

# National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

FALL 2006

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

### THE PROBATION CHALLENGE

As incoming President of The National Association of Probation Executives, I had the honor and privilege of addressing our association at our breakfast meeting held in Chicago on July 23rd. I titled the speech, "The Probation Challenge." I will attempt to recreate the major themes of that address.

The first challenge for probation is to answer the question, "How does probation become a 'Real Player' with a 'Seat at the Table'?" Unfortunately, we are viewed as the "secret service" of the criminal justice system. We need somehow to shed this secret shroud that continues to place our profession in the shadows of the justice system. It is time to commence efforts to establish collaborative relationships in order to develop strategies to market probation. Best practices research, articles that appear in professional journals, and conferences to discuss the plight of probation are falling short of telling the real probation story. 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?

Today, I am asking you to join me in taking the "Probation Challenge." In those annoying TV commercials, Madison



Avenue wanted us to take the "Pepsi Challenge." We want taxpayers, judges, and elected officials to take the "Probation Challenge." What do I mean by that?

Much of our federal and state criminal justice resources are now focused on homeland security. The mission of NAPE during the next two years under my stewardship must be to bring equal attention to "Community Security." A high profile educational campaign must be launched to convince taxpayers, elected officials, and voters to "Take the Probation Challenge." In appropriate cases, probation has proven to be a smarter and tougher sentence as compared to doing time with "Fred and Ethel" in prison. Probation contributes to community safety everyday. How? Here's the evidence. The statistics speak for themselves.

- In 2004, nearly seven million people were on probation, in jail or prison, or on parole at year end. That amounts to 3.2% of U.S. adult residents or one in every 31 adults.
- State and federal prison authorities had in custody 1,421,911 inmates while local jails held 713,990 individuals awaiting trial or serving a sentence at mid year 2004. An additional 70,548 were under jail supervision serving their sentences in the community.
- Regarding probation, at year end 2004, over 4.9 million adult men and women were under federal, state or local

*Continued on page 3*

## CONTENTS

President's Message: The Probation Challenge, <i>Rocco A. Pozzi</i> .....	1
Message from the Guest Editor, <i>Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.</i> .....	2
The Power of Partnership: A Conversation with Jeremy Travis .....	4
Intelligence Led Probation: What We Can Learn from Policing, <i>Donald G. Evans</i> .....	6
Partnerships between Community Corrections and Police Agencies in Texas: The View from the Police, <i>Jurg Gerber, Ph.D., Bitna Kim, and Dan Richard Beto</i> .....	8
Westchester County Department of Probation and the City of Mount Vernon Police Ride Along Program, <i>Rocco A. Pozzi</i> .....	11
Police-Parole Partnerships Continue to Evolve, <i>Bill Rankin</i> .....	14
Creating and Maintaining Police-Probation Partnerships, <i>Bernard Fitzgerald</i> .....	16
Partners in Fugitive Apprehension: Maricopa County Adult Probation Department and the U. S. Marshals Service, <i>Cathy Wyse</i> .....	18
Police-Probation Partnership Advances School Safety, <i>Thelma Grimes</i> .....	19
Law Enforcement Profile: The Secret Ingredient in the Offender Reentry Program, <i>Frances Breyne</i> .....	20
From the Bookshelf .....	22
Association Activities .....	24
News from the Field .....	28

## GUEST EDITOR'S MESSAGE

There has been a police-probation connection from the beginning. Lieutenant Edward Savage of the Boston Police Department, history records, was the first person sworn to probation officer duties, assuming that position in 1878 in probation's birthplace — Boston, Massachusetts. Drawing on the ranks of law enforcement for future probation officers was not a model that persisted long. Soon enough, the casework model then predominant in the emerging profession of social work was controlling in probation and continued, some would say, up to the present.

A shift in orientation — a return, in a way, to the first model — began to occur in the 1990s, when the notion of formal police-probation partnerships was reintroduced and strengthened. Surely, it was not an entirely new concept. In the same way that veteran police officers would remark on the “new” idea of community policing as a throwback to the days of the beat cop, so also many veteran probation officers would observe that they had always collaborated with local police departments, though in a low-key, non-programmatic fashion, typically.

Why the surge of interest in more formal arrangements? First, steady and worrisome increases in violent crime in the late 1980s and early 1990s caused all criminal justice agencies to change practice in the direction of more aggressive response and increased emphasis on staff safety. In probation circles, under the urgent circumstances, it seemed logical to partner with the police to both signal probation's resolve to a generation of crack-smoking, gun-toting probationers and to add a layer of security when undertaking neighborhood

contacts. Boston's Operation Nightlight and Texas' Project Spotlight were perhaps the most noteworthy of these efforts, which grew exponentially during the 1990s.

Where do these partnerships stand a decade later? The report card is mixed. In states such as California and Massachusetts, it seems as if there has been a clear and seemingly permanent change in practice, particularly with respect to joint patrol and absconder apprehension. In many other instances, when the early enthusiasm and initial funding ran out, both agencies returned to prior practice. So it often is with innovation in criminal justice, early enthusiasm and adoption followed by declining support, once dubbed the “panacea phenomenon” by Rutgers University criminologist Jim Finkenauer.

The contributors to this special edition of *Executive Exchange* offer a kind of retrospective of the police-probation movement. Articles include a report on the current situation in Texas, an in-depth interview on the subject with Jeremy Travis of John Jay College, and some ruminations by past APPA President Don Evans on one area where probation can learn from contemporary police practice. Were it possible, we would have added Lt. Savage's perspective as well.



**Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.**  
Executive Director  
Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court  
Past President

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE *cont'd*

probation and parole jurisdiction –4,151,00 on probation and 765,400 on parole.

- Among offenders on probation, half (50%) had been convicted for committing a misdemeanor; 49% for a felony and 1% for other infractions.
- Juvenile court statistics reveal that probation is imposed in 62% of adjudicated delinquency cases and approximately 675,000 juveniles are under probation supervision.

Despite these statistics, probation continues to be a “stealth” service that is not always on the radar screen of our criminal justice system. How do we change the perception of probation?

- By applying modern marketing strategies that are common in the private sector. Probation must begin to employ “Madison Avenue” techniques to develop an image for probation. This can only be done by investing time, energy and yes, even some revenues to develop the message.
- Too often we are talking to ourselves. All of our best practices and performance-based accreditation standards speak into an internal microphone. It is now time to aggressively tell our story into an external microphone.

What stories should we be telling? All too often stories appearing in the media are focused on something that went “wrong.” It’s time to start printing the “right stuff.” Positive stories that highlight probation intervention strategies with both adult and juvenile offenders must be brought to the attention of the public. Also, probation’s role concerning new issues that are facing our communities and the criminal justice system need to be emphasized.

Today, I want to take this opportunity to declare my goal to seek public attention to recognize the wonderful work our probation officers perform with kids and families coming through our family courts. Issues concerning status offenders, juvenile justice intervention strategies for violent prone youth,

family court/criminal court crossover cases and integrated service planning can provide compelling stories of probation helping families in crisis. We are the gatekeepers to family court and yet few ever know we are associated with family court activities.

Our current successes in dealing with difficult and dangerous adult offenders, such as sex offenders, batterers, drug offenders and those who make an automobile a deadly weapon because of alcohol abuse must begin to share the headlines that are sweeping across the front pages of our local newspapers. And, our new challenges, dealing with disproportionate minority representation in our system, issues involving human trafficking, and the bulging number of probationers coming through our door with mental health

issues are being confronted with our professions unusual tenacity and willingness to take on these new, difficult, and complex challenges.

In order for probation in the 21st century to be fully embraced and recognized by other members of the criminal justice community and our communities, probation departments nationwide must seek to strike a balance among social work, advocacy, and the traditional means of law enforcement. Probation leaders must be willing to allow their departments to avail themselves of all legal authorities and traditional law enforcement tools to address the risks and needs of today’s offenders while assuring, most importantly, protection of the community.

In conclusion, the challenges facing our profession to gain recognition as one of the major components of the justice system are within our grasps. We must educate our communities that probation, as a sentence and sanction, is not an alternative sentence but the sentence of choice in American jurisprudence. Finally, probation as a profession must be recognized as the keystone of the criminal justice system. This cannot happen without our elected officials and our communities taking the “Probation Challenge.”

 <p><b>POLICE</b></p>	 <p><b>COURTS</b></p>
 <p><b>CORRECTIONS</b></p>	 <p><b>PROBATION</b></p>

**Rocco A. Pozzi**  
President

# THE POWER OF PARTNERSHIP: A CONVERSATION WITH JEREMY TRAVIS

On June 20, 2006, former NAPE President Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., conducted a conversation with Jeremy Travis, President of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice (affiliated with the City University of New York). President Travis, appointed to his current position in 2004, previously served as Director of the National Institute of Justice and as Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters for the New York City Police Department, among other key positions. Throughout his distinguished career, he has championed the concept of partnership, both among criminal justices agencies as well as between the academic and practitioner worlds. The following is a transcript of the conversation between Corbett and Travis.

---

**RC – The focus for our discussion is police-probation partnerships. Any initial observations?**

JT – I’m puzzled by the cultural distance between police and probation. Both entities provide critical public safety services to the community. Probation, with its direct involvement with the supervision of offenders, offers rich opportunities for creative collaboration with the police in the service of public safety. It is striking that these two organizations remained so removed from each other even though there is such a strong overlap in their missions.

**RC – Why the separation?**

JT – Police departments over time became far removed from the community – they lost touch with the realities of streets and neighborhoods. Likewise, probation was removed from the community and historically had seen itself as a case management organization aligned with the courts rather than the community. As each entity moved toward greater contact with the community, the historical divide seemed more artificial and counter-productive. Both eventually got caught up in the evolution within the justice world toward greater community partnership.

**RC – What do you see as the utility of a real police-probation partnership?**

JT – There is great untapped potential there. Probation is charged with the supervision of large numbers of offenders living in the community so as to reduce future offending. The police have the responsibility of producing public safety. Probation staff can be an asset to the police because they know who the high risk people are. In fact, both probation and the police have intelligence about offenders. Sharing that knowledge will make both more successful at their core mission.

The congruity of function between the two suggests that they have a lot to learn from each other.

**RC – Do you see any risks in such a partnership?**

JT – We could worry that probation officers would become cops by another name – merely an extension of law enforcement. We could worry that this would simply create a larger surveillance apparatus, a network that got better at detecting violations but not at helping offenders get right with society and become productive citizens in the long term. Something will be lost if it is too much stick and not enough carrot.

**RC – How could an appropriate alliance work?**

JT – We start with the recognition that all those under probation supervision were originally arrested by police officers. Probation can let those officers know what happened as a result of their arrest and, in this way, the police can see themselves as part of a larger system and process. It can be as simple as the supervising probation officer getting back to the arresting officer to let that officer know what action the court took and the current status of the offender. The police currently don’t get that kind of feedback nearly often enough.

Imagine further that “John Jones” is under probation supervision in a particular neighborhood. The beat officers should know that Mr. Jones is on probation. They can act as extensions of the probation officer in keeping a watchful eye with respect to such issues as curfews. Both police and probation could focus on encouraging Jones when they observe positive behavior – for example, taking care of siblings, going to church, working steadily. In this way, the positive forces at work in the life of the probationer are recognized and encouraged by both entities. Offenders will then see police in a new, problem-solving role.

The criminal justice system doesn’t do enough to celebrate successful reintegration. We know from research that offenders “age out” — they leave behind their patterns of anti-social behavior and become law abiding. Knowing this, the criminal justice system has an obligation to help offenders find personal pathways to desistance. We know that many things contribute to desistance – attachment to family, church, employment, etc. Criminal justice agencies should be mindful of and encourage these positive forces. The justice system can do so much more to discourage criminal behavior.

**RC – You have served as Deputy Commissioner and General Counsel for the New York City Police Department. Is partnership a difficult task for police organizations?**

JT – Historically, it is true that police find it difficult to partner. It is less true today than it was ten years ago due to the rise of community policing. That model, at its core, calls for working with a range of entities on a pragmatic approach to crime reduction. Police are now expected to look outside themselves for help in identifying problems and finding solutions. Collaboration with community corrections presents a very productive opportunity, given the overlapping mission.

It is true that it is not easy for police to partner. It is easier for them to be self-reliant and insular. But they are not effective if they are inward looking. They are more effective if they are



Jeremy Travis

outward looking and take on collaborations, to help keep crime rates low.

**RC – How do you construct successful partnerships?**

JT – It’s not as simple as saying “Let’s find partners” or “Let’s emphasize partnerships.” What is required is a culture that promotes interagency collaboration and a problem-solving philosophy. Both potential partners need a deeply embedded culture that prioritizes these values or the partnership will become an artificial exercise.

Once a commitment to the goal of producing safety at the neighborhood level is truly present, those in charge will begin to look around to find people help them with that job and then police and probation will find each other.

**RC – Do you see a national trend toward more commitment to collaboration among criminal justice agencies?**

JT – No question about it. You need look no further than the work done in Boston. Through such efforts as Operation Ceasefire and the Boston Gun Project, collaboration was fostered among federal, state, and local agencies, as well as social service organizations and the community. It is a striking example of how much collaboration is possible and the results that can be achieved. We have made great progress nationally in terms of promoting collaboration but we have much further to go.

**RC – You are the President of a major college, with a particular focus on criminal justice. What role is there for universities such as yours in this effort?**



Ron Corbett

JT – When I headed the National Institute of Justice, I promoted the idea of research-practitioner partnerships. I am on the other side of that divide now and still believe that the academic community has a lot to offer to the world of practice — analytic skills, evaluation capacity, theoretical insights in understanding crime and desistance, independent, objective assessments of innovation and more. All that can help practitioners do a better job.

At the same time, those in the academic community can benefit from the real world experience not available in the university. For example, by providing students the opportunity to work jointly on projects with practitioners, we collaborate in educating the next generation in new ways of responding to enduring challenges.

**RC – You are closely identified with the topic of prisoner reentry, particularly through your book *But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry* published last year. What do you see as the future of reentry?**

JT – I hope the next decade is a time of the testing big ideas, of new ways of approaching reentry. I hope to see bold initiatives that would test fundamentally different approaches to aiding offenders through the process of returning home and turning away from crime. Two major recommendations in my book involved reentry courts and justice intermediaries. Through pursuing ideas like those and others, there is an opportunity for fundamental reform.

**RC – President Travis, on behalf of the membership of NAPE, thank you for your time and for your work.**

JT – You’re welcome.

## INTELLIGENCE LED PROBATION: WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM POLICING

by

Donald G. Evans

---

The interest in police-probation collaborations has been growing ever since probation became focused on the reduction of re-offending by offenders under supervision. It is timely that probation leaders begin to ask questions concerning what they have learned from these collaborations. For example, have there been any innovations in policing that might be considered useful for probation departments as they strive to improve the quality and effectiveness of their work in the community? "Intelligence-led policing" is such an innovation that has application to the way probation is approached.

One hallmark of a good collaboration between probation and police agencies has been the practice of information sharing. Better information on and about offenders makes for improved supervision and the development of program interventions that disrupt and prevent criminal activity. It also provides a good source of information about gang activity and other criminal associates that when used appropriately provides a tool for the reduction of criminal activity in the community. Probation agencies can learn from developments in policing such as the movement towards "intelligence-led policing" with its emphasis on crime reduction.

The concept "intelligence-led policing" originated in the England. The police service in Kent developed the concept in response to a series of robbery / theft offenses in their jurisdiction. Wishing to reduce the volume of property / retail crime in their community, they set up a process to gather and analyse intelligence about the crimes, identify and target the problem areas and offenders, and establish a mechanism to evaluate results from their efforts. From this small beginning the concept has been refined and spread to other police agencies and has become a tool in police and community efforts to reduce crime.

It is interesting that in some police jurisdictions, problems similar to those faced by probation were being addressed. In efforts to tackle crime effectively both these agencies faced the realization that:

- Existing functions and levels of accountability lacked the necessary integration and efficiency required for the task;
- Probation and police were not making the best use of resources available; and
- The recognition that a more targeted approach to prolific offenders (the "critical few") who account for the majority of criminal activity would be more efficient.

The efforts by probation agencies to use evidence-based practices and to re-tool probation services to be more effective in pursuing a reduction of offender re-offending has encouraged the development of probation-police partnerships. The next step should be learning how to lead probation services by the use of intelligence. Borrowing on the concept of "intelligence-led policing," probation can enhance its ability to reduce re-offending and prevent further victimization.

### Intelligence-Led Probation: A Working Definition

The concept of intelligence-led probation can be viewed as the application of offender information (gained from assessments and supervision work) analysis as a critical decision-making instrument that would facilitate a reduction in re-offending behavior and prevent new victimization through the use of effective probation interventions and collaborative multi-agency partnerships that are evidence-based in their approach to crime reduction. This approach is a model of probation in which information about offenders and their environments acts as a guide to interventions geared to the reduction of re-offending. It is proactive and anticipatory rather than passive and reactive. The foundational task of this approach is that the work of probation is to prevent offending and not just react to it.

An intelligence-led probation service would operate using strategic frameworks that build on the strengths of evidence-based assessments and interventions.

### Assessing the Risk of Re-Offending

Just as the police gather and analyze intelligence about the crimes committed in a community to assess the risk of criminal activity, so too can probation officers use intelligence to sort their caseloads can beginning to sort out their caseloads and target resources to those most likely to re-offend, allowing officers to take actions to prevent new offenses. A careful use of assessment and supervision reports will allow probation agencies to adhere to proportionality in dealing with their caseloads. A careful constructed strategy aimed at deploying resources to the offenders carrying the greatest risk of re-offending will mean that probation is dealing with serious high impact, but few in number, offenders. This strategy would also build public confidence in the work of probation.

### Managing the Risk of Re-Offending

Probation agencies that develop evidence-based programs and target high risk of re-offending offenders (the small percentage of active and repeat offenders who commit a disproportionate number of offenses) are more likely to see reductions in re-offending in their communities. Dealing with these prolific offenders will enable probation to make a major contribution to the safety of the community. Fewer offenders re-offending will change the volume of gang related activities, and drug involvement will be decreased in the local community.

