competency trap” — that is, hiring people who

have done a good job in the past of maintaining an organization — and instead they should seek out individuals who can transform the organization and who can lead the organization to the next level.

I am reminded of a quote from John P. Kotter (2006), one of America’s foremost leadership experts, who wrote:

Producing change is about 80 percent leadership — establishing direction, aligning, motivating, and inspiring people — and about 20 percent management — planning, budgeting, organizing, and problem solving. In most change efforts, those percentages are reversed. We continue to produce great managers; we need to develop great leaders.

If we hope to improve the criminal justice system, then that is where we need to focus our energies — developing great correctional leaders.

Conclusion

The corrections profession in the United States is facing many challenges, but these challenges also present an equal number of opportunities. And those opportunities, if taken, will result in an improved justice system for which we all may be proud.

References

- Beto, D. R. “Random Thoughts on the Future of Corrections,” *Crime and Justice International*, January / February, 2004.
- Beto, D. R. & Brown, Jr., M. “An Accidental Penologist’s Views on Correctional Leadership,” *Corrections Management Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter, 1999.
- Beto, D. R., Corbett, Jr., R. P., & DiIulio, Jr., J. J. “Getting Serious about Probation and the Crime Problem,” *Corrections Management Quarterly*, Spring, 2000.
- Beto, G. J. “Probing Prison Problems,” *Lutheran Witness*, March, 1968.
- Beto, G. J. “President’s Address: Centennial Congress of Correction,” *Proceedings of the One Hundredth Annual Congress of Correction*. College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1971.
- Beto, G. J. “Prison Administration and the Eighth Amendment,” *Texas Journal of Corrections*, November, 2001.
- Burns, J. M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1979.
- DiIulio, Jr., J. J. *Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.
- Glaze, L. E. & Palla, S. *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2004*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, November 2005.
- Harrison, P. M. & Beck, A. J. *Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2005*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, May 2006.

Executive Exchange

Jacobs, J. B. & Olitsky, E. "Leadership and Correctional Reform," *Pace Law Review*, Vol. 24, No. 477, 2004.

Kotter, J. P. "Transformation," *Leadership Excellence*, January 2006.

Morris, N. "A Snail's Pace of Prison Reform," *Proceedings of the One Hundredth Annual Congress of Correction*. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1971.

Pozzi, R. A. "The Leadership Void in Community Corrections," *Corrections Management Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter, 1999.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Solomon, A. L., Palmer, T., Atkinson, A., Davidson, J., & Harvey, L. *Prisoner Reentry: Addressing the Challenges in Weed and Seed Communities (Research Report)*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, September, 2006.

Wines, E. C. *Transactions of the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline held at Cincinnati, Ohio, October 12-18, 1870*. Albany, New York: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1871. [reprinted by the American Correctional Association on the occasion of its Centennial Anniversary, October 1970].

Appendix

Declaration of Principles Adopted and Promulgated by the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline

I. Crime is an intentional violation of duties imposed by law, which inflicts an injury on others. Criminals are persons convicted of crime by competent courts. Punishment is suffering inflicted on the criminal for the wrong done by him, with a special view to secure his reformation.

II. The treatment of criminals by society is for the protection of society. But since such treatment is directed to the criminal rather than to the crime, its great object should be his moral regeneration. Hence, the supreme aim of prison discipline is the reformation of criminals, not the infliction of vindictive suffering.

III. The progressive classification of prisoners, based on character and work on some well-adjusted mark system, should be established in all prisons above the common jail.

IV. Since hope is a more potent agent than fear, it should be made an ever-present force in the minds of prisoners, by a well devised and skillfully-applied system of rewards for good conduct, industry and attention to learning. Rewards, more than punishments, are essential to every good prison system.

V. The prisoner's destiny should be placed, measurably, in his own hands; he must be put into circumstances where he will be able, through his own exertions, to continually better his own condition. A regulated self-interest must be brought into play, and made constantly operative.

VI. The two master forces opposed to the reform of the prison systems of our several states are political appointments, and a consequent instability in administration. Until both are eliminated, the needed reforms are impossible.

VII. Special training, as well as high qualities of head and heart, is required to make a good prison or reformatory officer. Then only will the administration of public punishment become scientific, uniform and successful, when it is raised to the dignity of a profession, and men are specially trained for it, as they are for other pursuits.

VIII. Peremptory sentences ought to be replaced by those of indeterminate length. Sentences limited only by satisfactory proof of reformation should be substituted for those measured by mere lapse of time.

IX. Of all reformatory agencies, religion is first in importance, because most potent in its action upon the human heart and life.

X. Education is a vital force in the reformation of fallen men and women. Its tendency is to quicken the intellect, inspire self-respect, excite to higher aims, and afford a healthful substitute for low and vicious amusement. Education is, therefore, a matter of primary importance in prisons, and should be carried to the utmost extent consistent with the other purposes of such institutions.

XI. In order to the reformation of imprisoned criminals, there must be not only a sincere desire and intention to that end, but a serious conviction, in the minds of prison officers, that they are capable of being reformed, since no man can heartily maintain a discipline at war with his inward beliefs; no man can earnestly strive to accomplish what in his heart he despairs of accomplishing.

XII. A system of prison discipline, to be truly reformatory, must gain the will of the convict. He is to be amended; but how is this possible with his mind in a state of hostility? No system can hope to succeed, which does not secure this harmony of wills, so that the prisoner shall choose for himself what his officer chooses for him. But, to this end, the officer must really choose the good of the prisoner, and the prisoner must remain in his choice long enough for virtue to become a habit. This consent of wills is an essential condition of reformation.

XIII. The interest of society and the interest of the convicted criminal are really identical, and they should be made practically so. At present there is a combat between crime and law. Each sets the other at defiance, and, as a rule, there is little kindly feeling, and few friendly acts, on either side. It would be otherwise if criminals, on conviction, instead of being cast off, were rather made the objects of a generous parental care; that is, if they were trained to virtue, and not merely sentenced to suffering.

XIV. The prisoner's self-respect should be cultivated to the utmost, and every effort made to give back to him his manhood. There is no greater mistake in the whole compass of penal discipline, than the studied imposition of degradation as a part of punishment. Such imposition destroys every better impulse and aspiration. It crushes the weak, irritates the strong, and indisposes all to submission and reform. It is trampling where we ought to raise, and is therefore as unchristian in principle as it is unwise in policy.

XV. In prison administration, moral forces should be relied upon, with as little admixture of physical force as possible, and organized persuasion be made to take the place of coercive restraint, the object being to make upright and industrious freemen, rather than orderly and obedient prisoners. Brute force may make good prisoners; moral training alone will make good citizens. To the latter of these ends, the living soul must be won; to the former, only the inert and obedient body.

XVI. Industrial training should have both a higher development and a greater breadth than has heretofore been, or is now,

commonly give to it in our prisons. Work is no less an auxiliary to virtue, than it is a means of support. Steady, active, honorable labor is the basis of all reformatory discipline. It not only aids reformation, but is essential to it. It was a maxim with Howard, "make men diligent, and they will be honest" — a maxim which this congress regards as eminently sound and practical.

XVII. While industrial labor in prisons is of the highest importance and utility to the convict, and by no means injurious to the laborer outside, we regard the contract system of prison labor, as now commonly practiced in our country, as prejudicial alike to discipline, finance and the reformation of the prisoner, and sometimes injurious to the interest of the free laborer.

XVIII. The most valuable parts of the Irish prison system — the more strictly penal stage of separate imprisonment, the reformatory stage of progressive classification, and the probationary stage of natural training — are believed to be as applicable to one country as another — to the United States as to Ireland.

XIX. Prisons, as well as prisoners, should be classified or graded so that there shall be prisons for the untried, for the incorrigible and for other degrees of depraved character, as well as separate establishments for women, and for criminals of the younger class.

XX. It is the judgment of this congress, that repeated short sentences for minor criminals are worse than useless; that, in fact, they rather stimulate than repress transgression. Reformation is a work of time; and a benevolent regard to the good of the criminal himself, as well as to the protection of society, requires that his sentence be long enough for reformatory processes to take effect.

XXI. Preventive institutions, such as truant homes, industrial schools, etc., for the reception and treatment of children not yet criminal, but in danger of becoming so, constitute the true field of promise, in which to labor for the repression of crime.

XXII. More systematic and comprehensive methods should be adopted to save discharged prisoners, by providing them with work and encouraging them to redeem their character and regain their lost position in society. The state has not discharged its whole duty to the criminal when it has punished him, not even when it has reformed him. Having raised him up, it has the further duty to aid in holding him up. And to this end it is desirable that state societies be formed, which shall cooperate with each other in this work.

XXIII. The successful prosecution of crime requires the combined action of capital and labor, just as other crafts do. There are two well defined classes engaged in criminal operations, who may be called the capitalists and the operatives. It is worthy of inquiry, whether a more effective warfare may not be carried on against crime, by striking at the capitalists as a class, than at the operatives one by one. Certainly, this double warfare should be vigorously pushed, since from it the best results, as regards repressive justice, may be reasonably hoped for.

XXIV. Since personal liberty is the rightful inheritance of every human being, it is the sentiment of this congress that the state which has deprived an innocent citizen of this right, and subjected him to penal restraint, should, on unquestionable proof of its mistake, make reasonable indemnification for such wrongful imprisonment.

XXV. Criminal lunacy is a question of vital interest to society; and facts show that our laws regarding insanity, in its relation to crime, need revision, in order to bring them to a more complete conformity to the demands of reason, justice and humanity; so that, when insanity is pleaded in bar of conviction, the investiga-

tion may be conducted with greater knowledge, dignity, and fairness; criminal responsibility be more satisfactorily determined; the punishment of the sane criminal be made more sure, and the restraint of the insane be rendered at once more certain and more humane.

XXVI. While this congress would not shield the convicted criminal from the just responsibility of his misdeeds, it arraigns society itself in no slight degree accountable for the invasion of its rights and the warfare upon its interests, practiced by the criminal class. Does society take all the steps which it easily might, to change, or at least to improve, the circumstances in our social state that leads to crime; or, when crime has been committed, to cure the proclivity to it, generated by these circumstances? It cannot be pretended. Let society, then, lay the case earnestly to its conscience, and strive to mend in both particulars. Offenses, we are told by a high authority, must come; but a special woe is denounced against those through whom they come. Let us take heed that that woe fall not upon our heads.

XXVII. The exercise of executive clemency in the pardon of criminals is a practical question of grave importance, and of great delicacy and difficulty. It is believed that the annual average of executive pardons from the prisons of the whole country reaches ten percent of their population. The effect of the too free use of the pardoning power is to detract from the certainty of punishment for crimes, and to divert the mind of prisoners from the means supplied for their improvement. Pardons should issue for one or more of the following reasons, viz.: to release the innocent, to correct mistakes made in imposing the sentence, to relieve such suffering from ill-health as requires release from imprisonment, and to facilitate or reward the real reformation of the prisoner. The exercise of this power should be by the executive, and should be guarded by careful examination as to the character of the prisoner and his conduct in prison. Furthermore, it is the opinion of this congress that governors of states should give to their respective legislatures the reason, in each case, for their exercise of their pardoning power.

XXVIII. The proper duration of imprisonment for a violation of the laws of society is one of the most perplexing questions in criminal jurisprudence. The present extraordinary inequality of sentences for the same or similar crimes is a source of constant irritation among prisoners, and the discipline of our prisons suffers in consequence. The evil is one for which some remedy should be devised.

XXIX. Prison statistics, gathered from a wide field and skillfully digested, are essential to an exhibition of the true character and working of our prison systems. The collection, collation and reduction to tabulated forms of such statistics can best be effected through a national prison discipline society, with competent working committees in every state, or by the establishment of a national prison bureau, similar to the recently instituted national bureau of education.

