In the last Chiefly Speaking, I highlighted portions of the Arizona Judicial Branch strategic plan, Justice 20/20. Of particular relevance for adult probation is the desire of Chief Justice Berch and other court leaders to employ evidence-based practices throughout the state of Arizona. As a follow-up to my last column, I want to let you know about the statewide rollout of evidence-based practice (EBP) Codes and the activities that that will be taking place this summer.

Under the leadership of the Adult Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and through statewide committee work during the past year, all of the adult probation departments in Arizona agreed to implement evidence-based practices and a plan was developed to move forward with the implementation of EBP. One aspect of this plan has been significant revisions to the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration. Adult probation departments are currently engaged in a transition process so that each department’s policies and procedures will be in compliance with the revised Codes that reflect EBP.

The Arizona Supreme Court administers justice throughout Arizona and we must abide by the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration. The Codes provide the general guidelines and minimum standards that must be met by county probation departments. Some Code provisions are determined by statute, while others are recommended and agreed upon by the chief probation officers across the state. Ultimately, Codes are approved by the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court.

With input from the adult probation departments, the AOC revised relevant sections of the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration to reflect evidence-based principles. Following review by multiple committees, the final approval for the revised Codes came from the Arizona Judicial Council and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
The recent Code changes, which reflect evidence-based practices, are significant because they allow us the flexibility we need in order to develop more effective supervision strategies.

The EBP Codes are pertinent to standard probation, intensive probation, and interstate compact. Consistent with the EBP Code changes, the Uniform Conditions of Probation were also revised. The Arizona Code of Judicial Administration is available on the Arizona Judicial Branch website, http://www.azcourts.gov/AZSupremeCourt/codeofjudicialadministration.aspx. A link is also available from our Adult Probation website on the intranet. The five specific Codes affected are under Part 6 Probation:

- Section 6-105.01 – Powers and Duties of Officers Evidence Based Practices
- Section 6-201.01 – Standard Probation Evidence Based Practices
- Section 6-202.01 – Adult Intensive Probation Evidence-Based Practices
- Section 6-204.01 – Interstate Compact Probation Evidence-Based Practices
- Section 6-207 – Uniform Conditions of Supervised Probation

**EBP Code Transition Process**

In order to transition to the EBP Codes, each county adult probation department must complete certain steps by December 1, 2010. Our Department has already completed some of the steps and is aiming for an official start date under the EBP Codes of September 1, 2010.

**Step 1. Policy Revisions.** Probation departments must draft policies and procedures to reflect the revised Codes. After the policies are drafted, they are submitted to AOC for review and feedback. AOC approves the policies when they are complete and satisfactory. MCAPD revised the following 11 policies and our revised policies have been approved by AOC:

- 13.001 Standards for Training
- 20.020 Presentence Standardized Risk/Needs Assessments
- 31.003 Caseload Management Standards for Standard & Intensive Probation Officers
- 31.005 Field Reassessment Offender Screening Tool (FROST) and Case Plan
- 31.009 Drug and Alcohol Testing
- 31.011 Petition to Modify Conditions of Probation
- 31.013 Graduated Response
- 31.019 Expiration/Termination of Probation
- 31.023 Interstate Compact Supervision (Incoming)
- 31.031 Earned Time Credit
- 31.032 MARS Caseload

The effective date for the revised policies and their posting on the intranet will coincide with completion of the EBP Code transition process.

**Step 2. EBP Code & Policy Training.** Probation departments must complete EBP Code and Policy training. We have required that all MCAPD employees complete EBP and/or OST/FROST and Case Plan Training by June 30, 2010 and many training sessions have been conducted in order for staff to meet these requirements. Next is an EBP Code & Policy Training. This month, I prepared a video for the purpose of staff training that covers the key EBP Code requirements, resulting policy changes, and the new Uniform Conditions of Probation. MCAPD employees will need to complete this online training by August 15, 2010. Furthermore, this column provides a timely opportunity to highlight the key changes to the Codes and policies.