Another important aspect of managing the risk of re-offending is the critical task of engaging the local community in the work of probation. A responsive community will make it more difficult for offending behavior to go undetected. Community members, whether individuals or groups, are sources of information about criminal activity and also hold the key to open doors

that will assist offenders to re-integrate back into a pro-social environment.

Joining with the community will also help probation leaders to refine their thinking about the types of re-offending reduction strategies that could be implemented locally. For example, will the community support rehabilitative efforts and/or restorative justice models?

### Responding to Re-Offending

The last point in this model is to use the information gathered to influence and impact the decisions made to deploy resources and develop interventions. Using the information available from offender assessments probation agencies should be able to determine who they should be targeting and what interventions should be applied. By connecting offenses committed, or likely to be committed, to identified criminogenic needs, the department should be able to devise interventions that meet the needs and break or limit the impact of those needs on re-offending behavior. Examples include dealing with criminal associates through programs geared to gang exit strategies, treatment interventions for substance abusers, specialized programs for offenders with histories of violent behavior. Curfew monitoring and drug testing are also useful interventions to assist in reducing opportunities to violate conditions of probation. Using information about the offender and his or her environment allows for the development of preventive measures in the local community and increases the likelihood that working partnerships will be developed locally.

### Conclusion

The task of effectively working with high-risk offenders who have a propensity to re-offend is an important and critical aspect of probation work today. Is it possible to use the ideas involved in the intelligence-led policing model and adapt them for probation? I believe we can learn much from this concept and could better use the information probation gathers through assessment, field visits, and supervision activities to manage a difficult and problematic group of offenders. Using information to target high risk offenders allows probation to break the problem of re-offending into manageable pieces that is in line with their case management approach and provides for enhanced accountability. These "critical few" offenders are identifiable and there is evidence that appropriately delivered interventions will impact this group of offenders and a reduction in re-offending is possible. Just as the police should be driven by intelligence to act rather than merely react, so should those working in probation.

---

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

A version of this article appeared in the August 2006 issue of *Corrections Today*. It is reprinted with the permission of the American Correctional Association of Alexandria, Virginia.

---

## 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 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 drbeto@shsu.edu or dbeto@tca.net or by conventional mail to:

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

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* may be directed to Dan Richard Beto, Editor, 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.

## PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AND POLICE AGENCIES IN TEXAS: THE VIEW FROM THE POLICE

by

Jurg Gerber, Ph.D.  
Bitna Kim  
Dan Richard Beto

---

### Introduction

Although police agencies are involved in the early stages of criminal justice processes and probation and parole become involved relatively late, there is an obvious overlap in activities in the monitoring of the behavior of offenders. After an offender has been placed under some form of community supervision he or she may be monitored by an appropriate community corrections officer as well as law enforcement officers. In theory, this requires collaboration and cooperation between community corrections and police agencies. The more the representatives of the two types of agencies are familiar with each other's work, the more efficient and effective they are likely to be in their own. For instance, community corrections officers may assist police officers in their effort to investigate crimes. Similarly, a police officer who arrests a probationer may assist the probationer and the probation officer with a simple telephone call. Instead of proceeding with the usual criminal justice processes, a collaborative effort between the police and the probation department may lead to more efficient, and better, efforts of protecting the community and reintegrating an offender who has transgressed again, albeit in a minor fashion.

In practice, partnerships between community corrections and police agencies have been in existence for many years, but in most instances they have been relatively informal. Instead of having elaborate and formal arrangements as their basis, they often relied on personal friendships. A particular probation officer may have had a good friend working for the police, and they collaborated, but they did so on a personal rather than an agency level. The collaboration likely ended when the personal link was no longer present:

Unfortunately, most partnerships of this nature were based on individual relationships and rarely did they translate into formal relationships between agencies. With retirements, reassignments, promotions, and changing priorities, many of these wonderful personal relationships evaporated during the 1980s, and the effectiveness of offender supervision suffered (Beto, 2005).

### Operation Night Light, Project Spotlight, and other Probation-Police Partnerships

There were several more formal partnerships that existed in the United States throughout the 1990s that were aimed at formalizing the informal arrangements of an earlier time. Operation Night Light in Boston was one such example that focused on youth violence and gang-related youth violence. Responding to high rates of youth violence and the failure of the traditional crime control model that had probation and police officers working

independently, Boston attempted a new approach that formalized collaboration between agencies. Furthermore, Operation Night Light also changed monitoring patterns. Instead of visiting high risk youths during conventional daytime hours, teams of probation and police officers made surprise visits between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and midnight. These changes resulted in a substantial decrease in arrest rates for probationers under this program (Corbett, 1998; Kelling and Corbett, 2003).

Around the same time, under the guidance of the Manhattan Institute, a nationwide effort to transform probation was initiated. The Reinventing Probation Council took its inspiration from the "broken windows" thesis on policing. In its most basic form, the broken windows thesis states that police should respond to minor problems in communities. If left unchecked, these minor problems will evolve into major ones. However, instead of simply enforcing the law, police officers should take a proactive problem solving approach to their work; an approach that includes meaningful partnerships with other agencies (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000).

Project Spotlight was an effort in Texas at such reforms. Grants from the Governor's Office allowed the creation of teams of juvenile probation officers, community supervision officers, and police officers in seven counties to provide better and more coordinated supervision of at-risk populations. Similar to Operation Night Light and the recommendations made by the Reinventing Probation Council, the Texas program included supervision during late evening hours, but also the provision of services from various social and community agencies (Beto and Kester, 2002; Beto, 2005).

Other examples of collaborative relationships developed in the 1990s between law enforcement and community corrections include: the Anti-Violence Initiative in Minneapolis, Minnesota; Clark County Anti-Gang Unit in Vancouver, Washington; Project One Voice in New Haven, Connecticut; Smart Partners in Redmond, Washington; Fugitive Recovery Enforcement Team in San Francisco, California; Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership in Indianapolis, Indiana; and an information sharing project in Phoenix, Arizona (Parent and Snyder, 1999; Griffin, et al., 2004). And more recently we have witnessed the growth of partnerships between law enforcement and community corrections agencies for the purpose of conducting probation and parole sweeps throughout the United States (News from the Field, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c).

The creation of partnerships between probation and police agencies has not been limited to the United States. The value of such relationships has been seen in Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Australia, where various forms of partnerships have been created (Evans, 2006; News from the Field, 2006a, 2006c).

## Survey of Texas Law Enforcement Agencies

The success of such programs hinges upon the level of support they receive from the parties involved. If partnerships are simply mandated from “the top down” rather than endorsed and nurtured they are much less likely to work. In an attempt to evaluate the partnerships that existed, the Correctional Management Institute of Texas and the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation surveyed adult and juvenile community corrections agencies to determine the nature and perceptions of partnerships with police agencies (Beto, 2005). In the current survey we interviewed Texas law enforcement departments to learn about their perceptions. Borrowing from earlier surveys by Sexton (2000), Hughes (2000), and TELEMASP (no date), we were particularly interested in the nature and impact of the effect of leadership and organizational core culture on partnerships. We hypothesized that strong organizational leadership that supports and endorses partnerships with community corrections agencies would lead to more and better partnerships. Furthermore, we also hypothesized that police agencies that possess a core culture that values collaboration have a greater number of partnership agreements than agencies that see the police mission in more isolated terms. Finally, we were interested in learning if any differences existed between municipal police departments and sheriff’s offices in terms of partnerships.

We sent surveys, with the approval of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at Sam Houston State University, to 243 sheriff’s offices in the State of Texas and drew a random sample of 262 municipal police departments. We monitored responses and then contacted the offices and departments again that did not respond to the survey after three weeks. These departments received a second copy of the questionnaire and were again encouraged to complete it. Ultimately, we received 101 completed surveys from sheriff’s offices and 130 from municipal law enforcement departments (plus one that was complete but the respondent did not mark the question concerning the type of law enforcement agency for which he or she worked). The total response rate was 45.9 percent. While not outstanding, this is generally considered acceptable.

### Major Findings

A first finding is that law enforcement departments tend to have more relationships with adult probation departments than with adult parole or with juvenile probation departments, although the difference between adult and juvenile probation is often minimal. For instance, about 65 percent of the law enforcement departments have an informal partnership with adult probation departments with respect to information and intelligence sharing (the corresponding figures for adult parole and juvenile probation are 51.3 percent and 62.3 percent, respectively). For most other forms of “enhanced supervision partnerships” and “specialized enforcement partnerships” the figures are lower, but they are consistently higher for adult probation than for adult parole and about comparable for juvenile probation. For instance, 49 percent of law enforcement agencies have an informal partnership with adult probation agencies with respect to “interagency problem solving partnerships” but only 26 percent do so with adult parole, while about 46 percent of law enforcement departments have them with juvenile probation. With most other forms of specialized enforcement partnerships (e.g., sex

offenders, domestic violence, gun removal, drug trafficking, bar checks, and so on) and enhanced supervision partnerships (e.g., ride alongs, targeting high crime areas, and targeting high risk offenders) the figures drop considerably although in many cases 20-40 percent of law enforcement departments report some form of informal relationships between them and adult and juvenile probation departments.

However, the overwhelming majority of law enforcement departments do not have any formal partnerships with any community corrections agencies. The greatest number we found for any form of formal partnership was 14 for law enforcement departments and adult probation. In the vast majority of cases, literally only a handful (i.e., less than five departments) reported formal partnerships with various types of community corrections agencies on specialized topics. This means that most of these partnerships are not likely to survive when key individuals are transferred or retire (see Beto 2005).

Second, we were interested in how respondents from law enforcement departments who have either formal or informal partnerships evaluate these partnerships. In other words, do they see the partnerships as beneficial to their own agencies or do they see them as a strain on resources? In general, law enforcement representatives were quite positive in their assessments of the partnerships. About 57 percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement that “working with adult probation agencies has given me a great appreciation for their job” (the corresponding figures for juvenile probation and adult parole are 67 percent and 50 percent, respectively). Similarly, more than 60 percent of all respondents say that the partnerships with each of the three kinds of community corrections agencies “has been a positive experience.” Most optimistically, around 80 percent of respondents agreed with the statement, “I believe that the partnership with Adult Probation [Adult Parole or Juvenile Probation, respectively] is an effective method for supervising offenders.” At the same time, only a small percentage of the respondents agree with the statement that the partnerships have led to a decrease in adult and juvenile crime, respectively.

On a related note, we were interested in determining if law enforcement officers receive any formal training with respect to the work performed by the various community corrections agencies. Our study indicates law enforcement officers are much more likely to receive training with regards to juvenile probation than with regards to adult probation and parole. About 26 percent of law enforcement departments that have some form of partnership with a juvenile probation department receive at least some training on their work (the corresponding figures for adult probation and parole are 11 and 8 percent, respectively).

Third, we were interested in studying any differences in partnerships between sheriff’s offices and municipal law enforcement departments. We found no statistically significant differences in partnerships between the two types of departments and adult parole and juvenile probation, respectively. However, sheriff’s offices are much more likely to have partnerships with adult probation than do municipal law enforcement departments. For instance, they are three times as likely to have formal partnerships with adult probation with respect to information and intelligence sharing. Similarly, they are more than six times as likely to have a formal partnership with respect to fugitive/absconder apprehension units. For many of the other enhanced supervision and specialized enforcement partnerships the differences are not as dramatic, but they indicate consistently that sheriff’s departments

are more likely to have both formal and informal partnerships than municipal law enforcement departments.

Finally, we were interested in studying the relationship between the nature of the core culture of the law enforcement agency, support of the leadership of the agency, the existence of partnerships, and how they are seen by the agency. The concept of core culture was measured by support for statements such as: "The majority of employees in our organization believe that selected groups of offenders can change their behavior and life styles than that a balanced combination of sanctions, supervision, and services can assist them in doing so." The concept of leadership, in turn, was measured by agreements with statements such as: "The leaders of our organization know what it will take to create and maintain an interagency public safety alliance in our jurisdiction, and they are committed to doing so."

We hypothesized that good leadership and supportive core culture would lead to more partnerships and existing partnerships would be evaluated more positively. Our findings indicate partial support for our hypotheses. Consistent with our expectations, good leadership leads to more informal partnerships (the number of cases of formal partnerships was too small to allow for any meaningful statistical analyses), but a core culture supportive of partnerships does not seem to lead to more partnerships. However, there are very strong, positive relationships between supportive core culture and good leadership and positive evaluations of existing partnerships. Law enforcement departments that are characterized by a core culture that strongly supports interagency partnerships tend to evaluate them positively. The same holds true for departments that have leaders that see a benefit in partnerships.

### Implications

The results of our survey lead us to be cautiously optimistic about the future of partnerships between police and community corrections agencies. It appears that partnerships between probation departments and police are better established than those involving police and parole departments. However, there are also some troubling signs in the nature and extent of partnerships.

Beto (2005) showed that partnerships in the past were primarily informal in nature and thus were often terminated when key individuals retired, were transferred, or were promoted. Programs such as Operation Night Light and Project Spotlight included provisions that would formalize such arrangements and thus become more permanent. However, our survey indicates that this is not the case in Texas at this time. The overwhelming majority of partnerships that exist at this time are informal rather than formal and are thus subject to the problems identified by Beto (2005).

Law enforcement departments have more partnerships with probation departments than with parole departments. Although we did not include items in the questionnaire that would let us formally examine this issue, it is reasonable to speculate that differences in the level of local control between probation and parole departments can account for this fact. Probation offices are under local control whereas parole is under state-level control. This would lead us to predict that probation officers are more likely to seek out partnerships with local law enforcement departments (and vice versa) than is the case for parole officers. Both sheriff's offices and municipal law enforcement departments are local stake holders rather than being oriented toward state-level issues.

One of the most encouraging findings of our survey is that law enforcement departments that have partnerships with community corrections agencies tend to view them favorably. This leaves room for hope for expansion of such partnerships in the future. Transfers and movement of key individuals could lead to expansion. As they move to new positions in departments that do not have established partnerships, they may initiate them. Another way partnerships could proliferate is through enlightened leadership. Although one would hope that law enforcement officers would want to have partnerships, the reality is that they may not. Enlightened police managers may force rank and file officers into partnerships and the latter will develop favorable attitudes after they are forced to engage in the cooperative interaction. More generally, our research supports the idea that behavior may shape attitudes as much as attitudes shape behavior. A parallel can be drawn here between this study and community-oriented policing. Police officers who see their work primarily in terms of aggressive law enforcement may be openly hostile to this philosophy of policing. However, research indicates that once they become involved in community-oriented policing they often change their opinions and come to endorse the concept (Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994; Oliver, 2004). Given the obvious philosophical similarities between community-oriented policing and the partnerships we discuss, we are optimistic that the same attitudinal changes can occur with respect to partnerships between police and community corrections agencies.

Closely related to the above, our study also shows that leadership is more important in building partnerships than a core culture that is supportive of such arrangements. Leaders in probation and parole departments may be able to use our findings to push for more partnerships. A first step would be in the identification of police leaders who are sympathetic to their goals. Once they are identified, partnerships can be initiated. At first they may be informal, but should be formalized if at all possible. After the partnerships are in place, and supported by good leadership, they are likely to be evaluated positively by law enforcement personnel.

### References

- Beto, Dan Richard (2005). "Probation Partnerships: Insights from the Past, a View of the Present, and a Call for Leadership." *Executive Exchange* (Summer).
- Beto, Dan Richard, and Jim Kester, Editors (2002). *Project Spotlight: Focusing Resources to Prevent Crime in Texas Neighborhoods – Program Guide*. Huntsville, Texas: Center for Project Spotlight.
- Corbett, Ronald P., Jr. (1998). "Probation Blue? The Promise (and Perils) of Probation-Police Partnerships." *Corrections Management Quarterly* (Summer).
- Evans, Donald G. (2006). "Probation and Police Partnerships." *Executive Exchange* (Summer).
- Griffin, Marie, John Hepburn, and Vincent Webb (2004). *Combining Police and Probation Information Resources to Reduce Burglary: Testing a Crime Analysis Problem-Solving Approach*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Hughes, Diane K. (2000). *A Comparison of Paterson Juveniles under Probation Supervision before and after Implementation of the Paterson Juvenile Justice Village*. Trenton, New Jersey: Institute for Court Management, Court Executive Development Program.

Kelling, George L., and Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. (2003). *This Works: Preventing and Reducing Crime (Civic Bulletin No. 32)*. New York: Manhattan Institute.

Lurigio, Arthur J., and Dennis P. Rosenbaum (1994). "The Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel." In *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*, Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Editor. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Oliver, Willard M. (2004). *Community Oriented Policing: A Systemic Approach to Policing (Third Edition)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

News from the Field (2006a). *Executive Exchange* (Winter).

News from the Field (2006b). *Executive Exchange* (Spring)

News from the Field (2006c). *Executive Exchange* (Summer).

Parent, Dale, and Brad Snyder (1999). *Police-Corrections Partnerships*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Reinventing Probation Council (2000). *Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model*. New York: The Manhattan Institute.

Sexton, George E. (2000). *Working Together: Assessing Organizational Readiness for Collaboration*. Knoxville, Tennessee: The Knoxville Safety Collaborative.

TELEMASP (no date). *Survey on the Interaction between Law Enforcement Agencies and other City and/or County Agencies*. Huntsville, Texas: George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center.

**Jurg Gerber, Ph.D.**, is a Professor in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas.

**Bitna Kim** is a Doctoral Teaching Fellow in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas; in addition, she is a Doctoral Research Assistant with the Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

**Dan Richard Beto** is Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas; he is also a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario. He is a former President of the National Association of Probation Executives.