XXX. Prison architecture is a matter of grave importance. Prisons of every class should be substantial structures, affording gratification by their design and material to a pure taste, but not costly or highly ornate. We are of the opinion that those of moderate size are best, as regards both industrial and reformatory ends.

XXXI. The construction, organization, and management of all prisons should be by the state, and they should form a graduated series of reformatory establishments, being arranged with a view to the industrial employment, intellectual education and moral training of the inmates.

XXXII. As a general rule, the maintenance of penal institutions, above the county jail, should be from the earnings of their inmates, and without cost to the state; nevertheless, the true standard of merit in their management is the rapidity and thoroughness of reformatory effect accomplished thereby.

XXXIII. A right application of the principles of sanitary science in the construction and arrangement of prisons is a point of vital importance. The apparatus for heating and ventilation should be the best that is known; sunlight, air and water should be afforded according to the abundance with which nature has provided them; the rations and clothing should be plain but wholesome, comfortable, and in sufficient but not extravagant quantity; the bedsteads, bed and bedding, including sheets and pillow cases, not costly but decent, and kept clean, well aired and free of vermin; the hospital accommodations, medical stores and surgical instruments should be all that humanity requires and science can supply; and all needed means for personal cleanliness should be without stint.

XXXIV. The principle of the responsibility of parents for the full or partial support of their criminal children in reformatory institutions has been extensively applied for in Europe, and its practical working has been attended with the best results. It is worthy of inquiry whether this principle may not be advantageously introduced into the management of our American reformatory institutions.

XXXV. It is our conviction that one of the most effective agencies in the repression of crime would be the enactment of laws by which the education of all the children of the state should

be made obligatory. Better to force education upon the people than to force them into prison to suffer for crimes, of which the neglect of education and consequent ignorance have been the occasion, if not the cause.

XXXVI. As a principle that crowns all, and is essential to all, it is our conviction that no prison system can be perfect, or even successful to the most desirable degree, without some central authority to sit at the helm, guiding, controlling, unifying and vitalizing the whole. We ardently hope yet to see all the departments of our preventative, reformatory and penal institutions in each state molded into one harmonious and effective system; its parts mutually answering to and supporting each other; and the whole animated by the same spirit, aiming at the same objects, and subject to the same control; yet without loss of the advantages of voluntary aid and effort, wherever they are attainable.

XXXVII. This congress is of the opinion that, both in the official administration of such a system, and in the voluntary cooperation of citizens therein, the agency of women may be employed with excellent effect.

Dan Richard Beto, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, is Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas.

TREATMENT REGIMES: THE NEED FOR CONSISTENCY

by

Donald G. Evans

An abbreviated version of this paper was presented at the IV Penitentiary Congress held in Kalisz, Poland, on November 22-24, 2006.

Introduction

I would like to thank the organizers of this conference for the opportunity to participate in this worthwhile and timely discussion of major issues and challenges facing correctional systems today. The presentations and discussions, I am sure, will be both informative and instructive. It is my hope that my brief discussion of treatment regimes in prison settings, based on the experience of recent efforts in the Correctional Services of Canada will encourage your thoughtful consideration as we together struggle with ways and means to reduce the rate of re-offending on the part of released offenders.

In this presentation I intend to discuss, however briefly, the main characteristics of effective correctional programming, and look at three treatment regimes for specialized populations: sexual offenders, substance abusers and offenders with mental

illnesses. The last example will also be used to demonstrate the need for consistency and the value of continuity of care (from prison to community supervision). However, before I start there are three observations I would like to make regarding the current situation of treatment regimes in corrections.

Observations

If we are to avoid merely warehousing offenders our prison systems will need to offer a variety of programs geared to reducing the offenders' prospects of re-offending. These programs should be developed with a perspective that sees the continuation of the program in the community. Aftercare seems to have become a forgotten concept in corrections and needs to be reintroduced if significant gains are to be made in reducing re-offending. Better case management and supervision in community settings would enhance rather than detract from prison sentences. As a result of adopting this perspective, prison systems will need to address a critical concern that relates to the lack of continuity and consistency in offender programming, both in the prison setting and in community supervision efforts. Safe, secure cus-

tody is an imperative but corrections must do more than this if it is to promote public safety. Too often programs supportive of a prisoner's resocialization are commenced but not continued for a host of reasons including insufficient resources, lack of trained personnel, changes in leadership, or outright failure of leadership. If treatment regimes are to fulfill their promise there will need to be consistency in program efforts.

I would like now to turn to a discussion of what is meant by effective treatment regimes.

Effective Treatment Regimes

A treatment regime is a structured intervention that addresses the factors directly linked to the offender's criminal behavior. Now, I am assuming that a major goal of the correctional system is to assist in the resocialization of offenders and their subsequent resettlement in the community as law-abiding citizens through the provision of programs in prisons and in the community. It is critically important that treatment regimes meet the identified needs of offenders and contribute to their successful resettlement in the community. This is essential if the correctional system is to contribute to public safety.

From the work done in Canada, we can distill at least eight minimum characteristics of an effective treatment regime in both prison and community settings. They can be summarized as follows:

1. The use of an empirically-based model of change which facilitates a change in the offender's attitudes and behavior and is based on a theory supported by research.
2. The targeting of criminogenic factors that contributes directly to criminal behavior.
3. The deployment of effective methods of program delivery, including the statement of qualifications for treatment staff conducting or involved in the program.
4. A strong skills orientation in the program.
5. Attending to the issue of responsivity, this refers to the characteristics of offender's that have direct impact on how much benefit they will derive from the intervention.
6. Paying attention to program intensity, which means the scope, sequencing, and duration of treatment related to the seriousness and persistence of the offender's risk and need.
7. Being cognizant of the need for continuity of care issues. This means that treatment gains made during imprisonment are reinforced and strengthened by intervention efforts in the community.
8. Providing for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the treatment regimes.

This last item is extremely important and could include the following activities:

- rates of participation, completion, and reasons for non-compliance;
- assessment progress against program targets;
- the influence of responsivity factors;
- the participant's satisfaction with the program;
- the impact on institutional conduct and adjustment;
- rates of re-admission following release from prison;
- rates of re-offending following release from prison; and
- the cost-effectiveness of the treatment regime.

With this information as a background, let us turn now to a discussion of three examples of treatment regimes in the Canadian Correctional Service.

Examples of Treatment Regimes in Canada

The legislative purpose of the correctional system in Canada is to assist the rehabilitation of offenders and their reintegration into the community as law-abiding citizens through the provision of programs in penitentiaries and in the community. The Canadian Correctional System is therefore responsible for providing programs that will meet the legislative aim of the Parliament of Canada.

Before embarking on a discussion of the treatment regimes in the Correctional Services of Canada, let me first remind you that in Canada the correctional system is two-tiered. By this I mean that the length of sentence determines the placement of the offender in either the federal penitentiary or a provincial correctional institution. Any offender receiving a sentence of more than two years will serve his or her time in a federal institution, and those with sentences of less than two years will serve their sentences in provincial settings. In recent years, the population of prisoners in the penitentiaries has taken on a special character, namely, a division between those serving shorter sentences (2-5 years) and those serving much longer terms of imprisonment, including life sentences. Together with the increase in the number of offenders with substance abuse problems, violent and sexual offending histories, and diagnosed mental illness, the problem of treatment as well as care and custody concerns have occupied Canadian correctional administrators. This has led to the development of a number of treatment efforts that I am describing as regimes. What I mean by regimes is a structured approach to behavioral change.

All of the regimes used in the Correctional Service of Canada start with the three basic principles of effective correctional interventions, namely, risk, need, and responsivity (Andrews and Bonta, 2006). These principles suggest the following:

- Risk: Treat only offenders who are likely to re-offend (moderate risk or higher).
- Need: Target criminogenic needs (needs that are likely to produce criminal behavior). Examples of criminogenic needs are: antisocial personality, antisocial associates, antisocial cognitions, low attachment to family/lovers, low engagement in education/employment, poor use of leisure time, and abusing drugs or alcohol.
- Responsivity: Matching the treatment regime to the offenders' learning styles and culture.

These themes are repeated and modified in the following regimes that are geared to meeting the specific needs of sexual offenders, substance abusers, and mentally ill offenders.

1. Regime for sex offenders

In the Canadian system the following offenders are provided with an opportunity to be assessed for and to participate in sexual offender regimes:

- Offenders whose current conviction is for sexual offending.

Executive Exchange

- Offenders who have previously been convicted of sexual offending or have a history of sexual offending.
- Offenders whose current or past offences involved a sexual offence whether or not the latter resulted in a conviction.

Assessment

The focus of assessment and treatment of sexual offenders relies on identifying the nature and pattern of behavior resulting in sexual offending and then developing strategies and tactics that might be used to reduce the risk of re-offending (Quinsey, 1998). In Canada the assessment of sexual offenders is a systematic and dynamic process that evaluates offenders throughout their sentence. Upon admission to the prison, a sexual offender will be given a specialized assessment which includes an evaluation of their history and development of sexual behavior, sexual preferences, attitudes and cognitive distortions, social competence, medical history, psychopathology, and prior assessment and treatment results. To accomplish this, a variety of assessment methodologies and instruments are used in an integrated manner.

In this context, assessment determines the timing, focus, format, and content of the treatment regime. Throughout the process the assessment focuses on the offender's risk, need, responsiveness, and capacity for treatment.

Earlier in this paper I addressed the components of criminogenic needs and now I want to show how, based on practice and research, we can fine tune these needs for sexual offending. The key criminogenic needs for sexual offenders comprise the following:

- Deviant sexual interests (for example, children, paraphilias).
- Sexual preoccupations
- Antisocial orientation (lifestyle instability, rule violation).
- Attitudes tolerant of sexual assault.
- Intimacy deficits (emotional identification with children, lack of stable love relationships).

Treatment

In the Canadian Correctional System the treatment of sexual offenders is a therapeutic and semi-structured approach aimed at reducing the risk of re-offending through the use of effective self-management techniques. The regime deals with cognitive distortions, deviant arousal and fantasy, social competence, anger and emotion management, empathy, and victim awareness. These regimes tend to have a cognitive-behavioral basis and are delivered in group settings with individual intervention as necessary. The regimes emphasize the offenders need:

- To accept responsibility for their behavior.
- To recognize the behavioral progression that preceded and followed their sexual offences.
- To identify situations which place them at risk of re-offending.
- To, with assistance from correctional staff, develop strategies to prevent a relapse and repeat offending.

The sexual offender regimes in Canada usually include components that deal with the following issues:

- Attitudes towards sexuality and relationships.
- Empathy enhancement and victim awareness.

- Anger and emotion management.
- Techniques to reduce or control deviant arousal and healthy self-management skills.

The overall approach places emphasis on reducing the risk of sexual offending through combining self-management and external control through supervision.

Duration and intensity

Another dimension of the regime that needs to be clarified relates to the duration and intensity of the treatment. Regime intensity is linked to the offenders risk and need profile. For example, moderate to high needs are usually accommodated in an institutional setting where the regimes are longer and more intensive. Those offenders that are identified as having a lower risk and need classification tend to be matched with regimes of lower intensity and of shorter duration. These regimes are usually offered in either minimum-security prisons or while on community supervision. All offenders, regardless of level of intensity, are provided the opportunity to participate in a follow-up maintenance or booster regime. These regimes can be offered in either a prison setting or in the community through the parole office. The goal of the maintenance regime is to maintain the gains made in the sexual offender treatment groups as well as monitoring the offender's risk level and to work with them to further develop skills that improve their ability at effective self-management.

Working with sex offenders is complicated and complex and the state of our knowledge are still limited. It is therefore important that these treatment regimes are closely monitored and evaluated so that our knowledge of what is effective continues to develop. I would be remiss if I did not note that in this field, "programs have to be developed in the context of imperfect but increasing knowledge" (Quinsey, 1998:221).