The Codes have specific requirements regarding when to do the OST and FROST. If an initial assessment (OST) was not done at PSI, an OST must be completed within 30 days of sentencing or release from custody. For IPS cases, a FROST must be completed every 180 days from the date of the last assessment, regardless of risk level or IPS level. For standard probation cases that are medium or high risk, a FROST must be completed every 180 days from the date of the last assessment. A reassessment (FROST) is not required for standard probation cases that are low risk.
Case plans should target criminogenic needs identified through the OST/FROST and are developed in collaboration with the probationer. The EBP Codes have specific requirements regarding when case plans must be completed. For IPS, the case plan is due within 30 days of placement on IPS or release from custody. Follow-up case plans are required every 180 days. For standard probation cases assessed as medium or high risk, the initial case plan is due within 60 days of placement on probation or release from custody, and follow-up case plans are due every 180 days. For standard probation cases assessed as low risk, no case plans are required. This will be documented in APETS as N/A – low risk.

The Codes recognize that there should be less focus on probationers assessed as low risk; nonetheless, there are exceptions when a reassessment or case plan may be required for low risk cases. Regarding reassessments: 1) if a probationer assessed as low risk commits a new crime and the current assessment is more than 180 days old, a FROST should be completed, and 2) if significant changes to the probationer’s risk/needs are discovered and the FROST is more than 180 days old, a FROST should be completed. If a probationer assessed as low risk has criminogenic needs that require intervention, a case plan should be created. This is an area that will be covered in more detail in the policy training.

The Code for standard probation provides minimum supervision standards and each probation department can enhance these requirements. The contact standards in the following table meet minimum Code requirements and represent our department’s policy. The separate cut off scores that we use for males and females are based on the statewide validation study, which demonstrated that males and females fail at different rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Probation Contact Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk/ Supervision Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk (Males 18 or more, Females 21 or more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-High Risk (Males 11-17, Females 14-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Low Risk (Males 6-10, Females 9-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk (Males 0-5, Females 0-8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Code for Intensive Probation Supervision provides IPS levels that recognize the probationer’s assessed risk level. The path through IPS is different for individuals assessed as high risk than it is for individuals assessed as medium or low risk.

**Level I:** All individuals placed on IPS begin on Level I, regardless of risk level.

**Level II:** Individuals assessed as high risk who have been modified off of Level I.

**Level III:** Individuals assessed as high risk who have been modified off of Level II, and individuals assessed as medium or low risk who have been modified off of Level I. For individuals assessed as high risk, this is the transition level before standard probation.

**Level IV:** For individuals assessed as medium or low risk, this is the transition level before standard probation.

**Level V:** For IPS probationers participating in residential treatment.
The IPS contact standards in the table below are consistent with our Department’s policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPS Level</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Collateral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>4 times per week, with 1 at residence</td>
<td>1 time per week</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>2 times per week, with 1 at residence</td>
<td>1 time every 2 weeks</td>
<td>1 time every 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>1 time per week, 1 at residence every other week</td>
<td>1 time every 2 weeks</td>
<td>1 time every 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>1 time every 2 weeks</td>
<td>1 time every 4 weeks</td>
<td>1 time every 4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V</td>
<td>1 time every 30 days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 time every 30 days w/treatment provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes made to the Uniform Conditions were done with two goals in mind. One was to simplify the Conditions. The other was to change the wording to reflect EBP. Based on these goals, the Conditions will look a little different. The language of the Uniform Conditions was changed to reflect a more collaborative tone and to sound less directive. As an example, Condition 1 previously stated “Obey all laws.” The new wording for condition 1 states “I will maintain a crime-free lifestyle by obeying all laws, and not engaging or participating in any criminal activity.” The conditions have also been grouped together differently, linking the majority of the Conditions to criminogenic factors, and trying to provide greater clarity for probationers. Each Condition will fall under one of five headings. The five headings are:

- Law Abiding Behavior
- Reporting to APD
- Residence
- Treatment/Behavior Change/Pro-Social Activities
- Special Requirements

The new Uniform Conditions will also provide a new tool for officers to use as a guideline for discussing the Conditions of probation with probationers and helping with case planning. Overall, the new Codes provide us with increased flexibility so that we can focus our energy on the supervision of medium and high risk cases and engage in meaningful conversations with our probationers. Our departmental policies provide additional detail regarding how we will conduct our work. The EBP Code & Policy Training is being provided so that everyone will be informed of the changes.