---

## WESTCHESTER COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION AND THE CITY OF MOUNT VERNON POLICE RIDE ALONG PROGRAM

by

**Rocco A. Pozzi**

---

### Introduction

In his recent article in the Summer 2006 issue of the *Executive Exchange*, Donald G. Evans of the Canadian Training Institute presented a compelling argument and comprehensive framework for the necessity, the structure, and the many benefits of establishing probation and police partnerships. Under the umbrella of the "Broken Windows" concept of community corrections, Mr. Evans spells out, in a replicable format, the rationale and required action steps leading to successful interagency police partnering and enhanced public safety. Mr. Evans emphasizes the need for adequate planning time, cross training time for participating staff, the willingness to share resources, clearly written interagency protocols including identified purpose, goals, and objectives, participant roles and expectations, mechanisms for handling the media, publicly recognizing partnership achievements, and establishing performance based outcome measures.

The Westchester County Department of Probation is one of 38 county governmental departments serving the citizens of Westchester County. Bordering New York City's Bronx County in the south and Fairfield County, Connecticut, in the northeast,

Westchester is a diverse county of over 900,000 inhabitants located in urban, suburban, and rural communities.

As part of a seven year Federal Violence Against Women Act Grant, Westchester County Department of Probation established its first probation-police partnership in 1999. Project Safewatch, which consisted of a probation and county police ride along program as part of the department's specialized domestic violence offender supervision initiative, provided for off hours night and weekend home visits to batterers sentenced to probation. The establishment of this important police partnering effort followed many of the elements outlined in Mr. Evans recent article. Project Safewatch provided a foundation for the creation of the Probation-Mt. Vernon Police Ride Along Program in 2004.

In 2004, under the Federal Violent Juvenile Crime Reduction Grant Program, the Westchester County Department of Probation partnered with the City of Mt. Vernon's Police Department to secure overtime funds to establish a ride along program. With the overall goal of reducing violent juvenile crime and improving communication and coordination between the Mt. Vernon Police Department and the Westchester County Departments of

## Executive Exchange

---

Probation and Law, the project implementation commenced in the fall of 2004.

Each partner agency in the program shares interdependence in their juvenile justice service delivery efforts. In New York State, each county's Department of Law has the responsibility for prosecuting juvenile crime. A juvenile delinquent's entry into the juvenile justice system commences with an arrest. This is followed by either a pre-detention petition directly to the Family Court, or the issuance of an appearance ticket. Upon the issuance of an appearance ticket, the arrested juvenile and his or her family is directed to report to the Probation Department for an intake interview. Upon interviewing the respondent and his/her family, and in consultation with the victim of the offense, a decision is made by the Probation Department to either divert the case or forward the arrest to the Department of Law for formal prosecution. The Probation Department has supervision responsibility for juvenile delinquents either at intake diversion supervision or at the direction of the Family Court, upon its rendering a disposition for probation supervision.

### Planning Process

In the fall of 2004, after the securing of grant funds, and the execution of the Inter-Municipal Agreement between the County of Westchester and the City of Mt. Vernon, the all important planning process began. As with the prior planning process which led to the successful implementation of the Probation Department's Project Safewatch in 1999, initial meetings began on a cautionary note. Both executive level as well as middle management staff from the participant agencies, including Westchester County Departments of Probation and Law, the Mt. Vernon Police Department, and the Mt. Vernon Youth Bureau attended planning meetings.

During my recent presentation at the NAPE Awards Breakfast in Chicago entitled "The Probation Challenge," in which I discussed strategies for probation becoming an equally accepted partner in the law enforcement community continuum, I highlighted the need for probation departments nationwide to evolve from the misperception of solely providing traditional social work service delivery to a more balanced service delivery continuum. This approach utilized social work strategies, advocacy, and the traditional means of law enforcement to ensure offender accountability and enhance community protection. Although many departments nationwide, including Westchester County Department of Probation, do utilize their full peace officer authorities in their service delivery continuum, there is still a constant need for departments to make others law enforcement agencies aware of this important reality.

In order to build on the successes of Project Safewatch, and to address any misperceptions of the Probation Department's capabilities to be an equal law enforcement partner with the Mt. Vernon Police Department in the proposed Ride Along Program, the initial planning session required that protocols from Project Safewatch be fully presented. As a firearm carrying department with the authority to make arrests, it was made clear that in addition to social work and advocacy skills, probation officers possessed traditional law enforcement capabilities and were prepared to be an equal law enforcement partner as we entered this new service delivery endeavor.

Once all participant staff — including probation officer, police officer, Law and Youth Bureau worker — skill sets and capabilities

to support the Ride Along Program were fully understood by the partnering agency representatives, meaningful discussions commenced to identify roles, training needs, and other specifics necessary to ensure effective project implementation. Clarification of capabilities and roles also supported enhanced rapport and trust among participating agencies. The above referenced "cautionary note" refers to the need to engage carefully in this education and information sharing process, as it is a crucial step for successful probation and police partnering.

As the planning process evolved, the Family Court Judges were kept apprised of program development. Judges provided important feedback, input, and suggestions throughout program development. An important aspect of these discussions was clarification of the judiciary's expanded role in supporting the Ride Along Team in their efforts to provide the court with a more intensive field based supervision protocol for those respondents appearing before the Family Court. Of most significance was the reality of an enhanced response of immediacy to juveniles not in compliance with their court directives.

### The City of Mt. Vernon

The City of Mt. Vernon, with a population of 75,000 spreading over four square miles, is Westchester County's southernmost city, bordering New York City's Bronx County. While located in affluent Westchester County, New York, it is economically the poorest community per capita in the county. Fourteen percent of the Mt. Vernon population lives below the poverty level versus 9% of the Westchester population as a whole. Thirteen percent of the residents are senior citizens and 25% are under the age of 18, both of which are the highest rates in the county. Mt. Vernon has the highest unemployment rate in the county at 4.6%. In addition, Mt. Vernon schools have the highest drop out rate in the county at 12% versus 6% countywide. Several years ago, the city of Mt. Vernon disbanded its Police Department's Youth Division, which had dedicated youth officers to handle juvenile crime processing.

### Selected Ride Along Client Population

Although funded under the Federal Violent Juvenile Crime Reduction Program, in order to build in a prevention component, both juvenile delinquent and status offender respondents were selected for inclusion in the program. Under the New York State Family Court Act, juvenile delinquents (JDs) are youth between the ages of 7 and 16. status offenders, referred to in New York as persons in need of supervision (PINS), are between the ages of 7 and 18. To provide maximum impact to the Family Court client population, both formal cases appearing before the Family Court, as well as cases at intake and receiving diversion supervision, whether JD or PINS, were included. In addition, to further enhance the prevention component, non JD/PINS youth identified as "at risk" within the Mt. Vernon school system were also selected for Ride Along home visits.

### Cross Training

In addition to numerous general information sharing and discussions about their agency specific service delivery among project participants, the Department of Law took the lead in providing more formal interagency training sessions. Most

noteworthy topics included the New York State Family Court Act, confidentiality, offender intelligence and information sharing, sufficiency of arrest reports, interrogation procedures, and victim statements. Training sessions were crucial in enhancing interagency communication, establishing uniformity of response to field situations, resolving potential legal issues, and improving interagency understanding leading to clearly identified agency participant roles for the project.

### **The Pilot**

Grant funded overtime for both probation officers and police officers provided for evening and/or weekend ride along tours to the homes of the assigned participants. Both announced and unannounced home visits were conducted. To enhance probation and police officer communication and safety during tours, a detailed respondent pedigree was developed identifying respondent and family details and alerts to extenuating risks, such as instant and prior offenses, weapons, gang affiliations, drug usage, and domestic violence issues within the respondent's home. At the conclusion of every tour, tour reports for each respondent were generated by probation officers as to contact types made, observations, additional identified respondent and family service delivery needs, and action steps taken by tour officers.

The pilot was conducted during the month of December 2004 and consisted of ride along tours, two nights per week from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. The tour team was comprised of two police officers, one supervising probation officer, and two probation officers. A combination of both marked and unmarked police and probation vehicles were utilized. The police officers received supervision and/or consultation as needed from their on duty stationhouse sergeants. Depending upon the circumstances, a combination of either two or three team members actually approached each respondent's door. The remaining team members stationed themselves outside of the residence or in the surrounding community providing backup, conducting surveillance, canvassing the area for intelligence, and interacting with other community members. Team members were equipped with information/handout materials on accessing the Family Court system for PINS services as well as orders of protection in instances of domestic violence.

As often as possible on each tour, home visits were scheduled only to the homes of those respondents under the supervision of the two participating probation officers. This familiarity enhanced participant safety as well as eased receptivity of the families and entrance to the homes. In every instance, for every respondent with a Probation Department relationship, the probation officer team member took the lead on entering the home.

Before each tour, a 20 minute probation officer/police officer briefing was held at the Mt. Vernon Police Department prior to field deployment. Respondent pedigrees were reviewed in detail and issues of concern as well as a tentative field schedule for the particular evening were discussed.

At the end of December, an interagency debriefing, which included all relevant executive level staff, was held to discuss and plan for full program implementation in January 2005.

### **The Ride Along Program**

Building upon the pilot and utilizing both night tours as outlined above, and adding Saturday weekend tours from 8 a.m.

to 1 p.m., full implementation of the program commenced in January 2005.

By April 2005, the tours were conducted three times per week. Additionally, special event tours were added as needed. Special event tours, such as providing added security at an inter city football game or at a local community social event, provided an opportunity for other unique community outreach beyond the visits to particular respondents in their homes.

With the commencement of the full program, and in addition to the home and community visits, planned warrant execution arrests were added to the continuum of law enforcement service delivery activities. Utilizing the law enforcement tool of arrest provided a response of immediacy in attempts to hold respondents accountable while enhancing both community safety and probation credibility.

During every ride along tour, team members maintained contact via Nextel. An Attorney from the County's Department of Law was also on-call during each tour for assistance with legal issues, especially during arrests. Upon warrant execution of a respondent, probation officer team members transported the juvenile in custody to secure detention if a JD case, and to non-secure detention on PINS cases.

Throughout the first year of operation, monthly Ride Along Team meetings were held with participating staff to review programmatic progress in order to adjust team service delivery as needed.

### **Program Outcomes and Benefits**

During the first year of operation, the Ride Along Program provided support to 65 Mt. Vernon youth and their families under the supervision of the Probation Department. In addition, another 12 "at risk" youth were included in the program as part of prevention outreach.

Although funded under the Federal Violent Youth Crime Reduction Program, the partnership allowed for the setting of a juvenile arrest rate baseline in Mt. Vernon, rather than a clear accounting of a potential reduction in juvenile crime itself. Prior to the Ride Along Program's inception, and without a dedicated Mt. Vernon Police Department Youth Division, actual juvenile arrest rate data was compromised. It is anticipated that moving forward a more accurate accounting of arrest/crime rates will be possible.

Initial responses to the tour home visits from the families of participant respondents were mixed. Generally speaking, the families of PINS cases welcomed the surprise visits from law enforcement teams. As the families of these respondents had made application for PINS services for their child, this was not surprising; the visiting teams provided support and emphasized to each respondent the importance with which law enforcement viewed their parental request to deal with their misbehaviors. Families were pleasantly surprised and appreciative of the tour team's efforts in support of their parental efforts.

To the contrary, many of the families whose children were involved with JD behaviors were initially suspicious of the tour team's agenda for visiting their homes during non-traditional hours. Although knowing the probation officer team member assigned to their child's case, they were at times taken back by the police team member's presence. Other than in instances of an arrest, this response quickly diminished as families understood the purpose of the team's visits was to assist with their child's compliance with probation directives and to support the families'

## Executive Exchange

---

efforts to ensure satisfactory adjustment of their child to community based supervision.

In reviewing the many programmatic outcomes from the first year of the Probation-Police Ride Along Program, it is clear that the respondents, their families, the partner agencies, the agency participants, and the Mt. Vernon community at large all benefited.

Probation respondents benefited in numerous ways. First, through this more intensive field based supervision protocol, they were provided the maximum opportunity for accountability and opportunity to change their negative behaviors which brought them into initial contact with the juvenile justice system in Westchester County. Compliance checks with curfew directives, whether set by the court, probation officer, or the family, were an important aspect of the program. As noted previously, the respondents' families benefited in the support and advocacy provided them by team members to assist with their parenting and rule setting efforts.

In addition, respondents were supported in their educational efforts by means of homework checks and were also provided with enhanced summer employment opportunities. During home visits, families were assisted with additional service delivery referrals as needed.

The non probation "at risk" juveniles and their families visited, who were selected as part of the program's prevention component, benefited by providing advocacy, information, and referral services to address identified issues and to make clear what may lay ahead if their "at risk" behaviors were to continue.

Ride Along Team members and the Family Court Judges benefited in numerous ways. The interagency relationships and communication among the Mt. Vernon Police Department and the Westchester County Departments of Probation and Law and the Mt. Vernon Youth Bureau were significantly enhanced. The Probation Department was more accurately viewed as an equal partner in the law enforcement continuum. Probation and police officers were able to conduct targeted joint operations to address special needs of the Mt. Vernon community. Of highly significant note, The Mt. Vernon Police Department resurrected its Youth Division and Youth Officer Policing component with dedicated officers assigned to handle JD and PINS matters.

The Family Court received an enhanced response of immediacy from the law enforcement community in their dealings with respondents appearing before the Family Court and also served by the program.

The Department of Law received an enhanced quality on arrest reports and depositions from the Mt. Vernon Police to support more effective prosecution of juvenile delinquency matters.

The Mt. Vernon community at large benefited from the enhanced interagency communication and coordination among partner agencies, the resurrection of the Police Department Youth Division, improved police/community relations, and resulting enhanced community protection around issues of juvenile crime.

As a byproduct of the partnership, probation and police officers conducted joint presentations to community groups as well as attended national gang trainings as a law enforcement team.

An added compliment to the Westchester County Department of Probation/City of Mt. Vernon Police Department Ride Along Program was received in June of 2006 when the partnership was recognized by receipt of a 2006 NACo (National Association of Counties) Achievement Award. An interagency recognition event is in the planning as a result of this honor.

### Conclusion

The Westchester County Department of Probation-City of Mt. Vernon Ride Along Program exemplifies many of the characteristics of a successful probation-police partnership as outlined by Mr. Evans. Through resource sharing, it has been successful in addressing violent juvenile crime under the "Broken Windows" continuum of non traditional probation service delivery. Utilizing enhanced probation supervision strategies, the respondent participants were provided with the maximum opportunity for change and accountability. As I indicated in my recent NAPE presentation, the successful future of the probation field is contingent upon a balance between traditional social work strategies and our exercising the full range of our law enforcement authorities. Through this probation-police partnering initiative, in addition to the many benefits provided to the respondents, their families, and the community, the Ride Along Program has greatly increased probation's visibility and standing in the public safety continuum.

---

**Rocco A. Pozzi** is Commissioner of the Westchester County Departments of Probation and Correction in White Plains, New York. He is President of the National Association of Probation Executives and a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association.

---

---

## POLICE-PAROLE PARTNERSHIPS CONTINUE TO EVOLVE

by

**Bill Rankin**

---

Two Canadian cities have been chosen as the first to benefit from the new Integrated Police-Parole Initiative, announced in November 2005. The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) will join with Regina and Hamilton police departments in

this innovative partnership — hiring police officers to work as community corrections liaison officers (CCLO), monitoring the activities of higher-risk and higher-needs offenders in the community. They will act as links with police departments

and other law enforcement agencies, enhance information sharing and work to reduce the number of unlawfully-at-large offenders.

CSC Associate District Director for Eastern and Northern Ontario Gerry Minard says, "The CCLO position builds upon an excellent working relationship that we've had with the Hamilton Police for a long time. It will give our staff a little more insight into the problems that police face and the police will learn more about parole officers' challenges."

CCLOs will also participate on community assessment teams and provide an additional conduit of information between parole offices and police repeat offender squads. A total of 17 CCLOs will be hired across Canada by the summer of 2006 and paid for by CSC through the Interchange Canada Program. The new officers will report to CSC district directors.

Other cities to receive CCLOs include Saint John, New Brunswick, St. John's, Newfoundland, Halifax, Montreal, Québec City, St. Jérôme, Toronto, Ottawa, Kingston, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Kelowna, and Vancouver.

### **In a Rural Setting**

Police-parole partnerships are certainly not a new idea and there's no shortage of good examples in other parts of the country. Take for example Parole Officer Gerald Daigle and his one-man operation, part of the Ottawa Parole District. Daigle is responsible for 22 parolees spread out over a broad area of rural Ontario that runs east to the Quebec border, south to Akwesasne (previously known as Cornwall Island) on the St. Lawrence River and west as far as Long Sault. He says that his cellular and satellite phones, as well as dependable winter tires are what keeps him on a steady course through the winter months and gets him from farmhouse to country shack to coffee shop and all the other rendez-vous points where he meets his "clients."

Daigle counts on a crucial working collaboration with members of numerous police forces located on this territory — Akwesasne Mohawk Police, Cornwall Community Police Service, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Ontario Provincial Police with its six offices spread throughout the rural communities. "These collateral contacts are so important," Daigle comments. "They are the parole officer's around-the-clock eyes and ears in the community."

The principal centre inside his jurisdiction — a sprawl of farmland, highways and rivers — is Cornwall (population 45,000), the blue-collar town that has, over recent years, fallen on hard times thanks to factory shutdowns and massive layoffs — most recently at the Domtar pulp and paper mill.

### **Experienced Eyes and Ears**

Perhaps nobody's eyes and ears know more about this city and its criminal element than the police department's Detective Sergeant Bob Burnie, Criminal Investigations Division, a Cornwall native who worked his way up from beat constable over his 25-year career. Burnie and his law enforcement partners face unique challenges due to Cornwall's location along the eastern inland seaway and its close proximity to the American border.

"Along with our law enforcement partners, we suffer the woes connected with criminals who can drop off or pick up contraband almost anywhere along this 60-mile stretch of open waterway," Burnie comments. "Drugs are transported by boat in the warm

months and by snowmobile or even trucks over the ice during winter."

To complicate the situation even further, Akwesasne, just south of the city and home of the Akwesasne Mohawk Reserve, is the convergence point for numerous provincial, national and international boundaries. It is possible for one house on the island to be in American territory while just down the road a neighbor is on Canadian soil.