My second example of a treatment regime, relates to the approach taken to assist substance abusers.

2. Regime for substance abusers

The National Substance Abuse Program (NSAP) was developed to assist offenders to modify their substance abuse and criminal behaviors. It is estimated that approximately 80% of offenders in Canadian prisons have problems related to substance abuse and that this is a critical factor needing attention if the offender's potential for resettlement is to be realized. The strategies used in this regime were selected in order to prepare the offenders to more effectively manage those situations that give rise to a relapse into crime or substance abuse.

This approach is based on an integrated theoretical model which suggests that patterns of substance abuse have multiple determinants and can be explained in part by social learning theory. In this view, substance abuse is a maladaptive response to ongoing problems in living. The individual's behavior is initiated and maintained by past learning experiences including peer modeling, reinforcement contingencies, cognitive expectations or beliefs, and biological influences. The model argues that if substance abuse behaviors are learned, then the same processes can be used to assist the offender to develop more adaptive cognitive and behavioral coping responses.

Now, as you are all aware, not all substance abusers are identical. The degree of dependency and problems associated with

substance abuse range from low to severe. The strength of the association with criminal behavior varies although it tends to be somewhat more consistently linked with serious substance abuse. Given these factors it is necessary to consider what types of interventions should be provided. Based on research there is evidence that appropriate matching of the offender to the regime is critical to effective interventions.

As with most of the Canadian Correctional Services efforts, they have based the matching concepts on the risk, need, and responsivity principles. Again, the risk principle suggests that the intensity of an intervention must match the level of risk. That is, the high intensity treatment (defined as an intervention that is multifaceted and of longer duration) should be reserved for the higher risk offenders, while lower risk offenders should receive less intensive service or none at all.

The need principle posits that treatment targets factors empirically substantiated as being directly associated with criminal behavior. These are the criminogenic factors discussed earlier in the paper. Proponents of this approach argue that criminogenic needs can be changed through appropriate treatment and research has found that a positive change in this need domain can mitigate the risk of re-offending.

Responsivity is defined as a matching of the style and mode of service to the personal orientation, abilities, and learning strategies of the offender. This principle notes the importance of the offender's characteristics and attention to conditions that could promote or impede positive change. Matching is effective because the needs of the various groups differ and thus the regimes differ. For example, in the Canadian prison system, those with an assessed need level of high would receive 89 sessions and the program would last approximately five months, whereas a low assessed need would receive ten sessions of approximately two weeks duration. This substance abuse treatment model offers a range of treatment interventions that vary in intensity and are designed to be matched with the offenders' substance abuse severity. This approach tends to increase the chances of positive treatment outcomes.

The final example, relates to regimes for the treatment of the mentally ill offender.

3. Regime for mentally ill offenders

More recently the Correctional Service of Canada has been wrestling with the problem of an increase in offenders with mental health problems. This has led to the development of a community mental health initiative. What I am about to describe is a work in progress but an essential activity that is needed in order to fulfill the Service's mandate to support offender rehabilitation and contribute to community safety.

Mental health problems are now two to three times more common in Canadian prisons than among the general population and, according to some estimates, getting worse. Consider the following:

- Rate of mental health problems in prisons is rising (71% increase in offenders with mental health disorders since 1997, 80% increase in numbers of inmates on prescribed medication).
- Many inmates have both mental health and addiction disorders (requiring more comprehensive assessment and treatment).

- Offenders with mental disorders are more likely to return to prison (CSC, 2006).

These challenges led to the formation of a Community Mental Health Initiative Implementation Team, situated at the National Headquarters of the Correctional Service of Canada. Members of the team have been presenting information and training on the initiative to staff and to community partners. The objective of the initiative is to prepare offenders with serious mental disorders for release into the community by strengthening the continuum of specialized mental health support and providing continuity of support from institutions to the community. The key elements of the initiative are:

- Enhanced discharge planning;
- Transitional mental health services and support to targeted offenders;
- Mental health specialists to support offenders residing in the community;
- Training in mental health issues for community staff; and
- Specialized services such as emergency psychiatric assessments (CSC, 2006).

In the coming months the team will be completing training modules for staff, and assisting in the mobilization of support through partnership development in communities. This initiative is a prime example of trying to establish strong links between prison and community for the furtherance of offender rehabilitation and the promoting of community safety. Facing up to the essential need for a continuum of care is clearly indicated for offenders suffering from mental disorders. If re-entry, reintegration or resettlement of released offenders is to be effective in the reduction of re-offending a strong, practical aftercare effort will be required. Getting offenders with mental illness connected to a supervised medical support system would be a major accomplishment in the production of community safety.

Having review three efforts undertaken by the Canadian prison system, I would now like to spend a few moments identifying some lessons that have been learned from the Canadian experience with treatment regimes.

Lessons Learned from the Canadian Experience of Treatment Regimes

It is important that we examine the experiences of others and seek to draw out lessons that we could apply to our own situations. For me, the following brief discussion of the lessons that have been learned from these experiences in providing treatment regimes in Canada will I trust be constructive in your own efforts. As I noted in the title of this paper, consistency in implementation and application is essential to the effectiveness of these regime initiatives. For me there are two key lessons to be learned: one, the importance of the staff interactions with offenders; and secondly, adherence to the principles of risk-need-responsivity.

Dr. Karl Hanson (2006) has stated clearly the importance of effective workers with offenders in treatment regimes. He has noted that these workers are able to form meaningful relationships with offenders by which he implies that they are warm, exhibit accurate empathy, and are rewarding of positive gains made by offenders, and also provide prosocial direction by imparting skills, problem-solving techniques, and positive values to the

Executive Exchange

offenders. Let us not forget, in the search for technique the value of interpersonal skills of our staff.

The second lesson we can learn has to do with implementing the risk-need-responsivity principle. Dr. Andrews has briefly summarized the research on these principles and I merely highlight the main points for your consideration. He makes eight key points regarding adherence to risk-need-responsivity principles; they are as follows:

- Employ structured and validated risk/need assessment instruments.
- Never assign low-risk cases to intensive services.
- Reserve intensive for moderate and higher risk cases.
- Always target a predominance of relevant criminogenic needs.
- Always employ cognitive-behavioral and social learning interpersonal influence strategies.
- Managers and supervisors must attend to the relationship and structuring skills of service delivery staff.
- Clinical supervision entails regular ongoing high level modeling and reinforcement of relationship and structuring skills.
- Make monitoring, feedback, and corrective action routine, as a matter of policy. (Andrews, 2006).

Seeking to enhance and improve our treatment regimes so that offenders are supported in their efforts at resettlement and local communities are made safer by our efforts is a tough challenge, but a challenge I believe is necessary if prison services are truly to serve the public and avoid being another contributor to wasted lives through the warehousing of offenders and running the risk of returning prisoners to the street worse than when they were admitted.

Conclusion

I would like to thank you for your kind attention, and would like to draw your attention to a caveat to my presentation. I am not here to suggest that what we do in Canada is superior to anything done in other jurisdictions, but rather to report on what we are trying to do to reduce reoffending through the use of treatment regimes. My hope is that what we are struggling with will help inform your discussions and enable you to continue with all of us in seeking more effective practices that will promote safer communities and reduce further offending and victimization by those in our charge and care. We must be realistic, committed, and consistent in our efforts. I trust this conference is helpful towards that goal.

References

- Andrews, D. A. (2006). "Enhancing adherence to risk-need-responsivity: Making quality a matter of policy," *Criminology and Public Policy*, Volume 5, Number 3, pp 595-602.
- Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. (2006). *Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 4th Edition. Newark, New Jersey: LexusNexis.
- Auerbach, B. J. & Castellano, T. C. (Eds.) (1998). *Successful Community Sanctions and Services for Special Offenders*. Lanham, Maryland: American Correctional Association.

Corrections Service Canada (2006). *Improving Mental Health Services for Federal Offenders. The Community Mental Health Initiative*, April 2006, prepared by Jane Laishes, Mental Health Services, NHQ.

Hanson, R. K. (2006). "What Works: The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders," Presentation at the 25th Annual Convention of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, September 29th.

Latessa, E. J. (Ed.) (1999). *Strategic Solutions*. Lanham, Maryland: American Correctional Association.

Lightfoot, L. O. (1999). "Treating Substance Abuse and Dependence in Offenders: A Review of Methods and Outcomes" in Latessa, 1999.

Quinsey, V. L. (1998). "Assessment, Management, and Treatment of Sex Offenders" in Auerbach and Castellano, 1998.

Rice, M. E. & Harris, G. F. (1998). "Treatment for Prisoners with Major Mental Disorders" in Auerbach and Castellano, 1998.

Weekes, J. R., Mosner, A. E., & Langevin, C. M. (1999). "Assessing Substance-Abusing Offenders for Treatment" in Latessa, 1999.

Donald G. Evans, a past President of the International Community Corrections Association and the American Probation and Parole Association, is President of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario.

APPROACHING THE CENTENARY – CELEBRATION OR COMMISERATION? DEVELOPMENTS IN PROBATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

by

David Thomas

An abbreviated version of this paper was presented at the IV Penitentiary Congress held in Kalisz, Poland, on November 22-24, 2006.

Introduction

Thank you for the invitation to speak to you today. Events concerning probation in the United Kingdom are very fast-moving at the moment with weekly developments. What I am going to say is my interpretation of those events and not that of my employer. The facts, however, are the facts!

In the U.K. the supervision of offenders by probation officers will reach its centenary in 2007 and the Probation Service faces a real threat to its existence.

History

The Probation Service in the U.K. has its roots in Christian tradition in the second half of the 19th century, with Police Court missionaries trying to save fallen women and drunken men. Although the courts could already place offenders on probation, it was the 1907 Probation of Offenders Act gave Courts the power to appoint Probation Officers to supervise offenders. Probation was not a punishment or a sentence and required the consent of the offender until 2001.

It was, however, 94 years before a National Probation Service was created in 2001, when 54 independent services were transformed into 42 Probation Areas with a National Probation Directorate. The transition was not painless!

Just one year later the Government commissioned a review of correctional services. The Carter Report, warmly welcomed by Government, was published in December 2003 and recommended that:

- Sentences should be targeted better;
- The Prison and Probation Services should work closely together;
- There should be end-to-end offender management; and
- There should be contestability, or competition, for much of the work.

Also in 2003, a new Criminal Justice Act was passed which attempted to target sentencing and allow the precious resources of the Prison and Probation Services to be used on those offenders who needed them most. Since the Act came into force in April 2005 sentencers have responded to a punitive political and national climate by increasing, not controlling, the number of offenders sentenced to prison and placed on supervision. In 18 months the prison population has increased by 7%, or 5,000, to 80,000 and the prisons are at maximum capacity while the number of offenders on community sentences has risen by a similar proportion.

Within six months of the publication of the Carter Report, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) was established with a National Offender Manager and ten Regional Offender Managers (ROMs). As originally conceived the ROMs would have direct control over the staff who managed offenders.

The people who delivered interventions, such as group programmes or community service, would be managed by another agency, likely to be what was left of the Probation Service, and have their work opened up to competition. This split has not happened but there is now a very clear threat that, if new legislation goes through, under-performing Probation Areas will be put out to tender and interventions will still be put out to competition.

Probation Today

So where are we now? There are three main strands — NOMS, end-to-end offender management, and contestability or competition.

National Offender Management Service

Firstly NOMS. It is managing to bring the Prison and Probation Services closer together and create the environment for end-to-end offender management, both hugely important achievements. However, it is bureaucratic, very expensive, and lacks controls. There are now 1,600 people employed by NOMS and 500 civil servants dealing with it. It is reported to be massively over-spent but so far it lacks the legal power to carry out many of its intended functions. Its very existence is questioned by many in Government and large sections of the wider criminal justice system.