**Step 3. Approval for Governance under the new EBP Codes.** After the county probation departments complete their policy revisions and training on the new Codes, they submit an application to AOC. After this application is approved, an Administrative Directive is signed and the department is governed under the new EBP Codes. Our department plans to complete this process by September 1, 2010. Our revised policies and the new Uniform Conditions of Probation will go into effect once this process is finalized.

As I close this column, I want to announce the upcoming celebration of 2010 Probation, Parole and Community Supervision Week from July 18 - 24. This is an important time to recognize the dedicated probation and parole officers who are making a difference as they ensure that individuals on community supervision are given the opportunity for a “second chance.” Today, probation and parole officers have more tools, knowledge, and training than at any other time in the history of our industry, to make smart decisions and utilize proven approaches to help individuals succeed in the community and to improve public safety.
Steps to Creating a Safer Community
The Who, What, and How of Community Supervision

By Julie George-Klein and Tricia O’Connor

This is an easy way to remember the principles of risk-needs-responsivity, which form the foundation of evidence-based practices in community corrections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk level</th>
<th><strong>WHO do we focus our time and energy on?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBP suggests we should commit more services and treatment resources to our higher risk cases (medium and high risk cases), if we want to create safer communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic Needs</th>
<th><strong>WHAT do we focus on?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the best outcomes, interventions should target our probationer’s criminogenic needs -- factors that predict crime and that can be changed, such as anti-social personality, anti-social peers, and substance use. If we focus on the “Big Eight,” our probationer’s chances of leading a successful, pro-social life increase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsivity</th>
<th><strong>HOW do we focus on our probationer’s needs?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies known to be effective in addressing criminogenic needs include being responsive to a particular probationer’s circumstances. General responsivity involves using evidence-based strategies, such as cognitive-behavioral and social learning approaches, and drug treatment in the community. Specific responsivity involves tailoring interventions to individual needs, considering factors such as readiness to change, culture, gender, and learning style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mid Manager Sub-Committees
By Holly Burdine

In July 2008, the Mid-Managers Committee (MMC) was established with the purpose of increasing EBP capacity in frontline supervisors through active participation in departmental decision-making and facilitating multi-directional communication. The committee consists primarily of supervisors representing a blended cross-section of both badged and non-badged supervisors. However, line staff and/or executive team members’ input may be solicited, depending on the project.

Initially three sub-committees were established (Specific, Mid-Range and Global), although a fourth (Team Forum) has been added to assist in planning, coordinating and rolling-out the supervisor Managers Forums.

The chairs and co-chairs of each subcommittee became members of our Leadership Team. The original Leadership Team included Mike Cimino, Donna Vittori, Jodie Rogan (Mertens), Dave Strate, Tricia OConnor, MaryAnn Boyden and Julie George-Klein. Membership has changed as promotions, retirements and new opportunities presented themselves. Our Leadership Team now includes not only the co-chairs of each subcommittee and QA supervisors, but also Shari Anderson-Head and Alison Cook of the Policy, Planning and Analysis division.

The past two years have presented numerous challenges while yielding incredible results from the talented, skilled and knowledgeable members of this committee. Each subcommittee has challenged its members to seek information, create plans and generate outcomes for their numerous projects. It has truly been a valuable growth and learning experience for us all.

Specific Mid-Managers’ Projects and Future Goals
By Susan Savoy and Paula Krasselt

The Specific Mid Manager Committee was designed to address issues or projects of a scope that allows for completion within a short period of time. The committee was originally chaired by Donna Vittori until her promotion to Division Director. Since July 2009, the Specific Committee has been Co-Chaired by Paula Krasselt and Susan Savoy.

The Specific Committee’s first project was the Carey Guide Implementation Plan. The plan provides expectations at the department, division and unit level which encourages all staff to become familiar with the guides and utilize when appropriate. The plan has been greatly enhanced by the QA team’s (Trisha O’Conner and Julie George Klein) monthly Carey Guide review reminders and guide highlights. As a measure of sustainability, a recent Carey Guide survey was sent to department staff to assist in determining the use, effectiveness and recommendations to improve the Carey Guides. Results of the survey will be shared in the near future.