### **Cooperation is Essential**

It's a situation that could make for a prickly interplay between forces, but fortunately this is not the case. Over the years, going back as far as the whiskey smuggling days of Prohibition, law enforcers have learned to work together and support each other rather than squabble over turf.

"Really good cooperation," declares Sergeant Burnie. "We are part of well established units (the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit and the Integrated Border Enforcement Team) that developed strong links between several agencies over the years in order to keep on top of criminal activity in our jurisdictions. Weekly meetings with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, New York State Border Patrol, Ontario Provincial Police, Akwesasne Mohawk Police Service and Canada Border Services Agency, provide updated knowledge of criminal activity in our respective areas."

This same type of mutual assistance has existed between the police and parole since long before Gerald Daigle took over from retiring Parole Officer Bernie Driscoll in February 2005. Partnerships were essential for this parole officer when he was previously located in rural areas of New Brunswick.

"Bernie Driscoll was extremely helpful, hard working and highly respected by the police," says Sergeant Burnie. "Gerald is much the same on account of his previous experience. We've developed a good working relationship. He's called upon us to help some of his parolees and we are glad to do it."

### **Meeting a Parolee**

On one typical day, Daigle agrees to meet with one of his parolees inside a Cornwall shopping centre. Daigle enters the complex and joins a procession of shoppers huffing and puffing up the stairs of a broken-down escalator. He grabs a coffee from the Tim Horton's kiosk on the second level and settles himself at a small table next to a boisterous group of seniors who are busy chewing doughnuts and talking hockey, politics, and bingo. The parolee shows up on time, a young man in his twenties who served prison time for drug trafficking. He was no big-time dealer but the cocaine sales had been easy money that provided a hefty supplement to the \$10/hour he made roofing before his conviction.

### **Easy Money**

Daigle says it's tempting for young people to fall into the drug trade because it's all around them; they see friends and acquaintances driving shiny, new vehicles, buying houses, living far beyond their apparent means. And the payoff seems well worth the risk — until they get caught. Even after a stretch in prison, it's hard for some of them to go back to an honest job because they've tasted what they regard as a more glamorous lifestyle.

“Hopefully they will have upgraded their competencies during the process of their sentence and will be able to secure a better job in the long term,” says Daigle. “Becoming law-abiding citizens and productive members of their communities will more than likely require a lot of perseverance from these individuals.

“Young guys especially, you have to see up to twice a week, depending on their risk to re-offend and their needs in the community,” says Daigle. Attitude and motivation are important factors in the parole officer’s month to month assessment.

“I know through experience that some guys are not going to re-offend. They may have made one big mistake that got them involved with the law, usually at a young age. They might have been in the wrong place, with the wrong friends, at the wrong time. They may have been intoxicated, so naturally their judgment was impaired.

### Changing Attitudes

“It takes some time to alter their thought patterns; I encourage them to consider the people they associate with, find a steady job, apply program skills learned while inside, learn how to communicate and manage anger, and deal with drug problems. Those are the things that are going to keep them from going back to prison. These individuals will likely recognize the benefit of consulting existing community resources and I can help with the access. Ultimately, they will accept full responsibility for their behavior and actions, past, present, and future.

“Then there are the few — hard-core criminals — that are very hard to reach. Often the only things that change them is time, weariness and the desire to stay out of prison.”

This type may view their relationship with the parole officer as a cat-and-mouse game. Their attitude — purposely vague or evasive — quickly becomes apparent to an experienced officer. It’s in these situations that the police partnership is particularly valuable. They help keep a close eye on the offender and inform the parole officer of significant events or changes in behavior.

### Solid Links

Whether this takes the form of formal liaison partnerships such as the community corrections liaison officer (CCLO) role or informal working collaborations, these solid links have proven effective for supervising offenders in the community and contributing to their reintegration. The ultimate goal is public safety in every Canadian community, large or small. This is the essence of the parole/police officers’ work that they share from day to day.”

---

**Bill Rankin** is a Communications Officer with the Communications and Citizen Engagement Division of the Correctional Services of Canada in Ottawa, Ontario.

This article originally appeared in *Let’s Talk* (Vol. 3, No. 4), a publication of the Correctional Service of Canada. It is reprinted with permission.

---

---

## CREATING AND MAINTAINING POLICE-PROBATION PARTNERSHIPS

by

**Bernard Fitzgerald**

---

In Boston, Massachusetts, in the year 1990 there were 152 homicides. Most of the homicides involved young black men as either the perpetrators or the victims. Approximately eighty-five percent of them occurred in either the Roxbury or the Dorchester jurisdiction. The year 1990 was a record setting year for homicides but the years preceding and immediately following were not much better.

As a city and a community, there were no answers. The police beefed up their patrols. The courts began treating street violence much more seriously. Everyone was doing what they could, yet the violence would not subside.

Members of the Boston Police Gang Unit were making an extraordinary number of arrests and the courts were processing the cases, yet there was no relief.

As police officers from the “Gang Unit” and probation officers from the “Youthful Offender Unit” got to know each other in the halls of the courthouse, they began to exchange information about the people that they dealt with on a daily basis. The exchange of information was the key to the formation of the partnership. Two officers from the “Gang Unit” invited two probation officers to accompany them on their rounds one night. That night was

in November 1992, and thus was launched “Operation Night Light.”

Operation Night Light is generally considered to be the first of many police-probation partnerships that have sprung up over the years. At the time it was a response to a problem for which there was no immediate answer. People were desperate to stop the violence.

That simple act, probation officers riding with the police became a model for the nation. And the simple act of riding in the same car and sharing information became a way of getting a handle on those who were committing the violent acts on the streets.

The initial sharing of information brought about a sharing of responsibilities, a sharing of resources, a sharing of authority, and a sharing of equipment. The results were that probation or community corrections became actual partners in the criminal justice community.

The fact that probation was invited to the table was, in my experience, a sea change. Probation had never been considered a player when it came to fighting crime or planning or strategizing. Probation had always been considered a weak step-sister in the criminal justice community.

The realization that probation had a great deal to offer was an important discovery for the rest of the criminal justice community and for probation as well. It was the beginning of a new way of thinking about issues that we all had to deal with on a daily basis.

Probation came to the realization that it had information about defendants that would be helpful in suppressing violence. We had information about their peer groups, about their living situations, and about the conditions of probation that we could enforce. We became more knowledgeable about our powers – what we could and could not do.

The police were especially interested in the fact that we had the power of arrest without a warrant if we had reasonable suspicion that an individual was in violation of his/her probation.

The partnerships were formed and solidified with this new sharing of authority and information. We began to work together more intelligently.

The police officers became an arm of the probation department by virtue of them being in the streets twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week. They would report to us who they would see out after court imposed curfews and they would do a field interrogation. The report that resulted would afford probation an opportunity hold probationers to a greater degree of accountability with the report and the testimony of the officer. We, in probation, could tailor the conditions of those placed on probation in order to help the police in achieving their community policing mission.

Probation shares much of its information with the police officers on the “Gang Unit” and the officers that work the regular police districts. There is one officer who gathers, coordinates and distributes a list of all the probationers who have curfews. It lists the name of the defendant who has the curfew, who the probation officer is for that defendant, and what time the curfew takes effect. In working this way, the probation officers have eyes on the street twenty-four hours a day and the police have a way to respond to civilian complaints in regard to problems in their districts.

Another way in which the partnership has continued to grow is in the debriefing of those arrested for firearm possession. This has proven beneficial to the whole community, in that if a probationer is caught in possession of a firearm they are debriefed in terms of where they got the firearm. This has proved to be helpful in getting guns off the street and at times getting gun dealers also.

“Operation Ceasefire” was born out of police-probation collaboration. There came a realization that it would be necessary to do an educational piece about street violence and “Ceasefire” was born. There was a group assembled consisting of members of all the law enforcement partners and all the mentoring and social service partners. All those assembled would then give a presentation to young people from a particularly violent neighborhood. It would be emphasized that unless the violence ceased the law enforcement partners would be holding to a zero tolerance attitude when it came to dealings in that neighborhood. It was also emphasized that there were mentors and social service providers available if one were to choose to take advantage of them.

Since the time of their inception these programs have continued to exist. The partnerships in Boston have become almost institutionalized. The collective bargaining contract of the probation officers gives the chief probation officer the right to mandate at

least four hours per week of community supervision by each probation officer. It is and has been the way that business is conducted.

There are bi-weekly meetings held at the police department around the issues of street and gang violence. Probation is an integral part of these meetings as participants and presenters. Probation officers from throughout the city attend and participate. It is a sharing of intelligence among virtually all the law enforcement agencies in and around the city of Boston.

Recently the Boston Police Department formed the Boston Regional Intelligence Center. It is a center that gathers, assesses, and distributes a daily intelligence report to all the law enforcement agencies in the region as well as to some private sector partners as well. The center relies on information gathered from all the local, state and federal law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies. They also gather information from the local college police departments and the Boston School Police. Probation, parole and corrections attend these meetings on a daily basis. The issues that are discussed go from street crime and gang violence to homeland security issues.

The police probation-partnerships have also gone in the direction of re-entry programs. Probation plays a large role in the re-entry programs that take place in the local correctional facilities. Probation helps to determine the candidates who are most likely to re-offend after they are released. These are the candidates who are invited to the re-entry panel. The message that is given is that we are, as law enforcement agencies, going to be watching them very closely when they are released. The other part of the message that is delivered is that we have many services available as well as mentors to be assigned to them. We strongly suggest that they take advantage of those mentors and services.

The most important and the most difficult part of maintaining police-probation partnerships is keeping the lines of communication open. We have to speak to each other on almost a daily basis. Every day there are new ways found to enhance the process. We now serve warrants more successfully. Convicted sex offenders get much more scrutiny than they used to get. Probationers are getting the supervision and the opportunities that they need to keep them in compliance and help them to affect change in their lives. We all help to protect each others credibility. Maintenance is the key.

---

**Bernard Fitzgerald** is the Chief Probation Officer for the Dorchester District Court in Dorchester, Massachusetts; he is a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives.

---

## PARTNERS IN FUGITIVE APPREHENSION: MARICOPA COUNTY ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT AND THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

by

Cathy Wyse

Many police-probation partnerships are designed to increase monitoring of high-risk probationers. They often function as part of a comprehensive crime prevention initiative in the region. The partnership between the U.S. Marshals Service and the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department differs in that the entire focus is on apprehending probation violators.

What does it say about probation, the courts, the entire criminal justice system, when probation violators are not apprehended? What are the implications for public safety? Barbara Broderick, Chief Adult Probation Officer in Maricopa County, Arizona, manages a department that supervises 30,000 felony offenders in a county with 3.6 million residents. "It is critical to the integrity of the criminal justice system that we apprehend probation violators and bring fugitives back before the court," she says. "Failure to do so compromises community safety, undermines the public's confidence and trust, allows restitution to go unpaid, and sends the wrong message to those individuals who are complying with probation conditions."

David P. Gonzales, U.S. Marshal, District of Arizona, states, "The number one job of government is to protect citizens. It is important to get fugitives off the streets and to pay for their crimes. Victims need to be assured that the government is looking after their safety and welfare. They need to get closure to the crimes that they were involved in."

For more than a decade, the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department (MCAPD) has dedicated a special unit to working probation warrants. The unit also assists field officers if a dangerous probationer needs to be located and removed from the community quickly (e.g., before the warrant is signed). Currently, the fugitive apprehension unit has fourteen badged officers. Last fiscal year, approximately 10,700 new warrants cases were received and nearly 9,800 cases were cleared. The unit categorizes incoming cases and focuses their efforts on apprehending serious, violent offenders, including sex offenders. They are involved in about 295 arrests per month.

Department policy requires that probation officers make arrests with police. The officers in MCAPD's fugitive apprehension unit develop information and physically locate the offenders, then contact police to assist with the arrests. Police transport the probation violators to the jail, and probation officers typically complete the booking process. There are numerous law enforcement agencies in Maricopa County, including multiple city police departments, the county sheriff, and state and federal agencies. Officers in MCAPD's fugitive apprehension unit have worked very hard to develop credibility and maintain cooperative working relationships with law enforcement.

In 2003, probation officers in Maricopa County were provided an option to arm. When the department made this transition, Broderick mandated arming for the officers assigned to the fugitive apprehension unit. "These officers are doing the most dangerous job in probation," she said. "They are putting their lives on the line." The relationship between MCAPD fugitive

apprehension officers and law enforcement changed when the probation officers became armed officers.

Jerome Larson is the supervisor of the U.S. Marshals fugitive apprehension unit and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) task force in Maricopa County. The sole purpose of the multi-agency task force is to apprehend high-level felony cases. Participating agencies include the Chandler Police Department; Mesa Police Department; Maricopa County Adult Probation Department; Arizona Department of Public Safety; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; U.S. Marshals Service, and the U.S. Postal Service. The U.S. Marshals' warrants caseload averages 2,500 and each agency brings their own warrants cases for the task force to work. Last year, the task force made over 800 arrests.

According to Larson, the U.S. Marshals started providing assistance on probation's warrant cases over ten years ago. The probation arrests count on the Marshals' statistics, which helps their arrest numbers. When MCAPD's fugitive apprehension unit became armed, it was a turning point. Larson explained, "We couldn't put the county probation officers on our task force because our rules said you had to be armed. We were very happy when county probation decided to arm its warrants officers." An invitation was extended for a probation officer to join the task force. MCAPD agreed and, for the first time, one of MCAPD's officers was deputized as a U.S. Marshal, and was assigned as a full-time member of the HIDTA task force.

How does the partnership work? MCAPD currently has one probation officer from the fugitive apprehension unit assigned full-time to the HIDTA task force. He typically spends four days a week gathering information and working up cases, and goes out with the task force one day a week to make arrests. All addresses and warrants are verified in advance, so the task force can go from address to address making arrests. In addition to direct involvement as a member of the task force, other MCAPD fugitive apprehension officers call on the U.S. Marshals and receive their assistance when it fits specific arrest situations they are working.

What do the U.S. Marshals like about working with MCAPD? "County probation is sitting on probably the most ideal warrants situation there is," Larson said. "One, there are a lot of them, and two, there's information on where they're at." Richard Breed, supervisor of MCAPD's fugitive apprehension unit, sees this benefit as well. "We have the whole file. We know mom, girlfriends and that kind of stuff." In addition, his staff uses electronic information sources to conduct investigations and work up cases. "We come with pretty good intel," Breed said. Gonzales informs that the best intelligence information his marshals get on fugitives comes from probation officers. "We find probation officers to be more aware of what's happening on the streets, how offenders work, and where their hang-outs are. They really have a good pulse of the street, sometimes even more than most federal agents do. They are a wealth of information and I know other federal agencies utilize the probation officers because of the wealth

of information that they have. They really have the instincts and know-how to work the streets and they know probationers and how they tick." Gonzales has extensive experience with multi-agency task forces and finds that when different agencies and parts of government come together, you get different perspectives and more insight into the projects being pursued.

What does MCAPD see as the benefits from this partnership? After locating a fugitive, a probation officer typically contacts local law enforcement and then waits around for one or two patrol officers to come out for the arrest. Breed informed that with the U.S. Marshals, instead of waiting for back up, the probation officer is running with a team. There are more officers; they're full-time; they're professionals; and they're used to working together. It's more efficient and the tactical experience together brings safety benefits.

In addition to having a full-time member on the HIDTA task force, MCAPD's fugitive apprehension unit calls upon and receives additional assistance from the U.S. Marshals. The partnership involves an understanding — Breed won't call Larson for assistance unless it's a good case and a high-level offender; as long as Breed is calling with a good case, Larson will assist. One of the areas in which the U.S. Marshals have been helpful is forced entry. If MCAPD has good information that a high-level felony fugitive is holed up and not coming out, the U.S. Marshals have responded with the tools and a sufficient number of officers to force entry (when determined safe to do so). Otherwise, officers could spend an entire shift or longer waiting for a fugitive to exit. The U.S. Marshals Service has also been willing to accept responsibility for any damage caused by the forced entry. "When the U.S. Marshals come out, they come out in force," Breed stated. "That's another thing that helps us avoid runners, injuries and fights. When eight or ten guys show up at the house and they're all pretty beefy guys and tacted out, these guys think 'ok it's over, I'm not going to do anything stupid,' as opposed to, if a couple of guys show up, 'maybe I can go out the back door, maybe I can do this or that.' Show of force is the way they do business."

The partnership has provided useful contact networks and access to new technology. For example, after tracking a probation violator to Texas, MCAPD was able to contact the appropriate person in the U.S. Marshals Office in Phoenix, who made contact with the U.S. Marshals office in Texas, and the U.S. Marshals in Texas went out and made the arrest. Gonzales points out that

by having a full-time member on the U.S. Marshals HIDTA task force, MCAPD has access to 4,000 deputies that work nationwide and all of the U.S. Marshals' resources, including connections that allow them to track fugitives who have left the country. Due to the multi-agency composition of the HIDTA task force, MCAPD has also been able to obtain assistance from individual task force members in order to quickly connect with the right individuals within their respective agencies for a particular purpose. Furthermore, the U.S. Marshals have access to new technology, such as tracking devices, which are helpful and otherwise not available to MCAPD in pursuing fugitive cases.

In August 2005, MCAPD and the U.S. Marshals Service had the misfortune of sharing an officer-involved shooting incident. The probation officer assigned to the HIDTA task force and a U.S. Marshal went to a satellite probation office to arrest a probationer. When they entered the office lobby, the probationer pulled out a handgun and shot both officers before they had a chance to react. The officers suffered critical injuries. The reaction from both agencies was to pull together in support for the officers and everyone affected by the incident. At every level, from executive, to supervisor, to line officer, the agencies expressed a shared desire that the incident not interfere with continuing a good relationship. The partnership has remained effective and if anything, has grown closer.