A Government Minister is quoted as saying that NOMS was a mess but it had gone too far to stop now. Last week the Government announced, for the third time in as many years, its plans to establish it in legislation. It has not succeeded in introducing legislation thus far because of both the difficulties and the strength of the opposition.

Offender Management

Secondly, I turn to end-to-end Offender Management. This makes fundamental sense. The concept is very simple; that an offender will have one person supervising or managing them for the entire span of their contact with the criminal justice system, irrespective of how long it lasts or where they are in the system, providing they live in the same area throughout. This is very different to what happened before, where the person involved with the offender could change at every different stage, and often did as a person moved through the system. This led to discontinuity, gaps in service provision, lack of co-ordination, duplication and inefficiency.

Offender Management seeks to create a single pathway, focused on the individual offender, where the input is determined by their need and risk. One Offender Manager for each offender is essential for continuity, co-ordination and accountability. The components

of Offender Management are assessment, planning, implementation, review, and evaluation (ASPIRE). ASPIRE is essentially the role of the Offender Manager and is underpinned by a universal, electronic assessment and planning tool, OASys, used by probation and prison staff and transferred electronically between the two services with the offender as he moves between them.

All the elements are important but at the heart is the implementation of the planned objectives through effective supervision of the offender. Supervision is best described as the day-to-day personal process of motivating, encouraging and supporting an offender that is delivered by the Offender Manager (OM) in the community and an Offender Supervisor (OS) in custody.

Supervision in the Offender Management Model relies on teamwork. This is not the traditional notion of teamwork in Probation in the U.K., i.e. a group of people doing the same things with different offenders. Teamwork in the Offender Management Model involves a group of people doing different things with the same offender. As such there are complimentary roles and responsibilities:

- The Offender Manager is responsible for the overall plan and the sequencing of delivery;
- The Offender Supervisor has responsibility for actively implementing the plan on a day-to-day basis; of course, in many cases the OM and OS will be the same person;
- The Key Workers are responsible for delivering the interventions as determined by the OM; and
- The Case Administrator is responsible for ensuring the smooth administration and co-ordination of the work of the others.

An OM will manage a number of offenders and the team may be different for each one depending on their criminogenic needs and sentence. Effective communication is the key to it all and in time this will be through the means an electronic case management system shared by both prison and probation services. Originally planned to be in deployment now, unfortunately the main rollout will not be until late 2007.

So, for the first time in the U.K. we have a national case management policy that spans an offender's entire experience of the system, ensuring that the same things will happen in the same ways wherever the offender may be both in the criminal justice system or the country. This single model has universal support, including from Government. There is also an unprecedented level of co-operation between the prison and probation services and very high levels of staff enthusiasm. But, implementing this is not easy. The old model is deeply ingrained in our processes and our culture. Implementation is a process of transition that can only happen over several years and there are many difficulties, particularly as it is implemented in the prison setting. These include:

- A prison population and community workload that are out of control, prisoners in the wrong place and community resources focused on other priorities, e.g. preparing court reports;
- A climate of risk aversion and a serious backlog of assessments, including risk assessments;
- The infrastructure is inadequate at the moment; and
- The distraction of commissioning, contestability and legislative disruption.

Contestability

And so to the final, and most controversial strand — commissioning and contestability. These plans have encountered great opposition. The Government issued a consultation document late in 2005, which attracted 748 responses, of which only eight were in favour. In spite of this the Government chose to press ahead. Regrettably, every year a very small proportion of offenders under supervision commit very serious crimes but rarely get sustained national media attention or feature prominently in public announcements from Ministers. The results of the consultation were released at almost the same time as the publication of a highly critical report on a murder committed by offenders on supervision; a report that Ministers used to drive forward their agenda for change in the Probation Service and undermine the opposition to it. In doing so they caused the Probation Service to be exposed and undefended, with the good work it does to manage dangerous offenders undermined. In the months that have followed there have been a series of events attracting quite justified unfavourable media coverage that have provided excellent opportunities for Ministers to explain the work of the criminal justice system and contribution of the Probation Service in particular — opportunities that have not been taken.

The latest chapter in this story is that two weeks ago the Home Secretary, the minister responsible for the whole system, gave a speech to prisoners inside a London prison where he chose to announce that the Probation Service was performing badly and needed reform — and competition. This happened to be the same day that a one-sided undercover television programme about the work of probation hostels was broadcast and rather than putting this in context he chose to use it to support his message.

Now don't get me wrong. I am not saying that having some things done by other organisations is wrong. As the complexity and sophistication of assessment and planning increase there is a need to focus on what we do best. There has long been a recognition that the Probation Service cannot meet all the needs of offenders on its own and that there are many organisations, particularly in the "not for profit" sector that can address specific needs far better and more cost-effectively than we can. We therefore need to seek them out, harness their energy and work ever closer with them.

The Government says that service providers — meaning the Probation Service — should not determine what services are needed and how well they are performing. But Probation Areas now have the information and ability to analyse and respond to local need, can commission local services — and many of these alternative providers are local organisations — and can be held accountable locally. With the right incentives, or targets, they can almost certainly do it better than if it were done regionally or nationally. National commissioning of services from the private sector has a very poor history in the Probation Service and has resulted in very poor value for money, reduced service levels and costs increased by an average of 50%.

There is also the possibility of serious conflicts of interest, for example the potential of the same parent company that runs a private prison also delivering reports to the court. The current governance arrangements for probation are structured to represent and be accountable to local communities and should have that strengthened rather than removed. Local providers are often small and need to be given assistance to perform as required by being assured of long-term funding, given help

with information technology and infrastructure, etc. This is a model that has wide support but will not necessarily prevail, but the struggle is likely to be bitter. The centenary year will be critical.

Conclusion

I hope I have given you a flavour of current developments within Probation in the United Kingdom. As we approach the

centenary we have much to celebrate, but we also are in fear that the very same year will see the beginning of the end for probation as we know it. Thank you for your attention.

David Thomas is Assistant Chief Officer for the South Yorkshire Probation Area in Sheffield, England.

TECHNOLOGY COLUMN: HELPING COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS MONITOR SEX OFFENDER'S COMPUTER USE

by

Joe Russo

The National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center (NLECTC), a program of the National Institute of Justice, was created to provide support, research findings, and technological expertise to help State and local law enforcement and corrections personnel perform their duties more safely and efficiently. Over the past two years the NLECTC's Rocky Mountain Region office has been focusing on issues pertaining to community corrections and one of their major initiatives has been assisting agencies monitor sex offender's computer use.

Unsupervised computer use is clearly a concern in the context of sex offender management. This is true for many reasons. First, the Internet provides a cloak of anonymity and secrecy which is exactly the type of environment that these offenders desire and thrive in. Second, because forums and chat rooms exist on virtually any topic conceivable it does not take long for a sex offender to find a place on the web where his feelings about sex and his sexual preferences are accepted and understood. This is dangerous because it can reinforce and normalize the thinking errors that lead to further offenses. Third, the Internet provides access to victims both directly through online contact with children but also indirectly through dating services that offenders use to find potential victims by targeting single mothers with children of the desired age and sex. Lastly, and this should come as no surprise, the Internet is an incredible repository of pornography, both legal and illegal. Pornography obviously is intended to create a sexual stimulus, but it generally serves to reinforce negative and abusive views of sex. For sex offenders, viewing pornography is a risk factor that runs counter to the goals of treatment and continued use may be a contributing factor leading to new offenses.

So, the Internet is a dangerous place for sex offenders to frequent. Why not prohibit them from using it? Well, courts across the country are ruling against blanket restrictions against Internet use by offenders. Because the Internet is so prevalent in today's society and has many positive aspects that can be used to help an offender lead a productive life, the courts don't want to shut the offender out of modern life by saying he can't go online for any reason. Given that offenders will have access to the Internet, it is incumbent upon supervision agencies to set conditions around appropriate internet use and then monitor and manage this use.

There are a number of tools commercially available to help monitor an offender's computer use but many agencies can't afford them or don't have the resources to train their staff on how to use them. Responding to this need, NLECTC-Rocky Mountain funded the development of Field Search. Field Search is a free software tool designed specifically to assist non-technical probation and parole officers to quickly and efficiently scan an offender's computer and create a detailed report of their findings. Field Search can be downloaded onto a CD or a thumb drive which the officer can bring into the field with him/her. At the offender's home the software is run on the target computer. In about 20 minutes, Field Search performs three major functions: an Internet history search, an image search and a keyword search. Field Search quickly and automatically retrieves Internet histories from several popular browsers including Internet Explorer, Netscape, Firefox and Opera. Results are displayed in an easy to read format that include the date and time each website was visited and can be sorted in a number of ways to help the officer understand an offender's surfing patterns. Field Search quickly finds all logical images in jpg, bmp, png or gif formats. Images are automatically displayed in a gallery view. Field Search also allows officers to search for text in any logical file. Keywords are used to search for such things as pornographic materials and stories or the victim's name.

Officers can create reports by selecting any of these items for inclusion. A built in report function automatically creates a document which includes each item's associated path and date/time stamp. In the case of images, a thumbnail is included in the report. An export data function was provided which allows the officer to quickly transfer all of the raw data (internet history, images, keyword text hits) into an Excel® spreadsheet for analysis at a later time. This was built into the software in cases where the situation in the offender's home does not allow for a complete review on-site. If the offender becomes belligerent, for example, the export data function can be completed within a minute or two and the officer can leave with the data to be reviewed elsewhere. Reports can then be used to brief the treatment team about what was found on the offender's computer or, if necessary, to include in a revocation process.

Executive Exchange

NLECTC also offers a training course on Managing Sex Offender's Computer Use which was developed by Dr. Jim Tanner, a nationally recognized expert on computer forensics and community corrections. This two-day, hands-on training provides officers with information on the context of sex offenders and computer use, how to establish conditions of supervision that allow for effective monitoring of computer use and hands-on instruction on how to use software tools such as Field Search to actually monitor compliance. Funding has been secured to provide this course free of charge in ten sites across the country over the next year to agencies or groups of agencies that can demonstrate the interest and commitment to implementing a program of computer monitoring.

For those agencies unable to secure training, Field Search is also available on the NLECTC website. As indicated during the training, Field Search is best used as a way to gather information on newly sentenced or released offenders which can be used for treatment purposes and as a way to ensure that the conditions of

supervision and treatment are being complied with. Field Search is not a forensic tool and should not be used when prosecution for a new crime is the goal. In addition, Field Search is a point in time screen which can be used throughout supervision but the most effective and comprehensive monitoring programs should include a system that provides the ability to continuously and remotely monitor an offender's computer activity.

Joe Russo is Program Manager for Corrections for the Rocky Mountain Region of the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center in Denver, Colorado.

For more information on the Managing Sex Offenders' Computer Use training and the Field Search software please visit www.justnet.org/fieldsearch/ or contact Joe Russo at jrusso@du.edu.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

These reviews are contributed by Donald G. Evans, President of the Canadian Training Institute, and Dan Richard Beto, Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation and Editor of *Executive Exchange*.

Executive Exchange welcomes reviews of books and periodicals dealing with leadership and management issues, innovative programs and strategies, correctional policy, and trends in criminal justice. In addition, reviews of potential text books are also encouraged.

Another View of the Crime Problem

A review of *Power, Politics, and Crime*, by William J. Chambliss. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1999, 192 pp., \$20.00 (paperback).