In December 2009, the Specific Committee finalized and presented a Recognition and Transfer proposal which allows for a structured and uniform procedure to govern lateral transfers. Additionally, in March 2010, an implementation plan to outline the changes to the new Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees was finalized and disseminated department-wide.

The Specific Committee has recently started a new project addressing the outcome of the Victim Satisfaction Survey and how we can improve victim relations. The goal is to look at how technology can assist with improving victim communication, how staff can become more proactive in victim contact and how collaboration with other agencies can be beneficial.

The projects have been hard work but very rewarding! Thank you to everyone for their extreme energy and dedication! Feedback and suggestions are always greatly appreciated.
Mid-Range Committee

By Jodi Rogan and Dave Strate

The Mid-Range Committee of the Mid-Managers’ Committee has been tackling a couple of major projects since its inception two years ago. Co-Chaired by Jodie Rogan (formerly Mertens) and Dave Strate, the committee was created from the previous Graduated Response Committee. Consisting of a cross-section of staff across the Department, the Mid-Range Committee is unique in its membership. While the Mid-Managers’ Committee consists of supervisors, the Mid-Range Committee has had the opportunity to include upper management and, most importantly, line staff, due to the nature of the projects at hand. The participation from this cross-section of the Department has created a unique working committee that has resulted in important evidence based procedures and resulting policy changes, including the Earned Time Credit, Graduated Response, and Violation of Probation policies.

Additionally, the Mid-Range Committee has been influential in formatting and preparing Stages of Change training, the new behavior agreement and report forms, the new probationer report forms (Golden Rods), and the changes to the probationer letters to make them more evidence-based and effective.

Now that these major projects have been implemented, the Mid-Range Committee will prepare some follow-up measures in the coming months to assist staff in applying the information in their day to day efforts.

MMC Global Subcommittee Goals, Outcomes, and Future Plans

By Arlyn Harris and Lolita Rathburn

The Mid-Managers Global Subcommittee (long range), was tasked with the broad topic of Managing For Results. After much discussion, the following three goals were identified and our outcomes for each are listed below:

Goal 1: Increase staffs’ understanding of Managing for Results.

Outcome: We developed, administered, and reviewed survey results gauging APD staffs’ current knowledge of MFR. Additionally, we created and administered a concise explanation of MFR as well as a variety of management tools for leading conversations regarding MFR. Finally, we held MFR contests via the Chronicle and assisted in the organization of the MFR Managers’ Forum.

Goal 2: Develop a measurement tool for mid-managers to gauge/track the EBP principles staff use to achieve MFR goals and incorporate these measurements into annual evaluations and other methods of recognition.

Outcome: We compiled a comprehensive list of all EBP tools currently used by the APD, enhanced the monthly APO report to include EBP tools, and made recommendations to the Employee Performance Evaluation Committee (currently in progress).

Future Plans: The Global Sub-Committee is currently in the process of gathering data regarding Workload reduction throughout the department. The major work groups are Field (standard/IPS), Programs (CLAPPO, DUI and Drug Court), Pretrial, Presentence, and Support Staff. Our goals are to implement change as we are able, make recommendations to the executive team, and provide feedback to staff.

Staff are encouraged to contact any of the committee members with suggestions/input. We thank ALL those involved (past and present) for their hard work and dedication!
Evidence-Based Practice and Probationers With Serious Mental Illness

By Cathy Wyse

Various studies indicate that between 11 and 19 percent of individuals on probation and parole have serious mental illness (SMI), compared to about six percent of people in the general population. Based on these figures, our department likely supervises at least 3,435 probationers with serious mental illness. Approximately 600 probationers with serious mental illness are assigned to the SMI units at any given time, so we know that many individuals with SMI are supervised on other caseloads as well.

Historically, individuals with SMI have been more likely to return to jail or prison than other probationers and parolees and twice as likely to be revoked from community supervision. As a profession, we now have sufficient knowledge and tools to improve outcomes with this special population.