As a law enforcement executive, Gonzales feels that the union of law enforcement and probation is an easy and natural one because the agencies have the same goals and are involved with the same issues. He recommends to any manager in a probation department that they form a close liaison with the U.S. Marshals Service, and other federal agencies that have task forces, even if it's on a part-time basis. He notes that having a full-time officer on a U.S. Marshals task force is probably the ideal because it gives the agency 4,000 extra deputies to work their cases. There will always be fugitives and the trend has been for the number to grow and grow. "It's imperative that we team up on these task forces and put our resources together, because by ourselves, we cannot do it," Gonzales says, "but as a group, with different agencies involved, we can be very, very effective."

---

**Cathy Wise** is a Special Projects Manager with the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department in Phoenix, Arizona.

---



---

## POLICE-PROBATION PARTNERSHIP ADVANCES SCHOOL SAFETY

by

**Thelma Grimes**

---

While they call themselves a couple of goofballs having fun at work, Benson, Arizona, school administrators and the state agree that what Sepp Sprietsma and Gary Douglas have accomplished in establishing a school safety program is commendable.

The Arizona Department of Education and the Arizona Foundation for Legal Services & Education (AFLSE), recently honored Douglas, a Benson police officer, and Sprietsma, a probation officer, for having a school safety program model site. Four schools

in the state received the honor. The two were honored at a luncheon in Phoenix on September 20, 2006.

To be deemed a model site, Jennifer Nickason, program manager for the AFLSE, said the schools are evaluated in law enforcement education, administrative support, officer involvement in programs, agency/administration/officer collaboration, officer compliance and school safety resources. To qualify, on a scale of one to four, the school must receive a 3.5 or higher in every category.

When the state visited Benson, Sprietsma and Douglas said they weren't looking at gaining recognition; they actually thought they might be in some trouble with the grant funding.

Carol Connelly, executive secretary for the school district, said Benson Schools received just over \$101,000 this year as part of the Safe School's grant program.

"We didn't know there was such a thing as a model site," said Sprietsma. "The state came down and we thought we were being audited on our grant, and we thought we were in some trouble and could lose our funding. I thought we were going to get talked to. I thought we would be told we were doing too much."

The two went well beyond grant requirements. To keep grant funding they are both required to teach 180 hours a year, but last year completed more than 260 hours.

"If we just fulfilled the requirements of the grant it would be a lot easier," Douglas said. "We've tried to explain to a lot of people what exactly we do here, and I don't think it's always completely understood."

Besides teaching, the two are also responsible for handling child protective service cases involving students, any suspected criminal activity on campus, being a member of a multi-disciplinary team and, on the side, they coach for the middle school, high school, and the city soccer programs.

The two have also implemented several new programs that have become popular. One that has gained rave reviews over the last two years is the teen maze, where students get a glimpse at how choices they make now can impact the rest of their lives either through drugs and drinking, through having sex, or even through getting good grades and making the right decisions.

The duo, who obviously have a great working relationship, joked throughout Thursday's interview about how they, two men who went as far as having puppets photographed for their yearbook photos, have been deemed to be running a model program. However, Bryan Bullington, the high school principal, said their personalities and relationships with the students make them good at what they do.

"Gary and Sepp make an outstanding team," he said. "Together, they have developed an incredible rapport with students and staff that has earned them the respect necessary to be effective in

their positions. We are very pleased to have these two gentlemen as members of our team."

Douglas and Sprietsma agreed that during the last two years the two have worked hard to build an image with the students and make them realize that authority figures aren't necessarily a bad thing. "We work hard at building a relationship up with the kids," Douglas said. "When we first came, we were like the plague, and many students thought cops are bad people. We can now say we've worked to bridge that gap. We work with those students who are anti-government. We are happy to see it when we get to a point where they are willing to initiate the contact. That's more than any award or recognition. It's the smiles on the faces of those kids that make an effort to wave you down or come see you and talk to you. We can list a lot of students that were once in a lot of trouble, but now are willing to work with us."

Sprietsma said the recognition should not go to him and Douglas, but to the administrators, teachers, and students of a good school district. "The recognition should really go to them," he said. "We're just goofballs having a good time at work."

While they summed their jobs up as being chaotic most of the time, both Douglas and Sprietsma said they would finish their careers right there at Benson Schools if they could.

Douglas is a seven-year Benson Police officer, and Sprietsma said he's done a variety of jobs from being a probation officer to working for Arizona State Parks, but none were as gratifying as what he's doing now.

"The work is far out-weighted by fun, but we both take this job very seriously," Douglas said. "The safety of the students is our No.1 priority. We will continue to build relationships with the kids, but this is also a job where just when you think you have it all figured out — you don't. No matter what happens, we have to carry on no matter what and do a job to protect and educate the students."

---

**Thelma Grimes** is a reporter with the *San Pedro Valley News-Sun* in Benson, Arizona. This article appeared in the October 11, 2006, edition of the *San Pedro Valley News-Sun*; it is reprinted with permission.

---

---

## LAW ENFORCEMENT PROFILE: THE SECRET INGREDIENT IN THE OFFENDER REENTRY EFFORT

by

Frances Breyne

---

Janene Falley has a unique perspective on offender reentry. It's a perspective that might surprise those who still believe that a police officer's only job is to arrest criminals.

Falley is a Detective with the Topeka, Kansas, Police Department. She was promoted to that position in April of 2006. Before then, she was the Police Department's liaison to a Kansas Department of Corrections offender re-entry pilot program.

The Shawnee County Reentry Program (SCRIP) was established as a pilot in early 2003 using funding from the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI) Grant. The initial funding

was renewed by the Kansas Legislature in 2005, and additional joint funding was provided for a Shawnee County, Kansas program which became operational in early 2006. Preparations for a Wyandotte County, Kansas reentry program with partial legislative funding are also currently underway.

Janene Falley grew up in law enforcement. Her father was a police officer with the Topeka Police Department for 29 years, ending his tenure there as a Sergeant with the traffic division.

Falley joined the department in 1990 as a civilian records clerk. In June of 1994 she became an officer and worked in the uniform

division until 1996. She served on the Special Operations and Response Team (SORT) from 1996-1997. In 1997, she became a community police officer with the SORT where she remained until 2003.

When the opening was announced for a police department liaison with the SCRP, Falley applied for it. She was accepted for the position and began working with the program in January of 2003.

Falley's suitability for the job was clear. In her words, "My experience has been that people comply with structure when they are in prison, but have problems adjusting when they return to the community. The returning offenders need someone to meet them on their level and work with them in an individual way to address the issues that cause them to re-offend." Falley was in a unique position to do that since she had seen the negative effect their behavior could have on the community.

The reentry program was not Falley's first experience with helping offenders transition back into their communities. Dozens of offenders a month return to Shawnee County from county and state correctional facilities. Though they frequently return to the counties from which they came, the adjustment can be difficult.

While a community police officer, Falley did what she could to resolve those difficulties in a productive way. "I learned that everyone can change," she said. "Some simply don't have that ability without serious intervention."

There are several factors that most commonly cause problems for returning offenders. They often lack the support systems needed during a stressful time when the simple act of finding housing or a job sometimes elude them.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, the absence of these stabilizing factors very frequently leads offenders back to their criminal lifestyle. In search of support, they frequently turn to former antisocial associates, another factor which leads to re-offending.

The Shawnee County Reentry Program and other programs like it nationwide focus on the highest risk offenders; the ones who have a track record of cycling through the prison system over and over again. They are the offenders who pose the most risk to communities. Case studies show that these same offenders can become law-abiding citizens if their offending cycle is interrupted.

The fundamentals of reentry programming include early identification of the issues that make individual offenders more likely to re-offend. A case management plan is implemented for program

participants a minimum of 12 months prior to their release and that plan is continued once they return to the community. The same team members who will work with the offender once he returns to the community also connect with him before release.

One of those team members is the community police officer. Before her recent promotion, Janene Falley served that role for the SCRP. She met offenders while they were incarcerated to identify and resolve such issues as child support, driver's licenses, and warrant detainers.

She also provided a guiding force for offenders who might be understandably nervous about their prospects once they were released from prison. "I told them that my main objective was to help them overcome whatever barriers were going to interfere with their transition, but that in return I would hold them accountable for their behavior."

When asked about the importance of such a program to a member of law enforcement, she said, "It's important because prisons need to change, parole services need to change, the system needs to change and employees need to change. When the system starts addressing someone's core dysfunction and covers their criminogenic needs, individuals will start improving their behavior one at a time."

It is obvious that Janene Falley values the system but does the system understand the importance of the role that she plays? Without a doubt, according to SCRP Director Jonathan Ogletree, "Officer Falley's presence on the reentry team has been invaluable to us. She has been pivotal in increasing the level of communication between the Kansas Department of Corrections and the Topeka Police Department. The ability to freely share information is a huge benefit."

Perhaps more importantly, Ogletree says, "The community takes great comfort in knowing we have a member of the police department on our team. Employers and landlords become more willing to assist returning offenders when we have the credibility of a police department representative behind us."

Falley is one example of the crucial part that community and agency partners play in the offender re-entry process. When offenders have so many varied needs, a variety of supports are necessary to address those needs. When asked to explain what she learned from the experience, Falley said, "I must do the best job I can and keep moving forward."

---

**Frances Breyne** is a Public Information Officer with the Kansas Department of Corrections in Topeka, Kansas.

---

### FROM THE BOOKSHELF

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

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

#### Handling Criticism

Review of *Criticism Management: How to More Effectively Give, Receive, and Seek Criticism in Our Lives*, by Randy Garner. The Woodlands, Texas: Prescient Press, 2006, 150 pp., \$19.95 (paperback).

In addition to possessing strong leadership qualities, persons charged with leading organizations, project, or special initiatives, or who desire productive interpersonal relationships, must possess effective communication skills. And part and parcel of effective communication is one's ability to deliver and receive constructive criticism. In *Criticism Management: How to More Effectively Give, Receive, and Seek Criticism in Our Lives*, Randy Garner has produced a fresh and insightful book on how one might better initiate and respond to criticism.

Garner, who possesses a doctorate in social psychology, has recorded a distinguished record of service in the field of criminal justice, both as a successful practitioner and skilled educator. During a career that spans three decades, he has served as a Chief of Police, Executive Director of the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas, founding Director of the Texas Regional Community Policing Institute, and Associate Dean of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. He is currently Professor of Behavioral Sciences at Sam Houston State University.

In the first of 12 chapters, the author defines criticism and provides a brief history of the term. Most of the chapter is devoted to Garner's own definition of the term — "offering productive and constructive information intended to help others *grow, recover, improve, prosper, or excel*" (which he refers to as GRIPE) — and how best criticism may be conveyed. Building on the first chapter, in Chapter 2 Garner covers the subject of critical discourse, in which he touches on the topics of why people criticize, who criticizes, types of criticisms, critical response, and the benefits of criticism. The challenge of giving and receiving criticism is discussed in Chapter 3, in which the author enumerates why people typically do not like to criticize or be criticized. In addition, the topic of self-criticism is also covered.

Chapter 4 — "Critical Communications: Problems and Processes" — is particularly instructive, in that the author provides suggestions on how to offer constructive criticism effectively and while inflicting as little pain as possible. Addressed in the chapter is the role nonverbal communication — facial expressions, body language, eye contact, vocal tone, and distance — plays in conveying criticism. In Chapter 5, Garner discusses the "art" of giving criticism, with considerable emphasis on preparing a "productive and constructive criticism plan," which includes the following elements:

- Consider your goal and motivation
- Gather all the relevant information
- Consider the time and place
- Consider the emotional state of the giver and receiver
- Consider the psychological state of the recipient
- Evaluate the criteria being used to validate the criticism
- Use mental rehearsal and visualize the encounter
- Send a clear message
- Think win-win

Continuing on the message found in Chapter 5, the author provides in Chapter 6 some helpful tips when giving criticism; they are:

- Don't procrastinate
- Remain calm — monitor your own emotions
- Stick to the facts and be specific
- Criticize the deed, not the doer
- Make sure it's a dialogue
- Be prepared for a variety of responses
- Ensure effective communication had occurred
- Focus on the future, not the past
- Be concrete regarding expectations
- Acknowledge your comments may be subjective

In the next chapter Garner provides some techniques that may be employed when delivering criticism.

Chapter 8 is devoted to how one should receive and manage criticism. More specifically, the author recommends that one should:

- See the criticism as an opportunity
- Recognize there may be some truth in the criticism
- Engage in an honest assessment
- Separate the criticism from the critic
- See the criticism as information
- Remain in the third person
- Recognize the potential for personal development
- Not dwell on the criticism
- Accept the criticism if correct — learn the lesson
- Evaluate improvement

This chapter is concluded with a list of the elements of the criticism management process. Continuing with the subject of receiving and managing criticism, in Chapter 9 Garner discusses in detail the LAURA method of handling criticism, which includes: *listen* empathetically, *appraise* the criticism, *understand* the criticism and the critic, *respond* effectively, and *assess* the outcome. Chapter 10, building on the previous chapter, provides suggestion on how one might appropriately respond to the critic. And in Chapter 11 are found some strategies for seeking out constructive criticism.

In the final chapter, the author provides a summary of the book which, for trainers, could be used as outline for a PowerPoint presentation.

In *Criticism Management*, Randy Garner has provided a valuable tool for anyone responsible for supervising people, managing projects, and training skills in human resource management.

Dan Richard Beto

### Broken Windows Revisited

---

Review of "A Quarter Century of Broken Windows," by James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling, in the September/October 2006 issue of *The American Interest*.

---

James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling revisit their broken windows thesis that they introduced in March 1982 in an *Atlantic Monthly* article entitled "Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety." They used the metaphor of broken windows to denote disorder and to hypothesize that there might be a connection between disorder and crime rates. They argued that policing had an important and critical function to do more than investigate and fight crime. The task, as they saw it, was to return to the role of order maintenance. It was an argument for police to give greater sensitivity to communal rather than individual needs. This concept assisted and encouraged the development of problem oriented policing models.

Wilson and Kelling continued their exploration of this theme in another *Atlantic Monthly* article published in February 1989 under the title "Making Neighborhoods Safe." In this article they continue to explore the theme that taking care of disorder might reduce crime rates. Here they introduce the notion that "fixing broken windows" could do more to reduce crime than conventional incident-oriented policing. Again it was a strong argument for order maintenance policing. More emphasis was placed on the emerging concept of problem oriented policing and law enforcement's interest in communities and not just in individual crimes. In 1996 Kelling and Catherine Coles wrote a full length book regarding order maintenance, community policing, and problem oriented approaches to neighborhood safety. Their book, *Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Cities* was published by the Free Press. The articles and book give a strong impetus to efforts to maintain order and civility in our communities and suggest the possible value of problem-solving approaches at the local level might have a positive effect on community values and crime rates.

In "A Quarter Century of Broken Windows," Wilson and Kelling review the evidence for their thesis and answer some of their critics. This brief but helpful review accomplishes three things: a restating of the thesis, a review of the evidence both pro and con, and a reflection on the future of the broken windows concept.

#### Restating the Thesis

The authors reiterate their belief that police should return to their traditional role of maintaining public order and deal with serious crime. They keep the metaphor of the broken windows in a building, if not fixed leads to further breakage, and argue

that if public disorder is not dealt with more disorder results. The problem exists in their linking disorder with serious crime but in this article they suggest that it is unfortunate that they did not call this argument a speculation. Arguing ahead of the evidence is always a tricky business. The critics have jumped on this by noting that increased order hasn't led to less crime. Wilson and Kelling state that they "believe that when the police work to restore order and do so in a decent and lawful fashion, they have produced an important public good." The authors believe that it is not necessary to justify this particular result because it is self-evidently good. The authors then go on to give examples of this "self-evident good." Dealing with small matters made a difference, they argue, in managing large problems.

#### Reviewing the Evidence

With everyone interested in evidence-based practice it is worthwhile to do as these authors have done, take the time to look at the evidence, both pro and con. Testing their thesis is at the heart of Wilson and Kelling's work. They state that "it is necessary to test the argument that increased public order tends to reduce more serious crime, such as robbery in public places." A brief overview of research supportive of the broken windows hypothesis is given as well as a review of critical literature that takes a different viewpoint about increased public order. For readers interested in following this debate, this article is a good starting point.

Wilson and Kelling note that the best test of their theory would require an effort to change crime rates by increasing public order. They also state that it is unfortunate that such a test has rarely been done. The authors conclude that "much but not all of the evidence is consistent with the view that increased order is associated with decreased crime." However, for them evidence-based practice doesn't mean closing the door or assuming the matter is settled. The authors clearly state that they "happily acknowledge that the matter is not settled" and "are eager for more and better tests of the possibility that increased disorder leads to increased crime."

#### Reflecting on the Future of Broken Windows

The authors conclude their article by stating that "the broken windows idea does two things, one indisputably good and the other probably effective: it encourages the police to take public order seriously... and it raises the possibility that the more order will mean less crime." The broken windows concept for Wilson and Kelling "remains a strategy worth pursuing."

#### Conclusion

In reviewing this article I was challenged to reflect on the efforts of the Reinventing Probation Council that led to the publication of the monograph *Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model*. The key strategies noted in that monograph are still worth pursuing. I believe that there are five lessons probation can learn from a review of the "broken windows" literature. They are:

1. The need to stick to the principles and continuing working hard, and ask the question where will probation be in 25 years? But this will take strong leaders who see into the next generation of probation and plan accordingly. There is a need to remind ourselves that change takes time.

## Executive Exchange

---

2. The need to continue to evaluate what we do and engage in the production of a practice knowledge about “broken windows” probation.
3. The need to listen to our critics and critically evaluate their positions and viewpoints, and when the evidence is clear be prepared to modify our approaches.
4. The need to learn how to use the popular press and public publications rather than industry journals and academic journals as the sole repository of knowledge about probation. The most interesting thing about the Wilson and Kelling effort has been where they have taken the debate — out into the public domain.

5. Regardless of the difficulties, political pressures, lack of resources, and every other excuse we can imagine, we need to keep pursuing the strategy of transforming probation through leadership.

Persons interested in the future of probation would do well to read Wilson and Kelling’s article, review the Reinventing Probation Council’s monograph, and work to improve the visibility of probation as a serious contributor to public safety and community building.