There are signs in the United States that the race to incarcerate may be nearing the finish line, but it looks like there is a second wind occurring. After a decade or more of declining crime rates, we are again faced with the possibility of an increase in the crime rate and its obvious implications for corrections. In the past five years there have been a number of interesting academic studies and popular press articles that have called for a more rational approach to the perceived problems of crime control. The past presidential campaign in the United States was remarkable for the lack of emphasis on crime. In fact the major criminal justice debate centers on questioning the death penalty! Lately there has been a renewed interest in treatment within corrections. And of particular note, the Canadian exported "what works" research is a bigger hit with our neighbors to the south than in its reputed birthplace.

Not long ago, a Republican member of the legislature from a Southern state told an audience of chief probation officers that no more prisons would be built in the coming years. He cited the fact that the state was a leader in incarceration rates in the United States and that this was nothing to brag about. His main concern was the facts, as he understood them, which indicate that offenders are coming out of prison worse than when they went in. Also, he gave an example that related to women's imprison-

ment by noting that the 500 women imprisoned in one of the institutions had a total of 1,600 dependent children. This fact, he said should cause us to pause and ask what the current rage to punish is doing to the future generation. The representative also noted that in his state, 20 to 25 percent of the prison population suffered from mental illness and could (and should) be more profitably managed in hospital settings.

I cite his comments because they clearly reflect the changing perspective occurring among some legislators. Generally politicians and the press are quick to cite studies and policies that back the use of imprisonment and other "tough on crime" activities but slow to report on the recent development of concern about the tough approach. To assist our thinking about such policies and explore some of the critiques of the "get tough" approach, the book by William J. Chambliss, professor of sociology at George Washington University, provides some helpful analysis and insight.

Chambliss book is organized into three main sections, the first dealing with what he calls "propaganda," in which he explores the issues of the politics of fear and the marketing of crime that he calls the "politics of crime statistics." His thesis is simple and direct: "Distorting the reality of crime and wasting billions of dollars on crime control is an egregious public policy mistake. But equally serious is the fact that the burgeoning criminal justice industry creates widespread fear and suspicion."

In the second section the author deals with what he calls the "practice of crime control." Through ethnographic observations and analysis of census data, and relying on historical research, he describes what has been happening and the consequences for different segments of the population as a result of the crime control policies.

Chambliss explores crime in the ghetto and the white lower class and uses the examples that he gives to note that the crime control industry is not focused equally and that this has enormous consequences for the residents of these areas. In his view, finding crime is a self-fulfilling prophecy, and the images created by the press, politicians, and police contribute to this state of affairs. Another chapter in this section deals with the war on drugs, which the author gives the highly emotional subtitle, "America's ethnic cleansing." He uses this chapter to highlight the unequal treatment of minorities in the enforcing of drug laws. He argues for serious consideration to be given to the decriminalization of certain drugs. He notes that the "law enforcement propaganda that lumps all illegal drugs together as equally dangerous makes sensible policies and rational personal decisions impossible."

The concluding section deals with the implications of current crime policies, in which he explores two areas in particular. First, he relates to the fiscal implications of imprisonment and the impact of government budgeting strategies. Here he suggests that the crime control industry has made it necessary to reallocate funds from education and healthcare in order to support the growth of the criminal justice system. Secondly, he notes that crime myths become smoke screens for hiding from public view the criminal activity of corporations, law enforcement, and state organized crime. This chapter makes for very sober reading. Chambliss concludes this chapter by noting that "law enforcement agencies must be transformed from organizations that focus exclusively on 'crime control' to organizations whose mission is to implement social justice."

The author concludes his book by noting that the "legitimacy of office-holders no longer depends on upholding principles of fairness and social justice; it depends solely on the ability to use power for personal and political gain." He continues by writing "law enforcement agencies will continue to distort and lie about crime rates to meet their particular needs at any point in time. The crime control industry will continue to lobby and propagandize to buttress their profits and increase the size of their bureaucracies."

After presenting a rather dismal perspective on the current state of crime control policies and organizations, the author suggests what he calls simple solutions that are possible. He lists the following:

- Reversal of the policy of more-severe sentences for all offenders including juveniles;
- Creation of a well-informed press who must be skeptical of reports from politicians and law enforcement agencies;
- More civilian control of law enforcement bureaucracies;
- Training police officers to use less force and more conflict resolution techniques;
- Requiring prosecutors to use conflict resolution approaches in more cases;
- Create institutions to "guard the guardians"; and
- The need to seriously address the problems caused by corporate crime.

Chambliss book will be considered by some to be a bit over the top, but there is enough factual and observational data in this book to force one to stop and think about our current approaches to the issues of crime in our society. In another respect, I am reminded of that Republican legislator's main concern about the direction of our current policies, namely that if we are not careful, we will

have legislated ourselves into a police state, in which case the cure would now be the crime of the century as far as individual liberty is concerned.

Donald G. Evans

Examining Leadership

Recently we received several publications dealing with management and governance issues that contained articles worthy of attention. That which follows are brief reviews of three articles that have relevance to the probation profession.

Universal Elements

Review of "Recipe for Success," by Dave Denison, in the Winter 2007 issue of *CommonWealth*.

The Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth, founded in 1996 and commonly known as MassINC, is "an independent, nonpartisan research and educational institute." As part of its mission, MassINC "brings together diverse perspectives — including those held by conservatives and liberals, business and labor, advocates and policy makers — to focus on the challenge of achieving the American Dream in Massachusetts." Headquartered in Boston, MassINC is a tax exempt 501(c)(3) organization that identifies itself as "a new kind of think tank," in that it "combines the intellectual rigors of academic research with the timeliness and energy" needed to get its ideas into the public arena.

One of MassINC's products is *CommonWealth*, a quarterly publication that focuses on politics, ideas, and civic life in Massachusetts. In the Winter 2007 issue of *CommonWealth* is found an article by Dave Denison, a veteran journalist whose investigative reports, news stories, editorials, columns, profiles, book reviews, and essays have appeared in countless publications, including the *Boston Globe*, *Texas Observer*, *New York Times Magazine*, *Dallas Morning News*, and the *American Prospect*. The title of his article is "Recipe for Success," and offers suggestions on how the newly elected Democrat Governor Deval Patrick might have a productive and satisfying, if not great, term of office.

In his article, Denison offers "eight elements of success" that Patrick should embrace. The author's eight elements, drawn from interviews with former governors, politicians, and management experts, are as follows:

- Hire good managers;
- Set an ethical tone;
- Set clear priorities;
- Master the budget;
- Find a way to work with the legislature;
- Stay on the job;
- Show some courage; and
- Invigorate democracy.

These elements of success are just as applicable for executives in the field of probation as they are for governors.

This article is available online in a pdf version at the following Internet address: www.massinc.org/fileadmin/commonwealth/winter_2007/recipe_for_success.pdf

Executive Exchange

Denison's essay provides an excellent vision of leadership, and probation executives would find benefit in reading it.

Executive Development: Asking the Important Questions

Review of "What to Ask the Person in the Mirror," by Robert S. Kaplan, in the January 2007 issue of *Harvard Business Review*.

The January 2007 edition of the *Harvard Business Review* is devoted to the topic of leadership, and this publication contains a number of worthy articles. A particularly interesting one is contributed by Robert S. Kaplan, former Vice Chairman of the Goldman Sachs Group and presently the Thomas S. Murphy Senior Lecturer of Business Administration at Harvard Business School in Boston, Massachusetts. In "What to Ask the Person in the Mirror," Kaplan suggests that executives well along in their careers need to periodically ask themselves a series of questions in seven strategic areas to ascertain just how well they are performing.

Vision and Priorities

In this area, for executives to know if they have adequately communicated their vision to the organization, they should ask the following questions:

- How often do I communicate a vision for my business?
- Have I identified and communicated three to five key priorities to achieve the vision?
- If asked, would my employees be able to articulate the vision and priorities?

Managing Time

According to Kaplan, "leaders need to know how they are spending their time." In addition, they "need to ensure that their time allocation (and that of their subordinates) matches their key priorities." To determine this, the following questions are suggested:

- How am I spending my time? Does it match my key priorities?
- How are my subordinates spending their time? Does that meet the key priorities for the business?

Feedback

Many executives fail to provide timely feedback, instead relying on the antiquated practice of providing an annual performance evaluation. Likewise, a number of executives fail to cultivate subordinates who will honestly provide them with information and, if warranted, criticism. With respect to feedback, Kaplan raises the following questions:

- Do I give people and timely feedback that they can act on?
- Do I have five or six junior subordinates who will tell me things I may not want to hear but need to hear?

Succession Planning

Many leaders of organizations fail to groom possible successors, and this is particularly true in government service. To determine

if succession planning is being given adequate attention by executives, they should ask:

- Have I, at least in my own mind, picked one or more potential successors?
- Am I coaching them and giving them challenging assignments?
- Am I delegating sufficiently, or have I become a decision-making bottleneck?

Evaluation and Alignment

According to Kaplan, because the world is constantly changing, leaders need to adapt their organizations to meet the changing demands. To assist in this effort, executives should pose the following questions:

- Is the design of my organization still aligned with the key success factors for the business?
- If I had to design my organization with a clean sheet of paper, how would I design it? How would it differ from the current design?
- Should I create a task force of subordinates to answer these questions and make recommendations to me?

Leading Under Pressure

Kaplan writes: "A leader's actions in time of stress are watched closely by subordinates and have a profound impact on the culture of the firm and employees' behavior. Successful leaders need to be aware of their own stress triggers and consciously modulate their behavior during these periods to make sure they are consistent with their beliefs and core values." To assess behavior under stress, executives need to ask:

- What types of events create pressure for me?
- How do I behave under pressure?
- What signals am I sending to my subordinates? Are these signals helpful, or are they undermining the success of my business?

Staying True to Yourself

"Successful executives develop leadership styles that fit the needs of their business but also fit their own beliefs and personality," writes the author. The following questions will assist executives in determining their effectiveness as a leader:

- Is my leadership style comfortable? Does it reflect who I truly am?
- Do I assert myself sufficiently, or have I become tentative?
- Am I too politically correct?
- Does worry about my next promotion or bonus cause me to pull punches or hesitate to express my views?

Kaplan has provided an instructive article that any person in a position of authority would derive benefit by reading.

Leading Transformation

Review of "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail," by John P. Kotter, in the January 2007 issue of *Harvard Business Review*.

Another significant article appearing in the January 2007 issue of the *Harvard Business Review* is a reprint of the article "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail" by leadership guru John P. Kotter that appeared in the Spring 1995 issue. This article is as relevant today as it was when it was first published almost 12 years ago. The author, now retired, was the Konosuke Matsushita Professor of Leadership at Harvard Business School and a regular contributor to the literature of leadership.

According to Kotter, executives who are charged with leading change efforts in their organizations must do eight things right and in the right order. More specifically, leaders must:

- Establish a sense of urgency
 - Examine market and competitive realities
 - Identify and discuss crises, potential crises, or major opportunities
- Form a powerful guiding coalition
 - Assemble a group with enough power to lead the change effort
 - Encourage the group to work together as a team
- Create a vision
 - Create a vision to help direct the change effort
 - Develop strategies for achieving that vision
- Communicate the vision
 - Use every vehicle possible to communicate the new vision and strategies
 - Teach new behaviors by the example of the guiding coalition

- Empower others to act on the vision
 - Get rid of obstacles to change
 - Change systems or structures that seriously undermine the vision
 - Encourage risk taking and nontraditional ideas, activities, and actions
- Plan for and create short-term wins
 - Plan for visible performance improvements
 - Create those improvements
 - Recognize and reward employees involved in the improvements
- Consolidate improvements and produce more change
 - Use increased credibility to change systems, structures, and policies that do not fit the vision
 - Hire, promote, and develop employees who can implement the vision
 - Reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes, and change agents
- Institutionalize new approaches
 - Articulate the connections between the new behaviors and organization success
 - Develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession

The author emphasizes that this process requires commitment and a willingness to embrace a long term and sometimes difficult initiative.