The first element of evidence-based practice in community corrections is risk assessment. This tells us the person’s risk level and criminogenic needs (e.g., needs that when addressed affect the risk of recidivism). Eight risk factors have been identified as the strongest predictors of recidivism – these are the same for individuals with and without mental illness. However, mentally ill persons may have more of these risk factors.

Mental illness is not typically the cause of criminal behavior, and mental health treatment alone does not sufficiently address risk level and criminogenic needs. Therefore, it is essential to have a probation case plan that addresses criminogenic needs. Ideally, a good probation case plan will be integrated with evidence-based practices in mental health treatment.

It is noteworthy that specific probation officer strategies and techniques have shown promise in reducing recidivism of probationers with mental illness or increasing their linkages to services. These include “firm but fair” relationships, problem-solving strategies, and boundary spanning skills.

“Firm but fair” PO-probationer relationships include characteristics of caring, fairness, trust, and an authoritative (not authoritarian) style. This type of relationship results in better outcomes for the probationer. In fact, research indicates that relationship quality is a significant factor in outcomes for probationers in general.

Problem-solving strategies involve officers working with probationers to identify obstacles to compliance, resolve these problems, and agree on compliance plans. Problem-solving strategies and positive pressures to encourage compliance with the conditions of probation are effective in reducing recidivism. Our SMI officers regularly utilize the Mental Health Court as a way to expand the use of problem-solving strategies. Traditional officer threats of incarceration and other negative pressures have been shown to have a significant negative impact on the outcomes of individuals with mental illness, so these should be avoided.

Boundary spanning skills involves working closely with the treatment system. Officers develop knowledge about mental health and community resources, actively coordinate and work on teams with treatment and service providers, and advocate for services. This practice increases probationers’ use of services.

---

Top Eight Risk Factors for Recidivism

1. History of criminal behavior
2. Anti-social personality pattern
3. Pro-criminal attitudes
4. Anti-social associates
5. Poor use of leisure/recreational time
6. Substance use
7. Problematic circumstances at home
8. Problematic circumstances at school or work
Many of our SMI Unit officers have a background in the mental health system; they are knowledgeable about the mental health system and have contacts there. They collaborate with treatment and service providers regularly in their supervision of probationers. Another method of cross-system collaboration locally is The Arizona Mental Health and Criminal Justice Coalition. Members include Adult Probation supervisors and officers (including pretrial) and representatives from Correctional Health Services, Magellan, and treatment providers, as well as advocacy and consumer groups. The Coalition meets monthly to provide training, share information, network, and discuss issues. Their common purpose is to provide a full range of opportunities, from diversion to re-entry, for individuals with mental health issues engaged in the criminal justice system.

Research strongly suggests that specialized probation caseloads improve outcomes for probationers with serious mental illness. Typical features of specialized caseloads, as studied nationally, include smaller caseload size, significant and sustained training on mental health issues, and the strategies mentioned above – firm but fair relationships, the use of problem solving strategies, and extensive collaboration with community-based service providers. Our SMI units have demonstrated positive results. In fiscal year 2009, less than 5% of the probationers under their supervision had a new felony conviction and there was a 78.9% successful probation completion rate.

For further information about improving outcomes of probationers with serious mental illness, please consult a SMI Unit officer or supervisor or visit this website, [http://consensusproject.org/](http://consensusproject.org/).

What is Cognitive Behavioral Therapy?

By Cathy Wise

Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is significantly effective in reducing recidivism, as demonstrated in numerous studies. Furthermore, it has been shown to be effective in reducing recidivism of adult and juvenile offenders, high risk offenders, substance abusing and violent offenders, probationers, parolees, and prisoners. CBT is also effective in the treatment of a variety of problems, such as depression, mood disorders, sexual dysfunction, and substance abuse in adults, and problems experienced by children, such as disruptive and noncompliant behavior, and aggressiveness.

What is cognitive behavioral therapy? CBT is a treatment that focuses on thoughts, and the beliefs, attitudes, and values that underlie thinking. Thoughts can become distorted and affect the way a person views reality, interacts with other people, and experiences daily life. Some characteristics of distorted thinking include difficulty accepting blame for wrong-doing, a lack of self-control and empathy, inability to manage feelings of anger, and a mistaken sense of entitlement.