Donald G. Evans

---

## ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

---

### CHICAGO EVENTS

The National Association of Probation Executives held its annual events on July 22-23, 2006, in Chicago, Illinois.

Over 150 community corrections administrators gathered at the Chicago Hilton for the Members Reception on Saturday, July 22, 2006, during which they engaged in networking activities and renewed friendships.

On Sunday, July 23, 2006, approximately 70 NAPE members attended the Annual Awards Breakfast at the Chicago Hilton, at which time a number of criminal justice practitioners were recognized for their contributions in promoting public safety and advancing the probation profession.

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

The *Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award*, the Association’s oldest and highest honor, was presented to **Joanne Fuller**, Director of the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice in Portland, Oregon. Prior to assuming her present position, Fuller served the department in a number of positions of increasing responsibility. She was a supervisor of services for female offenders and their families, Senior Manager for Adult Probation Services, Deputy Director for Juvenile Services, and, immediately prior to being selected to lead the agency, Deputy Director for the department. Before joining the department, Fuller managed social services for domestic violence victims and homeless women at the Portland YWCA.

Fuller earned a bachelor’s degree in psychology from Lewis and Clark College in 1980 and a Master of Social Work from Portland State University in 1986.

During her 15 years with the department, Fuller has worked to develop an enhanced continuum of services and to increase collaboration among its many stakeholders. She has worked closely with substance abuse treatment providers, especially in the juvenile system, to develop a more coordinated continuum of treatment for juvenile offenders, including the development of a juvenile treatment court and a 16-bed juvenile secure residential alcohol and drug treatment unit.

In conjunction with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Fuller led the development of and championed juvenile detention reform, the objectives of which include eliminating inappropriate or unnecessary use of secure detention, and reducing detention rates and facility overcrowding. In addition, she has worked to redirect public resources from expensive detention facilities to community-based programming that can serve effectively and efficiently as alternatives to secure custody.



*Rocco A. Pozzi with Joanne Fuller*

Fuller was also instrumental in the development of the School Attendance Initiative. This particular initiative began in the fall of 1996 as a collaborative effort between the department and its school partners, community-based service providers, and county-supported Family service Centers on the issue of school attendance. This effort provides school attendance monitoring, family intervention, and case management services for K-9th grade students.

She co-chaired a collaborative effort to develop a strategic plan for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention. The plan, drawing on national research on what works best in delinquency prevention and early intervention, provided a strategic focus for individuals and groups committed to working on these issues in Multnomah County.

From 1994 to 2000 Fuller served as chair of both the Oregon Governor's Council on Domestic Violence and the statewide Domestic Violence Coordinating Council. During her tenure as chair, she advocated for domestic violence legislation, led in the development of a blueprint for statewide domestic violence practices, and completed a domestic violence prevalence study.

As the department's Director, Fuller is furthering the redesign of the adult community corrections system through the implementation of outcome-based management. She is also leading an initiative, with funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, to implement comprehensive system reform in the delivery of alcohol and drug services for juveniles.

In addition to her work with the department, Fuller serves as an adjunct faculty member at Portland State University School of Social Work. In addition, she presents frequently at statewide and national conferences on topics dealing with detention reform, services to offenders, system change, and organizational collaboration. She was also a member of the Advisory Board and faculty of the National Resource Center for Police-Corrections Partnerships.

#### Dan Richard Beto Award

The Association's newest award, the *Dan Richard Beto Award*, is presented to an individual who has provided distinguished and sustained service to the probation profession. This is a discretionary award presented by the President of the Association. The recipient of this year's award is **Christie Davidson**, Assistant Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University and Executive Director of the National Association of Probation Executives.

Davidson joined the Correctional Management Institute of Texas in 1994, the same year she earned a Bachelor of Business Administration degree from Sam Houston State University, as its first employee. Beginning as an administrative assistant to the Executive Director, she took over the responsibility of the NAPE secretariat in 1995 and has been the primary point of contact for NAPE members since that time.

During her tenure with the Institute, she earned a Master of Business Administration degree and assumed positions of increased responsibility, including project coordinator and chief of staff. She was promoted to Assistant Director in 2003.



Christie Davidson with Cherie Townsend

In 2004 Davidson was named Executive Director of the National Association of Probation Executives.

In presenting the award, outgoing President Cheryl K. Townsend talked of Davidson's commitment to NAPE, her significant knowledge base, and the excellent relationship she has developed with the probation profession. All this is particularly noteworthy since she came to the position with no prior probation experience.

In accepting the award, Davidson said how much this recognition meant to her and that she thoroughly enjoyed her relationships with the members of NAPE.

Dan Richard Beto, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives and for whom the award is named, was extremely pleased with the selection of Davidson, who worked closely with him for eleven years. "I could not think of a better choice for this award."

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

The *George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership* was presented to **John J. Larivee**, Chief Executive Officer of Community Resources for Justice (CRJ), a 128-year-old nonprofit organization in Boston, Massachusetts. The Keiser Award is presented jointly by the National Association of Probation Executives and the Community Corrections Improvement Association (CCIA) of Iowa.

Community Resources for Justice provides a myriad of services, including research, public education, and advocacy on issues critical to the delivery of juvenile justice and criminal justice services. In addition, CRJ provides residential and day services to offenders at 25 sites throughout New England.



John J. Larivee (center) with Rocco A. Pozzi and Gerald R. Hinzman

Larivee has been with CRJ for more than three decades, and has served as its Chief Executive Officer since 1985. He is Chair-elect of the Board of the Massachusetts Council of Human Service Providers. In addition, he is a past President of Citizens for Juvenile Justice and a past President of the International Community Corrections Association. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Larivee has served on the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice Innovation, the Advisory Council on Corrections, and the Advisory Council on Youth Services. He is also active in a number of professional organizations, including the National

## Executive Exchange

Association of Probation Executives, American Probation and Parole Association, American Correctional Association, and the John Howard Association.

Larivee earned a bachelor's degree from Boston College in 1972, a master's degree in criminal justice from the State University of New York at Albany in 1974, and a Master of Business Administration degree in 1983 from Suffolk University.

During his distinguished career, Larivee has made a significant contribution to the corrections profession through his leadership, his stewardship, his ability to develop consensus, and his thoughtful approach to issues. In presenting the award, Gerald R. Hinzman read from the nominating material that described Larivee as a "true servant-leader whose contributions are innumerable, and who has been a strong advocate for the rational approach to the delivery of human services."

Larivee, in accepting the award, recognized a number of individuals who had an impact on his career and to whom credit should be given for any successes he might have achieved.

### William Faches Award for Exceptional Community Service

The *William Faches Award for Exceptional Community Service* is also presented jointly by NAPE and CCIA. This year's recipient was **Brenda O'Quin** with the Tarrant County Advocacy Program in Fort Worth, Texas. In nominating O'Quin for this award, Tarrant County Juvenile Services Director Randy Turner wrote:

Brenda O'Quin's contact with Tarrant County Juvenile Services started in 1994 as a worker for the newly formed contract program called the Tarrant County Advocacy Program. She began a relationship with our agency that continues today.

The department was traumatized in August 1995 when her son Michael was murdered. An adult and juvenile shot and killed her son and a female passenger for Michael's car stereo. This was a time when victim rights were not established in the Texas juvenile justice system. Ms. O'Quin was one of our first victims to be involved in the juvenile court process, returning a victim impact statement and appearing for court hearings. She commenced on a mission to stop violence and assist victims of violent acts.

Shortly after the murder of her son, Ms. O'Quin formed a support group for families in similar situations. The group later affiliated with the national organization Parents of Murdered Children (POMC). Ms. O'Quin would also become a board member of the national group, and in 2001 she organized the National POMC Conference held in Fort Worth, Texas. The chapter was active locally and held several annual ceremonies — candlelight vigils, observance of Remembrance Day, acted as a school resource operating a support system for troubled students, and weekly support groups for parents whose loved ones were murdered. Ms. O'Quin volunteered her time for all of these activities.

In 1996 she became involved in speaking on victim impact panels. Ms. O'Quin has spoken on victim impact

panels at federal prisons, the Texas Youth Commission, schools, and universities.

In 2000 she was the speaker at the first victim impact panel for Tarrant County Juvenile Services, and she continues to speak at these programs several times a year. She has also provided training on the grief process to the department's Victim Assistance Unit. She also volunteers as a member of Tarrant County Juvenile Services Victim Advisory Committee.

In 2002 she participated in a Victim Roundtable with the Office for Victims of Crime Director John W. Gillis. She also arranged a media workshop between local newspaper reporters and victims. The newspaper adopted many of the suggestions from this training.

Ms. O'Quin has worked locally on a Murder Response Team, spoken at numerous conferences, and has been involved with the Tarrant County Juvenile Violence Task Force.

She has taken a very tragic experience and turned it into a personal commitment to end violence and help families that have felt its impact.

Brenda O'Quin has, through her extensive volunteer efforts, demonstrated the many qualities sought for in candidates for the Faches Award, said Gerald R. Hinzman in presenting the award.



Brenda O'Quin (center) with Gerald R. Hinzman and Randy Turner

### Arthur Neu Award for Exceptional Policy Development

**Oscar M. Babauta**, Speaker of the House for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), was this year's recipient of the *Arthur Neu Award for Exceptional Policy Development*. Babauta, who has recorded more than two decades to government service, was recognized for his efforts to enact legislation to enhance community corrections.

Babauta began his career in government service working in the Legislative Branch under Representative Ben M. Sablan. After two years in that position, he served as Deputy Special Assistant for Political Affairs for Governor Pedro P. Tenorio for four years.

He then served for the next four years as Special Assistant to Lt. Governor Benjamin T. Manglona until being elected to the CNMI Congress in November 1993. During his congressional career, Babauta served as chair of a number of committees, including Judiciary and Governmental Operation, Commerce and Tourism, and various special committees. From 2002 to 2004 he was House Minority Leader.

During his distinguished legislative carrier, Babauta was instrumental in the passage of a number of bills that created and improved the delivery of probation services. Specifically, in 1998, he passed legislation creating the Office of Adult Probation Supervision. A year later he successfully sponsored a bill to create a Probation Services Fund for the purpose of paying for the training and salaries of probation officers and client services and programs. This piece of legislation also provided for the collections of fees from probationers. That same year he also passed a similar bill to provide for the charging of a parole supervision fee. It was also in 1999 he co-sponsored legislation to establish sex offender registration. In 2002 Babauta sponsored legislation to permit probation officers to carry firearms and make arrests.

Currently pending in the CNMI Congress is the Probation Reform Bill sponsored by Babauta, which, if passed, will provide mechanisms to expand probation services, redefines offenses and punishment ranges, codifies some rights, provides for special conditions of probation, expands the definition of victims, allows for restitution to be enforced through civil judgments, and creates a pilot diversion program.

Babauta has been identified as "a proponent and champion for community corrections in the Northern Mariana Islands."

Unfortunately, due to pressing duties at home, Speaker Babauta was unable to attend the Awards Ceremony.

### Special Recognition



Cherie Townsend with Rocco A. Pozzi

It was also during the Annual Awards Breakfast that President Rocco A. Pozzi presented **Cheryl K. Townsend** with a plaque recognizing her distinguished service and leadership during the past two years as President.

### GUEST EDITORS SELECTED FOR EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

During the Board of Directors meeting in Chicago, several NAPE members volunteered to serve as guest editors of *Executive Exchange*. Immediate past President **Cheryl K. Townsend** of Nevada will be responsible for the Winter 2007 issue. Vice President **Joanne Fuller** of Oregon will assume responsibility for

the Spring 2007 edition, and Secretary **Melissa Cahill** of Missouri will put together the Summer 2007 issue.

Persons wishing to contribute articles for publication consideration are encouraged to do so. Articles dealing with leadership, organizational culture, innovative programs, reinventing probation, "what works" initiatives, reentry, police-corrections partnerships, and multi-agency collaboration are particularly desired. In addition, book reviews and news items are always welcomed.

### MEMBERSHIP CONTINUES TO GROW

As of July 14, 2006, the National Association of Probation Executives had 238 individual members, 22 organizational members, and five corporate members.

The states with the largest membership (individual, organization, and corporate combined) were Texas (42), Pennsylvania (24), New York (20), Arizona (16), Indiana (15), Ohio (11), Virginia (10), and California, Illinois, and Iowa (9).

The membership of NAPE has more than doubled during the past decade.

### NEW MEMBERS

Since the Spring 2006 issue of *Executive Exchange* was published, 20 probation professionals have joined the Association as individual members:

**Michael J. Abell**, Director of Court Services, Second Judicial Circuit Probation and Court Services, Benton, Illinois (Central Region);

**Quala Champagne**, Administrator, Division of Community Corrections, Madison, Wisconsin (Central Region);

**Brian Harte**, Program Administrator, Bell County Juvenile Probation Department, Killeen, Texas (Southern Region);

**Reginald Hines**, Deputy Director, Oklahoma Department of Corrections, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Southern Region);

**Jill L. Ingraham**, Chief of Probation, Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court, Albuquerque, New Mexico (Western);

**Bonnie Kennedy-Sinacore**, Chief, Monmouth Vicinage Probation Department, Freehold, New Jersey (Mid-Atlantic Region);

**Jeffrey Lichtenberg**, Director, Jefferson County Community Justice, Madras, Oregon (Western Region);

**Dennis A. Martinez**, Chief Probation Officer, 14th Judicial District Probation Department, Steamboat Springs, Colorado (Western Region);

**Byron Matsuda**, Director, Coconino County Juvenile Court, Flagstaff, Arizona (Western Region);

**Gerald Minard**, Associate District Director, Correctional Service of Canada, Kingston, Ontario (Canada);

**Louis Narvaez**, Chief, Camden County Probation Department, Camden, New Jersey (Mid-Atlantic Region);

**Michael W. Raith**, Director, Delaware County Adult Probation and Parole Department, Media, Pennsylvania (Mid-Atlantic Region);

**Ronald G. Schweer**, Deputy Chief U. S. Probation Officer, Eastern District of Missouri, St. Louis, Missouri (Central Region);

**Livingston D. Sutro**, Chief Adult Probation Officer, Cochise County Adult Probation Department, Bisbee, Arizona (Western Region);

**Scott Taylor**, Community Corrections Chief, Oregon Department of Corrections, Salem, Oregon (Western Region);

## Executive Exchange

---

**Dana Thompson**, Chairman, Missouri Board of Probation and Parole, Jefferson City, Missouri (Central Region);

**Yuriko B. Toro**, Probation Supervisor, Salt River-Pima-Mari-copa Indian Community, Scottsdale, Arizona (Western Region);

**Reginald R. Valencia**, Chief Probation Officer, Plumas County Probation Department, Quincy, California (Western Region);

**Donna White**, Director, Division of Probation and Parole, Department of Corrections, Anchorage, Alaska (Western Region); and

**Melinda Wilson**, Administrative Officer, 18th Judicial District Court Services, Wichita, Kansas (Central Region).

In addition, the following three agencies became organizational members:

**Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department** (**Michael E. Noyes**, Director), Dallas, Texas;

**New York City Department of Probation** (**Martin Horn**, Commissioner), New York, New York; and

**Washington State Department of Corrections** (**Mary Leftridge Byrd**, Deputy Director), Tumwater, Washington.

---

## NEWS FROM THE FIELD

---

### WESTCHESTER COUNTY PROBATION RECOGNIZED BY NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

On April 10, 2006, at the Lifesavers Conference in Austin, Texas, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) recognized 14 individuals and organizations from across the nation for accomplishments in improving traffic safety. Safety award recipients included the following individuals and organizations:

- **American Academy of Pediatrics** in Elk Grove Village, Illinois;
- **Rosalie Berquist**, Prevention Director of the Brain Injury Association of Westborough, Massachusetts;
- State Senator **Con Bunde** of Anchorage, Alaska;
- Chief **Michael Capriglione** of the Newport Police Department in Newport, Delaware;
- **East Valley DUI Task Force** of Phoenix, Arizona;
- **Greater Cleveland Automobile Dealers Association** of Brecksville, Ohio;
- **Phyllis Larimore**, Car Seat Program Coordinator at Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City, Missouri;
- **Robyn Litke**, Coordinator of the Red River Valley Safe Communities Coalition of Fargo, North Dakota;
- **Mississippi Primary Safety Belt Law Team**;
- **Tammy Ryden**, Citizen Traffic Safety Advocate in Norman, Oklahoma;
- **South Carolina Primary Safety Belt Law Team**;
- **Earl M. Sweeney**, Assistant Commissioner of the New Hampshire Department of Public Safety in Concord;
- **Westchester County Probation Department DWI Enforcement Unit** in White Plains, New York; and
- **Greg Wilkinson**, Public Information Officer for the Alaska State Troopers in Anchorage.

On May 9, 2006, NHTSA Regional Administrator **Thomas Louizou** presented the award to **Andy Spano**, Westchester County Executive. The Westchester County Probation Department was singled out for the excellent performance of the department's DWI Enforcement Unit, which works to keep probationers convicted of DWI from repeating offenses. The unit, which has 14 officers who oversee about 1,300 offenders, uses a number of innovative approaches to keep probationers alcohol and drug free.

"Our Probation Department and the Stop-DWI Program have been very successful in helping to keep drunk drivers off the road," said Spano. "This award demonstrates that our program is a model for the nation when it comes to traffic safety and prevention DWIs."

"We are very pleased to receive this award, and to be recognized nationally for the work we do with DWI offenders," said **Rocco A. Pozzi**, Commissioner of Probation. "Helping offenders to stay sober and off our roads keeps people in our communities safer."

In addition to Spano and Pozzi, those attending the award ceremony were Probation Deputy Commissioner **Jacelyn Levin**, Stop-DWI Director **Thomas Meier**, Assistant to the Probation Commissioner **James O'Shea**, and members of the DWI Enforcement Unit.

### WELLS RECEIVES AWARD IN MINNESOTA

On May 23, 2006, Cass County Probation Director Reno Wells was awarded the 2006 *Al Reker Memorial Award* at the Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers (MACPO) Spring Conference in Alexandria. The Reker Award is MACPO's highest honor and is given to a member who has shown professionalism and is dedicated to the field of probation and corrections.