Persons interested in reading more on this subject are encouraged to read Kotter's 1996 book *Leading Change* published by Harvard Business School Press.

Dan Richard Beto

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE FORMED

NAPE President **Rocco A. Pozzi** has created an Editorial Committee to assist in the production of *Executive Exchange*. In addition to **Dan Richard Beto**, who serves as Editor and Chair of the committee, and **Christie Davidson**, NAPE's Executive Director, members appointed included **Donald G. Evans** of Canada, **Francine Perretta** of New York, **Robert L. Bingham** of Indiana, and **Ronald G. Schweer** of Missouri.

EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE SURVEY

During the summer of 2006 members of the National Association of Probation Executives who subscribe to the NAPE listserv were asked to respond to an electronic survey about *Executive Exchange*, the organization's quarterly publication. This survey, conducted by Secretary **Melissa Cahill**, was commissioned by the Board of Directors in response to several questions posed by the Editor of *Executive Exchange*, during the Board of Directors meeting held in Chicago.

The electronic survey was designed to solicit responses from the readership to questions concerning areas of interest in articles, publication format, and willingness to contribute to *Executive Exchange*. A total of 57 responses to the survey were received, the results of which may be found below.

Do you read *Executive Exchange*?

The survey reflects that *Executive Exchange* is being read by NAPE members. Of those responding, 43 (75.4%) reported "always" reading the journal, and 13 (22.8%) said they read *Executive Exchange* "sometimes." Only one person (1.8%) said that he or she did not read the journal at all.

Which parts of *Executive Exchange* do you read regularly (check all that apply)?

The most popular part of *Executive Exchange* were the articles contributed by professionals (94.7%), followed by "News from the Field" (82.5%), "President's Message" (70.2%), and the book review section (50.9%).

Executive Exchange

What subjects would you like to see covered in future editions of *Executive Exchange* (check all that apply)?

This open-ended question gleaned a variety of responses. The top five areas of interest included a desire to see articles on leadership (87.7%), specific probation programs (86.0%), management (64.9%), technology (57.9%), and finance and budgeting (40.4%).

In addition, 13 respondents (22.8%) provided a list of other topics to which they would like to see articles devoted in future issues of *Executive Exchange*; the list included the following subjects: international events, trends, initiatives, and programs pertaining to probation; ethics; successful probation and parole programs; research applicable to program development and program evaluation; examples of effective partnerships and collaboration; point/counterpoint on topics where there may be differences of opinion; innovative programs or techniques; best practice models of supervision; strategic planning; organizational development and culture; and resource allocation.

What additional features would you like to see in *Executive Exchange*?

This question generated responses from 17 (29.8%) members. While some of these responses were similar to the answers found in the preceding question, new suggestions included the following subjects: profiles on probation chiefs; politics; programs and activities in members' jurisdictions; leadership development; employment information, promotions, retirements, and job announcements; interviews with probation leaders on program implementation and the future; and policies, procedures, and programs that would aid small agencies.

Other suggestions included: articles on succession planning; reports on international conferences; more coverage of community corrections and juvenile justice; information on research projects; more survey information relating to probation and parole; and probation office facility design.

One respondent expressed a desire to see information that showed "some tie-in with the ACA Probation and Parole Committee and how they are addressing the following problem statements: 1) raise the public's awareness of the purpose of probation; 2) showcase the critical role of probation in the criminal justice system; 3) explain the importance of having a strong and vital probation system; 4) establishing a single, unified voice for probation."

Would you be willing to write an article for *Executive Exchange*? If you are willing to write an article, what topic would you be interested in covering?

Only 23 (40.4%) of the respondents expressed a willingness to contribute an article for publication consideration.

Of those who expressed a willingness to contribute an article, they provided a wide variety of subjects, including articles dealing with: interagency cooperation; morale; probation consolidation and deconsolidation; performance-based budgeting; mental health issues; re-entry programs; organizational change; employee relations; vision and the future; real leadership; special programs, such as job court, pre-parole unit, special services for mentally ill or developmentally disabled offenders; automated case management system; ethics; experiencing in implementing successful programs and evidence-based practices; national accreditation; book reviews and articles relating to the future of probation; parole policies; addiction and drug courts; continuum

of sanctions; issues relating to specific categories of offenders; and legal issues involving community corrections.

Currently *Executive Exchange* is formatted with mostly text for articles. Do you like this format? If you do not like this format, please indicate what specifically you do not like.

Responses to this question revealed that an overwhelming 54 (94.7%) NAPE members liked the current format, with only three (5.3%) who did not like it.

As to the follow-up question, only one person responded. That member expressed the view that *Executive Exchange* should have a "more creative, eye appealing layout," with "briefer articles or at least abstracts for each article."

Please feel free to add any additional comments.

Nine people provided additional comments in response to this opportunity to share their thoughts about *Executive Exchange*, most of which were positive in nature. The additional comments are as follows:

- Perhaps a special edition occasionally on topics of major importance;
- Good publication overall; I enjoy all the information and all the happenings;
- Too much about Dan Beto and Sam Houston State;
- Like the publication in its current format. Easy to read and choose articles and information that is most relevant for me. No real substantive recommendations at this time.
- I share many of the messages and articles regularly at management and general staff meetings. I find this to be one of the most useful resources in doing my job, implementing new ideas, and challenging the department to be future focused.
- I think the articles are relevant and interesting. I would like to see more articles on motivational strategies for directors and department staff.
- I've appreciated *Executive Exchange*.
- I generally carry *Executive Exchange* with me to court hearings and to other meetings for reading in down times. The articles are the perfect length to read, and I don't have to wade through advertisements to continue reading an article. Keep it light!
- You may wish to consider increasing the font size of the articles and news items. I particularly like the position NAPE has taken concerning advertisements. NAPE has resisted becoming a publication that is overrun with advertisements like APPA, AJA, and ACA. Congratulations to Dan Beto and Christie Davidson at Sam Houston State University for consistently producing an excellent publication.

We are grateful to those NAPE members who took the time to participate in this survey. Their thoughtful comments will provide us with guidance in better serving the membership. In addition, we are grateful to those members who expressed an interest in contributing articles for future editions of *Executive Exchange*. Persons wishing to contribute to *Executive Exchange* should feel free to contact **Dan Richard Beto** [979-822-1273 or probation.executives@gmail.com] or **Christie Davidson** [936-294-3757 or davidson@shsu.edu].

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA LIMITS TRIAL COURTS AUTHORITY TO ORDER BODILY FLUIDS FROM OFFENDERS

As a result of an October 13, 2006, opinion issued by the Supreme Court of Canada, Parliament will have to rewrite legislation before trial court judges can order convicted offenders to provide bodily fluids upon request. In *R. v. Shoker*, 2006 SCC 44, No. 30779, Justice **Louise Charron** wrote: "A sentencing judge has a broad jurisdiction in determining appropriate conditions of probation; however, there is no authority under the Criminal Code to authorize a search and seizure of bodily substances as part of a probation order. It is Parliament's role to determine appropriate standards and safeguards governing the collection of bodily samples for enforcement purposes."

According to a synopsis provided by the Supreme Court of Canada, the accused, **Harjit Singh Shoker**, "was convicted of breaking and entering a dwelling house with intent to commit sexual assault. A psychological pre-sentencing report revealed that accused blamed his drug use for his behavior and recommended requiring the accused to submit to random urinalysis to manage his risk in the community." He was subsequently sentenced to imprisonment followed by a period of probation. According to the synopsis, "the probation order required that he abstain absolutely from the consumption and possession of alcohol and non-prescription narcotics and, to determine compliance with the abstention condition, that he submit to urinalysis, blood tests, or breathalyzer tests upon the demand of a peace officer or probation officer. The order also stated that any positive reading would be a breach of the abstention condition."

Shoker appealed the conditions, and the British Columbia Court of Appeal overturned part of the court's order. A majority of the British Columbia Court of Appeal held that the Criminal Code grants a sentencing judge statutory authority to include a monitoring condition in a probation order but that compelling the accused to provide bodily samples, in the absence of a governing regulatory or statutory framework, is contrary to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Court of Appeal also held that the sentencing judge had no jurisdiction to predetermine that a positive reading was a breach of probation. Upon appeal by the government, the Supreme Court upheld the ruling of the Court of Appeal.

ENHANCED SCRUTINY FOR SEX OFFENDERS

For the week preceding October 31, 2006, and a couple of days following, newspapers and television news shows throughout the United States reported on specialized efforts of probation, parole, and law enforcement agencies to restrict sex offenders' activities to protect young trick-or-treaters on Halloween Eve.

In addition to imposing more restrictive curfews on sex offenders, other strategies employed included random and planned home inspections, roving patrols, requiring offenders to report for training or treatment during the trick-or-treating hours, providing DNA samples, imposing restrictions on house decorations and answering the door for costumed children, and community notification efforts.

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY ADDS CANINE TO ASSIST IN DRUG DETECTION

In October 2006, the Northumberland County Adult Probation and Parole Department in Sunbury, Pennsylvania, purchased a two year old chocolate Labrador to assist officers in detecting drug possession and use by offenders under supervision. The dog, named Cloud, will be used to:

- Enhance the department's ability to detect controlled substances possessed by offenders, thus increasing offender accountability and community protection;
- Reduce the amount of staff time needed to conduct narcotic searches;
- Assist staff in searching difficult areas, such as perimeter searches and in cluttered areas;
- Deter offenders from possession controlled substances; and
- Enhance community knowledge of drug problems and improve probation-community relations through canine demonstrations and public appearances.

"With two-thirds of the 1,500 or so people under court supervision dealing with drug issues of some kind, the drug-detecting canine was a needed addition to the department," said President Judge **Robert Sacavage**. "The department's 20 officers often have to search homes in instances where there is a reasonable suspicion of drug involvement. This is an inherently dangerous activity. To the extent that we give officers guns and automobiles, the dog is an important tool.

"We have a vast drug problem here," Sacavage noted. Purchasing a drug-detecting dog "is not a luxury anymore, it's a necessity."

"In the past," Chief Probation Officer **Michael Potteiger** said, "the department was able at times to use drug dogs employed by neighboring county police departments, but the decision to purchase and train a canine for the agency's own use became a priority as the drug problem continued to escalate."

District Attorney **Anthony Rosini** was supportive of the purchase.

The dog's handler, probation officer Jim Cortelyou, said the partnership has resulted in much more effective searches. "Cloud can search a house in about 30 minutes," he said, noting that it took two to three hours for a team of four officers to conduct a similar search.

The community and local businesses have shown support for the dog, including an offer for free veterinarian care by the Sunbury Animal Hospital and free food from Weis Markets. In addition, the Northumberland County Vo-Tech Program assisted in decaling the K9 vehicle.

"The battle against drugs needs community support because everybody has a stake in it," Sacavage said. "Either we combat it with all our resources or it will consume us."

"This continues to be a learning process for both the dog and the handler, but they are making progress," said Potteiger. This was demonstrated when Cloud had his first "hit" on November 1, 2006, during an inspection of a residence in Point Township. Cloud was able to find two sandwich bags of marijuana, cutting

Executive Exchange

agents, and a scale in the home of an offender, who was suspected of illegal drug activity. "Cloud did his job," Potteiger added.

This new addition to the probation department is received favorable coverage in the local papers.

RYAN ASSUMES GREATER RESPONSIBILITY IN FLORIDA

On November 9, 2006, NAPE member **Timothy P. Ryan** was confirmed by the Miami-Dade, Florida, Board of County Commissioners as Director of Corrections and Rehabilitation. He began service on December 4, 2006, assuming responsibility for the 6th largest jail system in America, leading 2,695 staff that includes over 1,900 certified correctional officers.