In CBT, clients learn to recognize unrealistic or distorted thinking when it happens, and then to make a conscious choice to change that thinking or belief to reduce or eliminate problematic behavior. Clients learn specific skills to solve problems in the present as well as skills that can help them achieve appropriate goals and objectives.
Most cognitive behavioral treatment programs teach offenders problem-solving, critical reasoning, moral reasoning, self-control, impulse management, cognitive style, self-efficacy, and how to improve their social skills. Commonly provided in small group settings, CBT involves lessons and exercises, such as role plays, modeling, and demonstrations. Individual counseling may also be offered as part of CBT. Between sessions, clients are given homework and encouraged to conduct experiments. The therapeutic rapport established with the counselor is an important aspect of the treatment as counselors often take on the role of coach. Counselors also need to be consistent in expressing and modeling pro-social attitudes and behaviors and moral values and reasoning. Many programs last 20 weeks and include 20 to 30 sessions. The more sessions attended, the greater the impact on reducing recidivism.

Research indicates that when CBT is combined with other types of support, such as supervision, education/training, employment, and other mental health counseling, it is even more effective in reducing further criminal behavior.

---

**Insight on Violent Behavior**

By Stephanie Bradley

You’re supervising a probationer who tells you he/she is in what could be considered a domestic violence relationship. There hasn’t been any physical violence, only some concerns of controlling behavior. Or perhaps you are supervising a probationer who may have had domestic violence undertones in the probation case. How can you tell if the probationer’s victim (or any potential victim) is in grave danger?

Gavin de Becker is a world renowned author and security expert. His books, ‘The Gift of Fear’ and ‘Protecting the Gift’ are best sellers. He was recently featured on the Oprah Winfrey show discussing a training assessment that several law enforcement agencies are currently using. His conference has trained law enforcement, advocates, attorneys, court, probation, and correctional personnel, non-profit organizations, and survivors of domestic violence. The following is summarized from his Oprah appearance:

“What are the red flags that violence will occur or get worse? Bumps and bruises aren’t the only surefire signs you or someone you love is in a dangerous relationship. In fact, if your gut tells you something is wrong, it probably is.” De Becker elaborates on four signs that are often missed. Still, he says these are not the only signs a relationship may become violent.

**Physical violence.** Many consider pushing or hitting a major clue that your partner is capable of violence, but de Becker says it’s more than that. "It is the end of the mystery. Being hit is conclusive. It's over. According to de Becker, "Being hit doesn't work in relationships, and it usually doesn't get better."

**Symbolic violence.** Symbolic violence is the destruction of objects to intimidate the other person. "The destruction or tearing up wedding pictures. You come home and the wedding gown is torn up," he says. "[If someone throws] a television out a window, the message is, 'I can throw you out the window.'"

**Fast-paced relationships.** If you think you could be in a dangerous relationship, look back at when the other person began discussing marriage, moving in together and having children. "When the pace is accelerated like that in the beginning, that is itself a control strategy," he says. "And women feel uncomfortable and they'll tell you, 'Yeah, I felt it was a little bit fast, but what could I do? He loved me so much.'"
Drug-Related Probation Violators Apprehended and Brought Back to Court

By Cathy Wyse

Last summer, the Adult Probation Department received an American Recovery and Reinvestment Act grant to save five jobs and combat criminal narcotics activity stemming from the Southern Border. Five surveillance officers were added to the Fugitive Apprehension Unit to locate and arrest individuals with a probation violation warrant for a drug or drug-related offense. Previously, many of the probation violation warrants for drug offenses were not being served because of an emphasis on apprehending probation violators with person or property offenses.

Since October 2009, the five grant-funded surveillance officers have arrested 429 probationers with a probation violation warrant for a drug or drug-related offense and brought them back into the justice system. In addition, the officers assisted in clearing another 210 probation violation warrants on individuals with drug or drug-related offenses by providing information to local law enforcement agencies. In the course of their apprehension work, the officers conducted 32 probation searches that took illegal drugs, drug paraphernalia, and weapons off the streets, including 25 firearms. The officers have formed working relationships with numerous local law enforcement agencies.