Wells has worked in corrections since 1974 when he began his career as a jailer-dispatcher in Beltrami County. He also worked as a juvenile counselor at the Northwest Juvenile Training Center. In 1979 he became a probation officer for Cass County and in 1992 he was appointed Director of Court Services.

He has been described as a "hardworking professional who leads by example and continuously stresses the importance of taking care of your family."

The award, presented since 1982, is named in honor of **Al Reker**, a leader in community corrections in Minnesota, who served as Chief Probation Officer in Nobles County until his death from cancer.

### HODGES NAMED PROBATION CHIEF IN VIRGINIA

NAPE member **Marcus Hodges** has been named Chief Probation and Parole Officer for District 21 in Fredericksburg, Virginia, effective June 2007. District 21 covers Spotsylvania, Stafford, and King George Counties, as well as the City of Fredericksburg. From 2003 until his recent appointment, Hodges served as a correctional program specialist with the National Institute of Corrections on loan from the Virginia Department of Corrections.

---

Hodges, who possesses a bachelor's degree from Virginia Union University and a Master of Arts degree from Florida Metropolitan University, began his career in criminal justice in 1992 as a rehabilitation counselor at Buckingham Correctional Center in Dillwyn, Virginia. During his career, he has held a number of positions with the Virginia Department of Corrections: intensive supervision officer, senior probation officer at several facilities, community corrections regional manager for the Northern Region of Virginia, and Deputy Chief Probation Officer in Richmond.

During his temporary duty with the National Institute of Corrections, Hodges was assigned to the Community Corrections/Prisons Division, where he was involved in a number of community corrections projects. He also served on the faculty of the Executive Development Program for new probation and parole executives, a joint initiation of the National Institute of Corrections, National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University.

### MARION COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT ADOPTS BIKE PATROLS

In July 2006 the Marion County Probation Department announced it was adopting bike patrols in an effort that will better serve the nearly 100 homeless probationers living in downtown Indianapolis.

Two probation officers, assigned to the Homeless Team, will be outfitted similarly to the Indianapolis Police Department's bike patrol, including the use of protective gear. The officers will be biking around downtown Indianapolis three days a week (weather permitting), visiting homeless missions, day reporting centers, and trying to locate probationers who live on the streets.

The goal of the Homeless Team is to develop collaborative relationships with homeless service providers to reduce "failure to appear" rates and re-arrests of homeless probationers. Probation officers also assist offenders with issues such as substance abuse and housing, along with other matters that can increase the likelihood of successfully meeting the terms of their probation.

"Bike patrols adapt the concept of field work to best fit the population being served. Our officers have increased mobility to find the places where the homeless congregate," said Chief Probation Officer **Robert L. Bingham**. "Collaborating with homeless service providers to try to bring more stability to homeless offender's lives is also a natural extension of what a typical probation officer does. They are problem solvers, crime prevention specialists, motivators, educators, facilitators, and in some cases are the only support system an offender may have," he added.

"The officers are excited and enthusiastic about this project. This great idea was brought to us by probation officer **Joe Hodson**. Probation officers often customize programs for offenders in an effort to help them successfully meet the terms of their probation. For all probationers, the larger goal of course is always increasing the likelihood of their not re-offending. Supervising nearly 14,000 adult and youth, probation officers play a vital role in the criminal justice system and public safety," said **Christine Kerl**, a supervisor with the department.

### WALSH RECOGNIZED IN MASSACHUSETTS

**Michael Walsh**, Chief Probation Officer for the Quincy District Court in Massachusetts, was presented with a special award

named in honor of **Jim Minton**, the well-respected Brookline District Court Chief Probation Officer, who died more than a year ago following a courageous battle with cancer.

The *Jim Minton Excellence Award* was established by the Massachusetts Chief Probation Officers Association and presented for the first time at the organization's meeting in June 2006. The award was created by the Association to honor Minton's contributions to the Massachusetts Probation Service and to recognize a Chief Probation Officer whose "leadership, dedication, and contributions to the probation service have been an example to all and whose accomplishments are a credit to the Massachusetts Probation Service," according to Association President **David Parke**, Chief Probation Officer for the Barnstable District Court.

"In 2005 the Massachusetts Chief Probation Officers Association voted to establish an award in memory of Jim Minton, a long-time member of the Association who faithfully served as an executive board member and as secretary," Parke said. "Jim's spirit, enthusiasm, and commitment were admired by all who knew him. He served as an inspiration to other Chief Probation Officers."

A 33-year Chief Probation Officer, Walsh said he was "humbled" to be the award's first recipient. "I want to thank everyone. It is a great honor to be recognized by my peers and especially to receive an award in honor of Jim Minton."

Walsh served as Chief Probation Officer for the Marlborough District Court before assuming responsibility for the Quincy District Court. He was President of the Chief Probation Officers Association for 13 years. In addition, Walsh served on a variety of statewide committees to improve the delivery of probation services, including the Training Team of the Office of the Commissioner of Probation, Office Standards Committee, Violation of Probation Standards Committee, and the Warrant Protocol Committee. He is also active in the New England Council on Crime and Delinquency.

### NAPE MEMBERS PROVIDED SIGNIFICANT SUPPORT TO APPA INSTITUTE IN CHICAGO

At the 31st Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association held in Chicago, Illinois, on July 23-26, 2006, members of the National Association of Probation Executives lent their support and skills to help make the conference a success.

NAPE members serving on the 2006 National Program Committee, along with their areas of responsibility, included past President **Robert L. Bingham** of Indiana (Organizational Development and Leadership), **Caroline Rickaway** of Texas (Judicial), **Linda W. Layton** of Georgia (Offender Programs), **Michael Torchia** of Illinois (Supplemental Topics), and **Dee Bell** of Georgia (Intensive Sessions).

In addition, NAPE members served as presenters or moderators in 24 workshops and the Association sponsored four well-attended sessions.

**Cynthia Williams**, who works for NAPE member **Tom Plumlee**, Director of the Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Fort Worth, Texas, "did an excellent job as chair of the 2006 National Program Committee," said Bingham.

### CALLAHAN RECOGNIZED BY APPA

During the 31st Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association, NAPE member **Richard B. Callahan**,

## Executive Exchange

---

Chief Probation Officer for District 28 of the Virginia Department of Corrections in Radford, Virginia, was presented the *Sam Houston State University Award* for publishing "an article concerning probation, parole, or community corrections that provides new information and insight into the operation, effectiveness, or future of the community corrections profession."

In collaboration with **Michael M. Kaune**, Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at St. Francis College in Brooklyn Heights, New York, Callahan published several articles dealing with the 2005 Survey of Probation Officers Concerning the Use of Hair Testing for Illicit Substances. Their articles appeared in the *International Journal of Drug Testing and Executive Exchange*.

In addition to his duties with the Virginia Department of Corrections, where he has been employed since 1988, Callahan is a member of the adjunct faculty at Radford University.

### CAHILL MOVES TO MISSOURI, HUGHES TAKES OVER IN COLLIN COUNTY

NAPE Secretary **Melissa Cahill**, Director of the Collin County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in McKinney, Texas, has resigned to take a position with the U. S. Probation Service for the Eastern District of Missouri in St. Louis. Her last day was August 15, 2006.

During her two year tenure in Collin County, Cahill reduced the sizes of caseloads, streamlined management, and implemented a number of intervention programs. Prior to assuming the Collin County job, Cahill was Chief Psychologist for the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department.

In addition to her membership in the National Association of Probation Executives, Cahill, who holds a doctorate in clinical psychology from the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, is active in the American Probation and Parole Association and the Texas Probation Association.

State District Judge **Chris Oldner** commended Cahill for her "excellent" service to Collin County and for her "good and innovative ideas."

Cahill was a recognized leader in community corrections in Texas, said **Ron Goethals**, NAPE past President and her former boss. "We have lost a rising star in Texas probation."

At the time of her departure, Cahill was a member of the Advisory Council of the Texas Probation Training Academy at Sam Houston State University and co-chair of the Texas Probation Strategic Planning Committee. **Arlene Parchman**, chair of the Academy's Advisory Council and co-chair of the Texas Probation Strategic Planning Committee, praised Cahill for her efforts to enhance the probation profession. "She was such a knowledgeable resource, and she brought such energy to any project or initiative in which she became involved. We are really going to miss her," Parchman said.

**Bob Hughes**, a 14-year veteran with the department, was named the new Director. Prior to assuming his new position, he was one of three assistant directors in the department. Hughes, who began his probation career in 1992, is a graduate of East Texas State University (now Texas A&M University at Commerce), where he earned a bachelor's degree in sociology.

"He is well known to the employees and staff of the department, and he is ready to hit the ground running," said State District Judge **Curt Henderson**.

Cahill said she thinks Hughes will be an excellent director. "He has been an integral part of the positive changes that have occurred over the past two years," she noted.

### NEW PAROLE BOARD MEMBER APPOINTED IN KANSAS

In August 2006, Governor **Kathleen Sebelius** appointed **Patricia Biggs** to the Kansas Parole Board.

Biggs of Topeka has been the Executive Director of the Kansas Sentencing Commission since 2003. Between 1996 and 2003, she was Director of Research and Planning for the Kansas Department of Corrections. Prior to that, Biggs was an economist in Washington, D. C., a financial analyst in Pennsylvania, an instructor at the University of Connecticut, and an adjunct professor at Washburn University and Friends University.

Biggs, whose appointment must be confirmed by the Kansas Senate, will serve a four-year term. She replaces **Marilyn Scafe** on the board.

### JOINT HOMICIDE PREVENTION INITIATIVE ANNOUNCED IN PHILADELPHIA

On August 2, 2006, the First Judicial District and the Jerry Lee Center for Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania announced a joint effort to reduce the prevalence of homicides in Philadelphia.

Supported by commitments for \$1,000,000 in city, state, and private funding, the First Judicial District will launch a new Homicide Prevention Unit within its Adult Probation and Parole Department. Criminologists at the Jerry Lee Center will provide special training and employ advance data mining and risk analysis methods never before applied to the city's probationers to develop data-driven strategies for the five probation officers assigned to the new unit. These officers will then provide maximum treatment and supervision to the small number of convicted felons who have the greatest risk of being charged with murder.

The Jerry Lee Foundation's \$500,000 contribution to this project was matched in the new state budget by a \$250,000 appropriation to the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency for Penn's analysis and evaluation, and by the City of Philadelphia's \$250,000 appropriation to the First Judicial District for the creation of the Homicide Prevention Unit.

"The first Judicial District has been working to develop this homicide prevention project for almost two years," said Common Pleas Court President Judge **C. Darnell Jones, II**. "Our probation and parole co-chiefs, **Frank Snyder** and **Bob Malvestuto**, have worked closely with Penn's Jerry Lee Criminology Center to develop this model for predicting and thus prevention future homicides. It is very rewarding to witness the fruition of these efforts and gratifying to have the financial support to fully implement this program."

**Lawrence W. Sherman**, Director of Penn's Jerry Lee Criminology Center, noted that "the Adult Probation and Parole Department supervises more convicted offenders in Philadelphia than any other agency, but only a very small fraction of them are at a high risk of killing someone or being killed. If we can pinpoint these 'needles in the haystack' and help them to turn their lives around, we might well help to make Philadelphia a safer city."

## PROBATION SWEEP NETS ARRESTS IN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

During the first week of August 2006 the Street Crimes Unit of the Tracy, California, Police Department, working in conjunction with the San Joaquin County Probation Department, conducted a probation compliance check of 40 probationers living in Tracy.

According to an article appearing in the *Tri-Valley Herald*, the four-man teams hit the streets and arrested ten people for a variety of probation violations, including six documented gang members.

"The operation was very successful," said Detective Sergeant **Mark Duxbury**, who supervises the Street Crimes Unit. "Normally probationers and parolees who fail to report or provide a false address are doing so because they are continuing to commit criminal acts," he said. "These are the people we wanted to go after."

Eight of the ten people were arrested on charges of violating probation, ranging from not reporting after they were released from jail, failing a urinalysis test, not residing at the home on file with the probation department, and for prior misdemeanors for which they were cited and released.

The Street Crimes Unit conducts the probation sweeps about four times a year, and Duxbury says that because they are successful they play to work with probation in the future.

## NEW YOUTH JUSTICE ACT IN AUSTRALIA RECEIVES CRITICISM

According to a release from the Australian News Service, the Youth Justice Act introduced in August 2006 increased the maximum term of imprisonment for juveniles from one to two years and introduced consecutive sentences for multiple offenses. The previous law allowed only concurrent sentences for juveniles.

In applying the new law in juvenile court on August 2, 2006, Magistrate **David Loadman** said the new act "signaled a philosophical shift away from rehabilitation towards sentencing based on retribution or just desserts." He added that "although it is not a complete move towards the sentencing philosophies that are applicable for adults, there is a move away from the principles of reform and rehabilitation."

**Sharon Payne**, Chief Executive of the Northern Aboriginal Justice Agency, said the new regime was a "huge disappointment" because it specifically failed to mention indigenous offenders and was likely to result in higher incarceration rates. Describing it as "draconian," Payne opined that the new law "was made in isolation without any independent advice."

According to Payne, the new act failed to recognize that many young people broke the law because they were acting out "learned behaviors" which require understanding to correct, not criminalization. "The land-and-order overtones to it are obviously giving a direction to police and others to be much harder on young people," she said.

## CHEMICAL CASTRATION OF PEDOPHILE UPHELD IN CANADA

The August 9, 2006, edition of the *Ottawa Citizen* reports that a convicted pedophile order to take medication to control his sexual urges has failed in his efforts to have "chemical castration" declared unconstitutional.

**Shaun Deacon**, who has a lengthy history of sexual assaults on children and who was declared a "long-term offender" in 1998, was released from prison in November 2004 in British Columbia under the conditions he live in a half-way house, avoid children, and take anti-androgen medication. Deacon claimed the drugs prescribed under the conditions of his release were a violation of the liberty and security of the person guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. He also claimed the drugs caused mood swings, drowsiness, vomiting, nausea, and loss of bone density.

Last year he asked the National Parole Board to vary the medication condition of his release, but the board declined. He challenged the decision before the Federal Court, with his lawyer arguing that the right of competent adults to refuse medication is a matter of fundamental justice.

The Federal Court of Appeal ruled that "the right to refuse medical treatment, while perhaps accepted as the general rule, is also recognized as properly subject to limitations in certain contexts." In his written decision, Justice **Allen Linden** noted that Deacon was not forced to take the drugs and that he "may choose not to take the medication prescribed to him, although he thereby also chooses to face the consequences of his decision," a violation of the conditions of his release and, likely, a return to prison.

The panel of three judges unanimously rejected Deacon's appeal, upholding a previous decision of the Federal Court. The court also refused Deacon's claim that the National Parole Board exceeded its jurisdiction by ordering him to take the drugs.

## NEW DIRECTOR APPOINTED IN ANGELINA COUNTY

On July 26, 2006, the judges of Angelina County, Texas, appointed **Rodney J. Thompson** to be the Director of the Angelina County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Lufkin, Texas, effective October 2, 2006. At the time of his selection, Thompson was the Felony Unit Supervisor for the Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Fort Worth, Texas.

**Fred Rangel**, who recently retired as Director of the department following a distinguished career in the probation field, praised Thompson's appointment. He noted that his successor brings to the position "over 23 years of experience in increasingly responsible positions within the community corrections arena."

NAPE member **Tom Plumlee**, Director of the Tarrant County department, said "Rodney will be difficult to replace. He has been an integral part of this department for a number of years and he has held positions of responsibility in almost all divisions. While I hate to lose him, I know he will prove to be an asset to the justice system of Angelina County."

## MULTI-AGENCY SEARCH FOR PROBATION AND PAROLE VIOLATORS SUCCESSFUL IN VENTURA COUNTY

Hundreds of law enforcement officers from eight different agencies searched homes in Ventura County, California, during the early morning hours of August 10, 2006, in an attempt to apprehend probation and parole violators. Officers from federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies searched 106 homes in Oxnard, Port Hueneme, and El Rio. The operation was the result of a growing level of violence in the area, much of which was gang related.

According to an article appearing in the *Ventura County Star*, at the conclusion of the operation, police had arrested 31 people and confiscated a shotgun, three pistols, and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. In addition, they seized homemade clubs, along with quantities of marijuana and heroin.

Many of those targeted in the operation were suspected "taggers" or members of Oxnard's most notorious gangs, the Colonia Chiques and the Southside Chiques. The two gangs are responsible for many of the city's homicides, said **David Keith**, a spokesman for the Oxnard Police Department.

Oxnard Police Commander **Robert Cox** called the sweep a success. "We've definitely made a statement that gang violence and drugs will not be tolerated here."

### PROBATION OFFICER OF THE YEAR NAMED IN NEW YORK STATE

On August 3, 2006, **Robert M. Maccarone**, State Director of Probation and Correctional Alternatives (DPCA), presented the 2006 *Probation Officer of the Year Award* to **Roger N. Roush**, a probation officer with the Dutchess County Office of Probation and Community Corrections. This annual award was presented during the New York State Probation Officers Association Conference held in Albany, New York. The award is presented by DPCA in recognition of exceptional service, dedication, and professionalism performed by a probation officer who has significantly contributed to the field of community corrections and strengthened its role within the criminal justice or juvenile justice systems.

Roush's nomination was submitted by Dutchess County Probation Director **Mary Ellen Still**, who praised the officer for his consistent performance, enthusiasm, and dedication, especially with regard to his work with gang involved youth.

Director Still said, "Officer Roush's proactive approach in dealing with gang-involved youth by facilitating and coordinating a task force comprising local law enforcement, the District Attorney's Office, and other interested parties is representative of his initiative and resolve. Prevention and education, as well as enforcement, became the focus of the task force and Officer Roush used his knowledge and expertise to work with his own probationers and also serve as an in-house resource to other probation officers and law enforcement officials."