Ryan, a 1970 graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, began his career in corrections as a deputy sheriff for the Alameda County Sheriff's Office in Oakland, California. For the next 28 years, he moved up the ranks within the department to Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, and Commander.

In 1998 he was selected as Chief of Correction for the Santa Clara Department of Correction in San Jose, California. After four years in San Jose, Ryan was named Chief of Corrections for Orange County, Florida, responsible for 4,200 confined offenders and 7,000 in community-based programs. It was during his tenure in Orange County that Ryan became involved with NAPE, participating in the Executive Development Program at Sam Houston State University.

BJS RELEASES LATEST DATA ON PROBATION AND PAROLE POPULATIONS

In November 2006, the Bureau of Justice Statistics released *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2005* written by statisticians **Laurel E. Glaze** and **Thomas P. Bonczar**. The report reflects that at yearend 2005 there were an estimated 7,056,000 persons under some form of correctional supervision. Of that number, 4,162,536 offenders were on probation, 784,408 on parole, 747,529 in jails, and 1,446,269 in prisons.

This report in pdf version and related statistical data and tables are available at the BJS web site: www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ppus05.htm. Once at the site, click on "Acrobat file (387K)" for the actual report.

NAPE MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONGRESS

On November 22-30, 2006, a delegation of corrections leaders from the United States and Canada visited Poland at the invitation of Adam Mickiewicz University, the University of Gdansk, the Probation Officers Association of Wielkopolska, and the Central Board of the Prison Service.

The delegation, organized by the National Association of Probation Executives and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, had as its members: **Dan Richard Beto**, Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, and a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives and the Texas Probation Association, led the delegation; **Donald G. Evans**, President of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, and a former President of the American Probation and

Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association; and **Doug Dretke**, Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, and a past President of the Texas Corrections Association.

Also attending the conference from the United States and a nominal member of the delegation was NAPE member **Gerald R. Hinzman**, Director of the 6th Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and President-elect of the American Probation and Parole Association.

The primary purpose of this trip was to attend the IV Penitentiary Congress held in Kalisz, Poland, on November 22-24, 2006, which had as its theme "the mission of the prison service in the face of current correctional policy and social expectations."

At the conference, members of the North American delegation, along with a number of other conference participants, presented papers. Beto spoke on "correctional leadership: a return to the basics" and Evans addressed "correctional treatment regimes and the need of consistency." Dretke's subject dealt with "the promises and perils of private prisons" and Hinzman discussed "the use of community based residential facilities in the correctional continuum."

In addition to Poland, the United States, and Canada, countries represented at the conference included Great Britain, Germany, France, the Russian Federation, and the Czech Republic.

Following the conference, members of the North American delegation toured two prisons, a high security juvenile facility, and an orphanage. In addition, they visited the courts in Gniezno and Poznan, as well as the probation office in Poznan. They also held a series of meetings with representatives of the Central Board of the Prison Service, the Probation Officers Association of Wielkopolska, and Adam Mickiewicz University.

During their time in Poznan, members of the delegation were hosted by **Piotr Burczyk**, President of the Probation Officers Association of Wielkopolska, **Irena Szostak**, Chief Probation Officer, and **Anna Kosterkiewicz-Kwiatkowska**, a probation officer. Also serving as hosts in Poznan were **Piotr Stepniak**, Head of Penitentiary Studies, and Dean **Wieslaw Ambrozik**, both of Adam Mickiewicz University.

BOWIE COUNTY PROBATION FOCUSES ON SUBSTANCE ABUSE NEW YEAR'S EVE

An article written by **Lynn LaRowe Sandefur** and appearing in the December 31, 2006, issue of the *Texarkana Gazette* describes a special supervision initiative of the Bowie County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Texarkana, Texas.

On New Year's Eve and continuing into the early morning hours of New Year's Day five probation officers and an investigator with the District Attorney's Office assigned to work with the Drug Court in Bowie County visited probationers with drug and alcohol abuse problems.

"This is the first time we have done this for New Year's," said Chief Probation Officer **Jack Pappas**. "This goes hand in hand with the special programs and drug courts we have implemented. We need to be out there checking on these folks," he added.

The department has already instituted a policy of providing intensified supervision efforts for sex offenders on Halloween night.

Pappas believes the random visits will provide increased public protection and serve as a deterrent. He hopes the program will

encourage probationers to remain free of drugs and alcohol during the biggest party night of the year. "We know this is a tough time for a lot of people; we want them to succeed," he said.

For probationers attempting to maintain their sobriety and as an alternative to remaining at home, Alcoholics Anonymous gathered at a community center for dinner and fellowship. Following dinner, motivational speakers addressed those in attendance. The local AA community held meetings all night to assist those struggling with sobriety.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICES ANNOUNCES INITIATIVE TO COMBAT COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN

The U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) announced On December 8, 2006, a \$1 million award to the Salvation Army and its partners for a new initiative to reduce and eliminate the commercial sexual exploitation of children in the United States. The funding will be used to develop a national, multi-site training and technical assistance program to assist five selected cities in coordinating investigative, prosecutorial, and victim service resources.

The announcement was made at the first meeting of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Community Capacity Building Initiative in Chicago, Illinois, where representatives from federal, state, and local organizations gathered to build alliances to combat commercial sexual exploitation of children.

"We are coming together to protect our children through a unique partnership," said OJP Assistant Attorney General **Regina B. Schofield**. "This program draws upon the commitment and expertise of law enforcement, prosecutors, community advocates, and most importantly, the victims themselves."

The two-year cooperative agreement was awarded to the Salvation Army and its primary partners, Girls Educational and Mentoring Services (GEMS), Polaris Project, and the Bilateral Safety Corridor Coalition. The five selected cities are Atlantic City, Chicago, Denver, San Diego and Washington, D.C.

Combating the sexual exploitation of children is a major priority of the Department of Justice. In February 2006, Attorney General **Alberto R. Gonzales** announced the Project Safe Childhood initiative. Project Safe Childhood brings together U.S. Attorneys, federal, state, and local law enforcement, and non-government organizations to combat the proliferation of technology-facilitated sexual exploitation crimes against our nation's children. For more information on Project Safe Childhood, please visit the web site www.projectsafchildhood.gov.

The Office of Justice Programs provides federal leadership in developing the nation's capacity to prevent and control crime, administer justice, and assist victims. OJP is headed by an Assistant Attorney General and comprises five component bureaus and an office: the Bureau of Justice Assistance; the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the National Institute of Justice; the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; and the Office for Victims of Crime, as well as the Community Capacity Development Office, which incorporates the Weed and Seed strategy and OJP's American Indian and Alaska Native Affairs Desk.

FULLER ASSUMES NEW POSITION

NAPE Vice President **Joanne Fuller**, after more than 15 years with the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice,

became Director of the Multnomah County Department of Human Services in Portland, Oregon, in January 2007.

In her new position, Fuller will oversee more than 500 employees committed to providing human services to Multnomah County citizens. The Department of Human Services consists of Aging and Disability Services, Developmental Disability Services, Domestic Violence Services, Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Business Services. The role of this agency was expanded when Multnomah County commissioners merged the Department of School and Community Partnerships with the Department of Human Services.

Fuller earned her bachelor's degree in psychology from Lewis and Clark College in 1980 and a Master of Social Work degree from Portland State University in 1986. During her tenure with the Department of Community Justice, Fuller served in a number of positions of increasing responsibility; she was a supervisor for services for female offenders and their families, Senior Manager for Adult Probation Services, Deputy Director for Juvenile Services, Deputy Director, and Director.

In addition to serving on a number of boards and committees in Oregon, Fuller is active in a number of professional organizations and is frequently called upon to speak at national conferences. She is a former member of the Advisory Board and faculty of the National Resource Center for Police-Probation Partnerships.

"She has been an innovator in community corrections and is widely respected by her colleagues throughout the country," said NAPE President **Rocco A. Pozzi**.

Cheryl K. Townsend, a former NAPE President who has worked with Fuller on a number of initiatives, commented that "her departure from community corrections will leave a significant leadership void."

In 2006 Fuller was recognized as the Probation Executive of the Year by the National Association of Probation Executives when she was presented with the *Sam Houston State University Award*.

Replacing Fuller as Director of the Department of Community Justice in an interim capacity is **Steve Liday**, Assistant Director for Adult Services. Liday, a veteran with the department, does not plan to seek the position permanently and, as a result, a national search will be conducted to fill the position.

JUVENILE DETENTION SUPERINTENDENT HIRED IN INDIANAPOLIS

Richard L. Curry, Jr., a 14 year veteran with the Indiana Department of Correction, has been hired as the new Superintendent of the Marion County Juvenile Detention Center in Indianapolis, Indiana, effective January 2, 2007.

A U. S. Army veteran with service in Germany, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq, Curry worked his way up through the ranks of the Indiana Department of Correction from an entry level correctional officer to Assistant Superintendent of Operations at the Putnamville Correctional Facility. He is also a minister, and serves as the Senior Pastor of the True Tried Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis.

"Two important things are underway at the Juvenile Detention Center: the first is increased attention to the basics, things like safety, security, and cleanliness of the center. The place has to be clean, the students fed, and the center must be adequately staffed for the protection of the students and the community,"

said Chief Probation Officer **Robert L. Bingham**, who was tasked with administering the center since April 2006 following revelation of staff misconduct and the arrest and firing of a number of employees.

"What is also underway is changing the culture and the mindset of the people who work here. Everyone isn't suited to work in a correctional or detention environment. We need employees who can balance appropriate discipline with care and concern. Richard's experience and management philosophy are essential ingredients to our ongoing reform efforts," Bingham added.

Curry is a graduate of Indiana Wesleyan University where he earned a bachelor's degree in management.

"Out of the 55 applicants from our national search, Richard's background outdistanced the competition. Richard impressed us as a dedicated, focused professional who understands the need for strict compliance with policy and procedure, the importance of training and staff development, and the recognition that detention improvements are based on team building and collaboration. We are eager to begin the new year with a new Superintendent in place to continue the reform efforts begun by Robert Bingham and Acting Superintendent **Kevin Riley**," said **Ron Miller**, Administrator for the Marion Superior Court.

NEW JUVENILE JUSTICE HEAD APPOINTED IN FLORIDA

Walter A. McNeil, Chief of Police for Tallahassee, Florida, has been named Secretary of the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice by Governor **Charlie Crist**. McNeil, a 28-year veteran with the Tallahassee Police Department, earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Southern Mississippi and a master's degree from St. Johns University in Springfield, Louisiana. He is an adjunct professor at Florida A&M University and has been active in youth programs and civil activities.

In announcing his appointment, Crist said that McNeil was "a dedicated public servant who obviously is dedicated to public safety."

McNeil said that his new job will be a "mix of prevention and corrections, with emphasis on the first."

According to **John Proctor**, one of Tallahassee's Deputy Police Chiefs, McNeil is "an excellent leader, a dynamic guy, and a family man. All of that is important in the work he has to do."

CARWAY RETIRES IN NEW YORK

On January 18, 2007, veteran probation executive **John J. Carway**, Director of the Nassau County Probation Department in Mineola, New York, retired after more than four decades of distinguished service.

Carway, who earned a bachelor's degree from Fairfield University in Connecticut and a Master of Social Work degree from Fordham University of New York, began his community corrections career in Nassau County as a probation officer in June 1964. In 1970 he was named Supervisor of Community Services and later Supervisor of the Family Court Division. From 1971 to 1979 he served as Assistant Director for Research and Staff Development. Commencing in 1979 and continuing to 1996, Carway was Assistant Deputy Director. He was named Chief Deputy of Probation in 1996, a position he held until 2001, when he was named Director of the department following the retirement of his predecessor.

In addition to his duties as Director of the Nassau County Probation Department, Carway also served as Commissioner of the Nassau County Parole Board. He has also had a private practice of social work for more than 30 years.