Wes Shipley, Adult Probation Division Director for the Fugitive Apprehension Unit, stated that the project is demonstrating positive results and doing its part to interrupt criminal narcotics activity. “For public safety, we want to get them picked up and brought back before the Court,” Shipley said. “The Court will determine if the individual would benefit from another opportunity on probation and what sanctions are appropriate.”

Persistence. If he won’t take no for an answer, it’s not because he’s smitten, de Becker explains. Anybody who doesn’t hear the word no is trying to control you. Persistence does not mean you are special. Persistence means he is troubled.”

If you or someone you know could be in a life-threatening relationship, take de Becker’s assessment tool at www.mosaicmethod.com.

MOSAIC is a computer-assisted method for predicting comprehensive assessments for violent behavior. It is a tool being used by several law enforcement agencies across the country. The website also contains helpful hints and real world advice on what to do if you think someone has violent [or lethal] tendencies.

Persistence.
MCAPD Celebrates - Crime Victims’ Rights Week

By Shari Andersen-Head

During the week of April 18th-24th we recognized communities throughout the nation that rallied to honor and support victims of crime. With the theme, *Crime Victims’ Rights: Fairness, Dignity, Respect*, 2010 National Crime Victims’ Rights Week recalled the ideals that inspired the decades long struggle of Victims’ Rights movement and challenge all Americans to honor Victims’ Rights. National Crime Victims’ Rights Week served as a call for action - an urgent summons for fairness, dignity, and respect for all victims of crime. The 2010 National Crime Victims’ Rights Week ignited the passion for fairness, dignity, and respect that launched the Victims’ Rights movement and inspired decades-long progress for victims of crime.

Chief of Probation, Barbara Broderick issued certificates of appreciation to the following individuals for their outstanding service on behalf of victims of crime:

- Alison Cook-Davis
- Amy Primak
- Andrea Teasley
- Barbara Goree
- Christina Coller
- Clint Hill
- Connie Delgado
- Daniel Hernandez
- David Puyear
- Diane Bracamonte
- Donald Chludzinski (PO)
- Erika Blanco (SO)
- Glynn Thomas
- Israel Fierros
- Jane Parker
- Jason Crouch
- Jeff Gallimore (SO)
- Jill Bognar
- John Cleland
- John Patterson
- Kate Dannenbaum--Chrysalis
- Kelly Seppanen
- Ken Snodgrass
- Kevin Peters
- Kristi Ward
- Laura Thomas
- Linda Dore
- Lisa Roubicek
- Lynne (Sunny) Carpenter
- Mark Hendershot
- Mauro Munoz
- Ralph Pagano
- Randy Koeppen--Chrysalis
- Robert Cherkos
- Sarah Golabiewski
- Scott Skoropys
- Sergio Mosqueda
- Stephanie Bradley
- Ted Milham
- Tracy Medrano
- Vincent DeArmond

“*Fairness is what justice really is.*”

~ Potter Stewart

U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice (1958 – 1981)
AZ WANTED Task Force  
By Mark Bergmann

Over the past several years, several members of the Fugitive Apprehension Unit were recruited by the U.S. Marshals Service to become sworn members of a multi-agency task force that is completely dedicated to apprehending violent and dangerous fugitives. Probation Officers George Fairburn and Paul McDonald and Surveillance Officers Emmanuel Briseno and Greg Clark have worked tirelessly to bring local and nationally wanted felons to justice.

When the national resources of the U.S. Marshals Service are combined with the powers and duties of our Department, the end result is a formidable weapon to combat fugitive felons in and out of the state of Arizona. On occasion, these officers are called upon to aid in the apprehension of nationally known fugitives wanted for murder, kidnapping, sex crimes and other violent and dangerous acts. Recently, the team that included Greg Clark, Emmanuel Briseno and Paul McDonald received information that known violent members of a Drug Trade Organization were possibly in the Phoenix area. As the investigation unfolded, our officers began surveillance of a house that eventually led to the capture of three members of a Jamaican “hit squad”. These members were wanted in connection with a triple homicide in the New York area. A subsequent search produced approximately 229 pounds of marijuana, several weapons and a large sum of cash.