"Officer Roush is a recognized leader and expert on gang activity and prevention methods. His commitment to and compassion for youth has enhanced probation's position within the law enforcement community, schools, parents, and the youth he helps guide away from gang involvement and criminal activity and toward more successful, productive futures," said Maccarone.

Roush has been a probation officer with the Dutchess County Office and Community Corrections since September 1989.

### CHIEF APPOINTED IN SOLANO COUNTY

In an article appearing in the *Vacaville Reporter* on September 6, 2006, it is noted that **Isabelle Voit** has been named the new Chief Probation Officer for Solano County, California, replacing recently retired probation chief **Gemma Grossi**.

"Ms. Voit brings a wealth of experience to the position of Chief Probation Officer," commented Judge **Garry T. Ichikawa**, presiding juvenile judge of the Solano County Superior Court. "Her work experience crosses all levels of the probation system, from group counselor to probation officer and management. With this

breadth of experience, I believe she will provide the guidance needed in continuing our excellent work in the adult and juvenile probation programs."

Voit, who has a bachelor's degree in management, began her career with the Solano County Probation Department more than two decades ago as a group counselor at the juvenile hall. During her career, she has held a number of positions, including probation officer, supervising deputy probation officer, probation services manager, and Chief Deputy Probation Officer.

"The selection of Isabelle as our new chief probation officer is an outstanding choice," said Solano County Supervisor **John Vasquez**. "Isabelle has shown excellent leadership and management skills throughout her career. Her rise to the top position is proof of her skills and dedication to the field of probation."

The probation department is comprised of four divisions: adult, juvenile, juvenile detention, and administrative.

### INTERAGENCY CRIME-FIGHTING EFFECTIVE IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

According to an article appearing in the August 17, 2006, edition of the *San Bernardino Sun*, a law enforcement coalition led by the San Bernardino County Probation Department conducted a two day sweep of the area resulting in the arrest of 59 offenders. The multi-agency operation, which mobilized about 150 personnel, included representatives from the probation department, sheriff's department, San Bernardino, Redlands, and San Bernardino City Unified School District police departments, state parole board, and U.S. Department of Justice.

In addition to the arrests, the 12 teams developed valuable intelligence and delivered a message, said Chief Probation Officer **Jerry Harper**. "The message is clear: if you go AWOL, abscond, fail to comply with the terms of probation or have a warrant, we will come and get you. We are going after noncompliance very aggressively."

Six handguns and a hand grenade were seized, said Deputy Probation Director **Michelle Scray**. In addition, in at least five instances officers had to notify Child Protective Services to report unsafe or negligent conditions for children.

Deputy Probation Director **Rick Arden** said this cooperative initiative was a success. "You are going to see more of these large scale operations countywide."

### CANADIAN TRAINING INSTITUTE APPOINTS BETO SENIOR FELLOW

**Donald G. Evans**, President of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Training Institute (CTI) based in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, announced on September 12, 2006, that **Dan Richard Beto**, former Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston University, has been appointed a Senior Fellow of the Institute.

"Mr. Beto, who has devoted more than four decades to the criminal justice system, is a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives and continues to serve as editor of *Executive Exchange*. Mr. Beto, currently Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation, will be contributing through research and writing to augment CTI's work in the field of community corrections," Evans said.

The Canadian Training Institute is a National Voluntary Organization which provides training, consulting assistance, promotes

collaborative action, and undertakes applied research projects in contributing to the effectiveness of services delivered by criminal justice and related human service agencies.

CTI is committed to fostering inclusivity, equality, and life long learning by enhancing services which assist individuals to participate as responsible, valued, and contributing members of our society. In this respect, CTI assists in the development of knowledge, skills and services that reduce crime, promote active participation, and ultimately contribute to healthy individuals, agencies, and communities. CTI strives to achieve the following goals:

- To provide field relevant training and development programs and other learning resource materials in facilitating the personal and professional development of staff, volunteers, and individuals involved with or served by criminal justice social service and other human service agencies.
- To provide consulting services in facilitating change, team building and other related organizational development activities in contributing to the effective and efficient delivery of services to individuals.
- To collaborate with others in undertaking and disseminating information arising from applied research demonstration projects as a means to both enhance the effectiveness of services delivered, and to potentially contribute to delivery system changes within the criminal justice system.

“The Board of Directors of the Canadian Training Institute welcomes Mr. Beto to the work of the Institute and looks forward to his contributions in the furtherance of our mission and mandate,” said Evans.

### WHITTINGTON ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT PLANS

Earlier this year **Marie Whittington**, Chief Probation Officer for Riverside County, California, for more than eight years, announced she will retire in early 2007. Prior to her current position, Whittington was Chief Deputy Probation Officer for San Mateo County from 1995 to 1998 and spent more than 25 years at all levels in the Orange County Probation Department in California.

“When I came to Riverside County I promised to stay five to seven years and I’m in my ninth year now,” Whittington said, explaining her decision. “I’ve accomplished my goals and things are going well.”

**Sharon Waters**, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, lauded Whittington’s accessibility and cooperative spirit in dealing with the court. “We appreciate that she has given the court and the county a year to find a replacement chief, and that she has offered to assist in the process. We wish Marie all the best in her retirement.”

Presiding Juvenile Court Judge **Becky Dugan** called it a pleasure to have dealt with Whittington on important issues, such as quality of juvenile outplacement facilities and programs. “She steered the probation department in the right direction on juvenile matters and it is now up to a new chief to take the department the rest of the way.

A successor will be appointed as part of a joint selection process involving the Riverside County Superior Court and the County of Riverside.

Whittington, a longtime member of NAPE, has recorded a distinguished career in community corrections that exceeds seven lustrums. “While her retirement is well deserved, the field

of probation will miss Marie’s expertise,” said NAPE President **Rocco A. Pozzi**.

### VETERAN INDIANAPOLIS PROBATION OFFICER HONORED BY ADVOCACY ORGANIZATION

On September 15, 2006, during the Fifth Annual Citywide Summit of the HOPE (Helping Others Prosper Economically) Team, Inc., Marion County Probation Officer **Patti Cushingberry**, known for looking for the good in everyone, was one of two recipients of the *Ralph Dove Diamond Award*. The award recognizes community members who display a grass-roots “spirit of compassion” embodied by the late **Ralph Dove**, former director of the Homeless Initiative and the Wheeler Boys & Girls Club.

The HOPE Summit, held at Martin University in Indianapolis, Indiana, brought together a host of individuals and organizations that provide human services. The Hope Team was founded in 2001 to improve the human conditions of those in need through networking, advocacy, and service delivery.

Cushingberry, who has worked in probation since 1977, has devoted most of her distinguished career to helping juveniles.

“Patti Cushingberry is truly one of a kind,” said **Robert L. Bingham**, Marion County Chief Probation Officer. “She is easily one of the most memorable and remarkable officers with whom I have had the pleasure to work during my career. Patti has the uncanny, natural ability to instantly connect with probationers, to earn their confidence, and, in the process, remarkable turn-arounds in attitude, thinking, and behavior occur. Her passion for helping probationers adopt a permanent prosocial lifestyle is legendary.”

The other recipient was **Tony Williams**, who turned his gang related shooting at the age of 15 into a crusade to keep urban youth out of trouble.

### EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM HELD

On September 10-15, 2006, twelve probation and parole executives attended the Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation and parole executives at the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. This program, a joint initiative of the National Institute of Corrections, National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, has been offered since 1997.

Attending this program were **Donna White** of Alaska, **Yuriko B. Toro** of Arizona, **Reginald R. Valencia** of California, **Dennis Martinez** of Colorado, **Melinda Wilson** of Kansas, **Bonnie Kennedy-Sinacore** and **Louis Narvaez** of New Jersey, **Reginald Hines** of Oklahoma, **William J. McDevitt, Jr.**, of Pennsylvania, **Paul Becker** and **Michael Noyes** of Texas, and **Quala Champagne** of Wisconsin.

Members of the faculty included **Martin J. Krizay** (NAPE Treasurer) of Arizona, **Rocco A. Pozzi** (NAPE President) of New York, **Christie Davidson** (NAPE Executive Director) and **Ron R. Goethals** (NAPE Past President) of Texas, **Marcus Hodges** of Virginia, and **Dot Faust** of the District of Columbia.

It was during this program that Goethals, who is retired, announced that he was stepping down as a member of the faculty. He, like the creators of the program, believed that members of the faculty should be active probation executives. With Goethals departure there are no original members remaining on the faculty.

### NEW ANTI-CRIME UNIT APPROVED IN SCHENECTADY COUNTY

The Schenectady County Legislature in New York approved the creation of the Office of Field Intelligence in September 2006. This new anti-crime unit, initially proposed by District Attorney **Robert M. Carney**, will be based in the Schenectady Police Department and will be comprised of three detectives, an assistant district attorney, probation officer, parole officer, and a crime analyst.

This new office, funded by a grant of \$815,000 from the New York Division of Criminal Justice Services, will assist the participating agencies in efforts aimed at reducing gun violence, control street gangs, and suppress drug dealing.

Schenectady Police Chief **Michael Geraci** and **Joe Mancini**, Deputy Director of the Schenectady County Probation Department, said the joint effort will increase the amount of information shared between the law enforcement agencies, thus allowing them to identify crime trends quicker.

### PROBATION OFFICER MURDERED IN THE PHILIPPINES

On the morning of September 7, 2006, **Concepcion Lumanglas**, Assistant Provincial Parole and Probation Officer of the Philippines Department of Justice, was kidnapped from her home in Ilagan, Isabela. The following day her tortured body was found in neighboring Naguilian. The victim's body bore several stab wounds and signs of strangulation.

According to articles appearing in several newspapers in the Philippines, several people have been arrested in connection with the kidnapping and murder of the 50-year-old public servant, including the alleged mastermind, **Rommel Laciste**, who was supposed to have been in custody for another murder, and **Rommel Acacio**, a police officer.

Senior Superintendent **Jude Santos**, Police Director of Isabela, decried the special treatment Laciste was allegedly getting in the Santiago City Jail, where he was able to go in and out of his detention cell. Officers investigating the kidnapping and murder suggested that the crime could be work-related.

### JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICER RECOGNIZED IN MICHIGAN

**Barbara Donaldson**, who has served as a Juvenile Probation Officer in Traverse City, Michigan, for more than a quarter of a century, was presented the *Mary S. Coleman Award for Excellence in Juvenile Justice* on September 20, 2006, by the Juvenile Justice Association of Michigan.

In speaking about Donaldson's recognition, **Michael Stein**, Director of Court Services for the Grand Traverse County Family Division of the 13th Circuit Court, said "she dedicated her entire professional life to helping our youth and their families." According to Stein, it was not uncommon for former probationers to come back to the court as adults to see her. Many have credited Donaldson for turning their lives around.

Donaldson, who viewed the award as the high-point of her career, praised her coworkers. "I think we have staff that just work together and really care about the lives of our kids," she said.

### WEST VIRGINIA ANTI-COHABITATION LAW CHALLENGED BY PAROLEE

A West Virginia parolee is challenging the constitutionality of the state's anti-cohabitation law after his parole was delayed for more than four months because he wanted to live with his fiancée.

According to a recent *Associated Press* article, **William Stanley** was granted parole on June 7, 2005, but remained in custody until October because his plan to move in with his fiancée was illegal under West Virginia law. A lawsuit filed on September 18, 2006, on Stanley's behalf alleges his constitutional rights were violated and asks the Kanawha County Circuit Court to declare the law unconstitutional.

West Virginia's anti-cohabitation law makes it a misdemeanor to unmarried people to "lewdly and lasciviously associate or cohabit together."

"He had to follow the laws of West Virginia to get paroled and this was a law that was still on the books, so the parole officer would not release him to his fiancée because that would be a violation of the law," said **Andrew Schneider**, Executive Director of the West Virginia American Civil Liberties Union.

Named as defendants in the lawsuit are the West Virginia Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety, Division of Corrections, and Director of Parole Services **Delbert Harrison**, among others.

Stanley spent more than eleven years in prison for multiple courts of forgery; he will be on parole until 2023. Initially he had proposed to live with his brother in Jackson County, but that plan was not approved because of the close proximity to the victims. After both plans were rejected, Stanley was paroled to the Union Mission in Fairmont, a faith-based nonprofit facility.

The ACLU reports that West Virginia is one of seven states with anti-cohabitation laws, including North Carolina, where a state court recently ruled that state's law unconstitutional. The other states are Florida, Michigan, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Virginia.

### TRANSITION IN JUVENILE LEADERSHIP IN LAKE COUNTY

On September 18, 2006, **Leonard Young** of Vernon Hills assumed the duties of Director of Juvenile Probation and Detention for Lake County, Illinois, replacing **Louise Loud**, who held the post for 30 years. In announcing the appointment, Circuit Court Chief Judge Christopher **Starck** said Loud would work with Young until late December to assist in the transition.

As reported in the *Lake County News-Sun*, since moving to Vernon Hills last year, Young has been a consultant for juvenile justice services. He has served as an instructor in literacy programs in middle and high schools in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Young has also held senior administrative positions in Cleveland, Ohio, in the juvenile court and detention center.

Young, who started his juvenile justice career as a probation officer in 1973, is a graduate of Cleveland State University where he earned a bachelor's degree in urban affairs.

Loud plans to continue teaching courses in criminal justice, family law, and juvenile delinquency at the College of Lake County and the University of Wisconsin - Parkside. She also hopes to finish a book to help parents deal with the loss of a child.

## MOHAVE COUNTY SELECTS NEW CHIEF

After a six month search, Mohave County has a new Chief Probation Officer. **Friend Walker** of Alexandria, Virginia, will assume responsibility for a 125-employee department that provides both adult and juvenile probations services.

Walker, who possesses a master's degree in criminal justice from Grambling State University, as over 20 years of law enforcement experience, including serving as Chief of Police for Collinsville, Illinois. At the time of his appointment, Walker was chief criminal investigator for the Department of Defense criminal investigation task force in Virginia.

## NEW PAROLE CHAIR APPOINTED IN ONTARIO

On October 1, 2006, **Cynthia Morton** was appointed Chair of the Ontario Parole and Earned Release Board.

In announcing the appointment, Community Safety and Correctional Services Minister **Monte Kwinter** said "as chair of Ontario's Parole and Earned Release Board, Cynthia Morton brings significant experience in the justice sector and community involvement. She will help ensure the concerns of the community and victims are heard in the parole process and help strengthen the confidence of Ontarians in their safety and the province's justice system."

Morton is a graduate of the Osgoode Hall Law School and has been a member of the National Parole Board of Canada since 2003. She served as Deputy Attorney General and Deputy Minister of Labor and Education in British Columbia. She is also a former children's commissioner in that province as well as a former Assistant Deputy Minister of Labor in Ontario.

The Ontario Parole and Earned Release Board decides whether or not to grant parole to adult offenders serving sentences of under two years.

## CAYMAN PROBATION PIONEER DIES

**Joyce Hylton**, age 93, Cayman's first probation and welfare officer, died at her home on October 1, 2006, following several months of poor health.

According to the *Caymanian Compass*, the Cayman Islands' leading newspaper, "Miss Joyce," as she was known, was appointed probation officer in 1963 after she and other concerned citizens lobbied for a separate court to deal with juvenile offenders.

Although she retired in 1984, she continued to remain active, serving on the Adoption Board. She was a member of the Garden Club of Grand Cayman and a founding member of the Cayman Orchid Society. She was also widely known for her work with the Cub Scouts and for helping the Lions Club with its community projects. Hylton was made a Member of the Order of the British Empire (MBE) in 1978.

Funeral services took place on October 8, 2006, at Elmslie Memorial Church.

## PROBATION VOLUNTEER HONORED IN INDIANAPOLIS

On October 4, 2006, **Elisha Snow**, a Marion Superior Court volunteer, received honors from **Bart Peterson**, Mayor of Indianapolis, Indiana, for her community services efforts in a very non-traditional volunteer capacity with the Marion County

Probation Department. The annual Mayor's Community Service Award recognizes Indianapolis' citizens for volunteer efforts and commitment to community service.

In nominating Snow, the probation department's Community Outreach Coordinator **Patti Cushingberry** said: "During the last seven months, Elisha has managed to volunteer 30 hours per month, along with caring for her two children, work a job, and attend classes at IUPUI. She wanted some experience in the probation department, and also wanted to give back to her community so we took her on as our only casework volunteer."

"Probation officers not only have stressful jobs, but they manage extremely large caseloads. After her initial training, she has been a lifesaver to the department's west side office. Her availability frees up officers on crisis situations, and has also helped cover vacant caseloads," Cushingberry said. "She also helped facilitate a mentoring/life skills program for youth and young adult probationers ages 16-21."

Probation Supervising Judge **Mark Stoner** also lauded Snow for her volunteer work with the courts and encouraged others to consider volunteering with court programs.

"Elisha's volunteer efforts have been a positive experience for both her and the department. She is a great role model for probationers, managing her family and educational responsibilities and still making time to give back to the community," said Stoner. "When the public thinks of volunteering, they may not think about working in a volunteer capacity in the area of public safety. There are many programs for juvenile and adult offenders that are in need of volunteers."

## MILLER NAMED CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER IN SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS JURISDICTION

**Joseph Miller** of Grayville, Illinois, has been named Chief Probation Officer of the First Probation Division of the Second Judicial Circuit, which includes the southeastern Illinois counties of Edwards, Richland, Lawrence, and Crawford. A 17-year veteran with the circuit, Miller replaces **Robert Christy**, who resigned effective October 1, 2006. Miller is a graduate of Eastern Illinois University, with a bachelor's degree in education.

In announcing the appointment, **George W. Timberlake**, Chief Judge of the Second Judicial Circuit, cited Miller for "his dedication and leadership" and "his commitment to his community and profession."

# NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

## Who We Are

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

## What We Do

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

## Why Join

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

## Types of Membership

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

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

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

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

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

## Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

AGENCY \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE # \_\_\_\_\_ FAX # \_\_\_\_\_ E-MAIL \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF APPLICATION \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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