Carway is active in a number of organizations and boards, including the National Association of Probation Executives, American Probation and Parole Association, Nassau County Youth Bureau, Health and Welfare Council of Long Island, Nassau County Family Violence Task Force, and the American Academy for Professional Law Enforcement.

During his tenure as Director, Carway was able to rebuild the department following massive retirements, hiring more than 166 new probation officer, probation assistants, and support personnel. In addition, he was able to secure 191 promotions for members of this staff. Also during his administration, the Sex Offender Unit was formed, as was the Gang Unit and the Electronically Assisted Reporting (EARS) Unit to utilize new speech recognition technology to keep track of low risk probationers and pre-trial releasees.

Although retired, Carway said he plans to remain active in public service.

PAST PRESIDENT PARTICIPATES IN ROUNDTABLE ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

On January 18-19, 2007, **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and a NAPE past President, attended a roundtable in New York City hosted by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Center for Court Innovation to discuss "Trial and Error: Failure and Innovation in Criminal Justice Reform."

In addition to Corbett, persons invited to participate in the roundtable included: **Greg Berman**, Director of the Center for Court Innovation; **Theron L. Bowman**, Chief of Police of Arlington, Texas; **Foster Cook**, Director of Jefferson County Community Corrections in Alabama; **Ronald Davis**, Chief of Police of East Palo Alto, California; **Jaime Fuster Berlinger**, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico; **Elizabeth Glazer**, First Deputy District Attorney in Westchester County, New York; **Frank Hartmann**, Senior Research Fellow at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University; **Domingo S. Herraiz**, Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice; and **Michael P. Jacobson**, Director of the Vera Institute in New York City.

Other invitees included: **Robert Keating**, Adjunct Professor for the Judicial Honors Extern Program at Pace University in New York; **Adam Mansky**, Director of Operations for the Center for Court Innovation; **Philip Messer**, Chief of Police for Mansfield, Ohio; **Timothy J. Murray**, Executive Director of the Pretrial Services Resource Center; **Juanita Bing Newton**, Administrative Judge of the Criminal Court of the City of New York; **Chauncey G. Parker**, Director of Criminal Justice Services for the State of New York; **Michael D. Schrunk**, District Attorney for Multnomah County, Oregon; and **JoAnn Wallace**, President of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

During their deliberations, the roundtable participants focused on three primary topics, which included: 1) the tension between creating space for innovation and the need to make hard decisions in a world of finite resources (e.g., money, staffing); 2) the tension between the need to manage power dynamics (e.g., the expectation of elected officials, the demands of the local media)

and the need to create an institutional culture that promotes honest reflection and learning from failure; and 3) lessons for the field.

As a result of this meeting, a paper will be prepared that will address a number of the failures in the criminal justice system, such as failure of design, failure of implementation, failure to manage power dynamics, and failure to engage in self-reflection.

"This was a productive meeting," said Corbett. "I was impressed with the diversity of the group and the quality of the discussion. I hope the report from this meeting will provide some guidance to the field."

PROGRAM CREATED TO REDUCE TEXARKANA JAIL POPULATION

According to an article written by **Lynn LaRowe Sandefur** and appearing in the *Texarkana Gazette* of January 24, 2007, a unique partnership has been formed in Texarkana, Texas, to ease the pressure on the Bowie County Jail. The new Alternative to Incarceration Program (AIP) was created to place non-violent offenders on "true" house arrest instead of sentencing them to the Bowie County Jail.

Offenders whose criminal histories do not reflect violent offenses may be allowed to serve all or a portion of their sentences at home under the intense supervision of the Bowie County Community Supervision and Corrections Department and sheriff's officers assigned to the District Attorney's Office.

When offenders are placed on AIP, they are confined to their residences unless permitted to leave by supervising officers. A bright green sticker bearing the program's initials will be affixed to the door of the offenders' residences and on the back windows of their vehicles, said **Jack Pappas**, Bowie County Chief Probation Officer.

Offenders will also be subjected to electronic monitoring and be required to wear vividly hued wristbands. The stickers and wristbands will allow for easy identification by law enforcement and members of the community.

"We want the whole community to supervise these people," said Pappas. If an AIP participant is noticed engaging in suspicious behavior, police should be contacted, he said.

Visitors to the homes of AIP offenders will be subjected to criminal history checks and arrest if warrants for them are found, said Mary Choate, a sheriff's deputy assigned to the District Attorney's Office to monitor these offenders. "We are actually seeing very few visitors other than immediate family," she added.

Offenders will be permitted to leave their homes for medical treatment, programs, and employment, said Choate, who makes daily contact with AIP participants.

During the day AIP offenders will be engaged in treatment programs, performing community service, or working.

"If they meet the criteria and we can make productive citizens out of them, AIP may be appropriate," said **James Carlow**, Bowie County Judge. "For some people, there is a better punishment than jail."

Those offenders with jobs will be required to pay their own way. Pappas noted that the supervision of an offender on AIP will cost a fraction of what the county spends to house a person in jail — approximately \$40 per day assuming there exists no medical issues. Once the AIP caseload reaches 100, "the savings to the county will amount to close to \$1 million per year," Pappas said.

"Getting low-risk offenders out of jail to make room for more serious ones makes sense," said Pappas. "We're not sacrificing justice or safety. AIP gives judges another sentencing option."

The courts, county commissioners, prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and probation officers are working collaboratively to make this program a success.

JAMES FULLWOOD RECEIVES HIGH HONOR FOR HUMAN SERVICE

"**James R. Fullwood** has dedicated his professional, spiritual, and personal life to improve human and race relations within his community." This was the introductory statement to the biographical essay that won Pender County native James Fullwood the *John R. Larkins Award*, one of North Carolina's highest honors for human services. Nominations are submitted to the Governor's Office of Community Affairs by the employee's manager, supervisor, or agency head. A panel selected by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Observance Committee judges each entry.

On January 12, 2007, at 12 noon at First Baptist Church in Raleigh, Fullwood was bestowed this honor during a program for the 2007 State Employees' Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. Fullwood was born in Pender County and graduated from C. F. Pope High School in Burgaw. He went on to further his education at North Carolina Central University, where he earned a bachelor's degree in commerce. He began his impressive career in criminal justice in 1974 as a probation/parole officer. Over the next three decades Fullwood would work his way to the higher ranks in the field of adult probation. Currently, he serves as a Second Judicial Division Chief in the Division of Community Correction.

However, it is not his path of steady job promotions that prompted the nomination for the prestigious award; instead it is his outstanding track record as a humanitarian. From 1971-1973, Fullwood acted as a Unit Representative for the Racial Harmony Council when he served as a specialist in the United States Army in Fort Carson, Colorado, and received recognition for his outstanding service.

In his current position, he helped promote an effort to recruit more Spanish speaking probation officers. As a result of this initiative, numerous Spanish speaking employees were hired and basic Spanish training for current officers was conducted. Due to Fullwood's efforts, the Division of Community Corrections initiated this concept statewide to meet the needs of a growing Hispanic population.

Although his admirable ambition moved him to the state capital, Fullwood has never turned his back on his roots in the Southeastern region and has often loaned his courageous spirit to his hometown folks. Along with the members of the local chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., Fullwood made history when they convinced Wilmington city council members and county commissioners to seriously consider and pursue changing the name of Smith Creek Parkway to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Parkway.

Despite very blatant opposition from some elected officials and local citizens, he and his "frat brothers" never backed down and the parkway was indeed named for the slain civil rights leader, who was also a member of Alpha Phi Alpha.

More recently, Fullwood purchased The Union Chapel School in March 2005 to be renovated as a cultural center focusing on

education, tutoring, and mentoring youth. The school was established in 1863, and the one room building was constructed in 1908 for African American children in the Yamacraw Community of Pender County.

In July 2005, it was relocated to land owned by Fullwood. It is his hope that in the spring of 2008, the community will host a dedication ceremony and the school's first reunion.

Certainly, these are just few reasons cited as why **Robert Lee Guy**, the director of the Department of Correction Division of Community Corrections, nominated Fullwood for the award. For through his position at work and his beloved fraternity he is and has been involved with various projects ranging from helping the homeless to mentoring young males in the community. Furthermore, as a member of Ebenezer Missionary Baptist Church, he serves as a trustee and a teacher for the youth.

In his written explanation of why he felt Fullwood was deserving of the award, Guy concluded, "Believing that all people can live together, work together and flourish together in racial harmony, he has pioneered a diverse array of civic and community activities by reaching out to both local and national leaders..."

This article was written by **Johanna Thatch-Briggs** and appeared in the January 25, 2007, issue of *The Wilmington Journal* in Wilmington, North Carolina.

CROGAN NAMED AS WHITTINGTON'S REPLACEMENT

In the last issue of Executive Exchange it was announced that longtime NAPE member **Marie Whittington**, Chief Probation Officer for Riverside County, California, planned to retire in early 2007. On January 23, 2007, the Riverside Board of Supervisors unanimously confirmed **Alan Crogan** as Whittington's replacement.

Crogan has held senior positions in the probation departments for Santa Barbara and San Diego Counties. In 2003 he retired as San Diego County's Chief Probation Officer.

Crogan was selected following a nationwide search; it is anticipated he will succeed Whittington in late March.

DOVER POLICE CHIEF HEADS NEW HAMPSHIRE DIVISION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES

On January 29, 2007, Dover Police Chief **William Fenniman** became the Director of the New Hampshire Division of Juvenile Justice Services. Fenniman, who spent 26 years with the Dover Police Department, served as Chief since 1991.

The Division of Juvenile Justice Services is part of the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services. In his new position, Fenniman administers a staff of 350 and a \$60 million budget. The agency serves approximately 5,200 youths in the justice system annually.

In explaining his choice of Fenniman for the position, Health and Human Services Commissioner **John Stephen** said "since my days at the Attorney General's Office and at the Department of Safety, I have been extremely impressed with the positive values in the youth in Dover through a number of community based programs, many of which were organized, overseen, and implemented by the Dover Police Department under Bill Fenniman."

Dover City Manager **Michael Joyal** praised Fenniman for improving community outreach and singled out his efforts in

helping youth. "Since he became Police Chief, the department has been recognized as one of the most innovative in the state," Joyal said.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS WILL RELOCATE ITS LONGMONT FACILITY

In April 2007 the National Institute of Corrections will close its facility in Longmont, Colorado. The Academy and Information Center will remain in Colorado, but will move closer to Denver International Airport. The new location for the Academy and Information Center will be 791 Chambers Road in Aurora, Colorado.

Training programs initially scheduled for the Longmont facility will be held in the Aurora facility. Changes to scheduled training programs will be posted on the NIC web site.

The Jails Division will join NIC's other program divisions in Washington, D.C.

TOPICS IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS RELEASED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

The National Institute of Corrections has recently released the 2006 issue of *Topics in Community Corrections*. This latest issue, produced under the direction of **George M. Keiser**, Chief of the Community Corrections/Prisons Division and who provides the foreword, deals with the topic "Effectively Managing Violations and Revocations." Several NAPE members contributed to this publication, which contains articles on the following subjects:

- A New Look at Violations of Community Supervision;
- Taking a System Approach to Reducing Parole Violations;
- Ohio's Evidence-Based Approach to Community Sanctions and Supervision;
- State and Local Agencies Partner to Manage Violations of Supervision in Oregon;
- Four-Point Strategy Reduces Technical Violations of Probation in Connecticut;
- An Ounce of Prevention: Proactive Supervision Reduces Violation Behavior;
- Pre-Parole Unit and Job Court Reduce Violations in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania; and
- Violation Management in Missouri: The Change Process and One State's Plan.

This publication is available online at www.nicic.org/library/period301.