As a Department, we should all be extremely proud of how these officers handled a very difficult and dangerous operation. The following is a summation of the commendation these officers received from a very appreciative Chief from the Greece Police Department in New York:

Letter of Appreciation  
By Frank Castiglia, AZ WANTED Task Force Commander

I wanted to pass on a letter of appreciation sent by Chief Baxter from the Town of Greece Police Department. Your officers were involved in a significant task force case on March 18, 2010; they worked tirelessly, around the clock, to arrest these dangerous criminals and disrupt a Phoenix based Jamaican Drug Trade Organization (DTO). This is an outstanding example of teamwork and commitment to enhance public safety. Their professionalism and dedication is a credit to your agencies and law enforcement.
Recently a supervisor with Adult Probation received the following letter from a probationer and shared it with the QA Team. One of our team’s goals is to help staff understand the finer points of EBP and help them discover how they may best approach probationers who are, or perhaps are not, working toward making positive changes in their life. Given this, we would like to share the letter with you. It is a testament to the work Adult Probation does and reminds all of us how important our belief in others’ abilities, as well as our approach in assisting them, can make a tremendous difference.

I hope this letter is well received on behalf of my probation officer.

I have hit every rung of the ladder in the juvenile and adult criminal justice system. At the age of twenty-three I meet with the parole board for the first time and mind you back in those days I had an answer for everything. I told the parole agent at that time, I do not intend on coming back here if you let me out. Over the next few years or so, I did exactly what I needed to in order to stay out of the legal system. I got a job, continued college, got married and started a family.

Then life changed; my wife was killed in an accident and I turned to drugs. Everyone faces tragedy in their lives but not everyone always gets over it, but somehow we manage to move past it. I was able to move beyond the anger, by becoming a drug addict and once again, I found myself in and out of the criminal justice system...a system I thought I left behind.

I have been on probation this time for 2 ½ years, mind you I started my criminal past forty-five years ago. As stated, I experienced jail, prison, parole and probation previously, but this time is different, one might not expect a letter from the likes of me especially one that is provided to an “authority figure,” my probation officer.

Let me tell you what! The Maricopa Adult Probation Department has been my only hope. My probation officer was the key, the secret combination, the spirit, confidant, and believer I needed. She has never spoken to me in anger, she never intimidated me with consequence, but rather she made me a part of her team effort to avoid them, and she was a craftsman in human personalities. Perhaps most importantly she never failed to convey to me that my future was important. I found the commitments I was not willing to make to myself I could make to her. She was not always able to anticipate my behavior, but she never failed to provide me the opportunity to be trusted.

I visit my probation officer once a month. I hear in the background, if not in the very room I sit with my officer, the anger, intimidation and frustration booming in the voices of authority. I have no doubt “alienation of compliance” is like building a home with only half the nails. These booming voices of authority with their proud list of threatening consequences have availed no conformity in my life. Yet by her faith, trust, and calm, compassionate conviction she has led me to desire the light of compliance.

So thank you, people of the probation industry. I have come a long way because of one of your own. I suppose you could say a good client comes along every now and then. But do not do it! My life was a job that needed to be worked on, and I needed help. I guess I needed to know that help was what you offered.
Did you know performing community service can help probationers feel a sense of pride? That is what they are saying after working in Mesa completing their community restitution hours at our local work projects. In addition to staying compliant by performing their Court ordered hours, giving back in their own community gives those who participate a feeling of pride and individual involvement which might not be felt in any other way. In mid-October 2009, the Maricopa County Adult Probation Community Restitution Program began offering CRP-sponsored special projects on Monday and Tuesday mornings. From the beginning, our average crew size consisted of over 13 workers per day!

APD veteran SO Connie Sinsabaugh leads our weekday work crew with a great attitude and lots of energy! One of her special projects is located at CARE Partnership (a CRP certified, non-profit agency), where they began by clearing the land, conditioning the soil and giving back with their service by starting a community garden. Our CARE garden project is “a work-in-progress” that continues to be one that draws a working crowd. It is great to see the difference this project has made for our employees, the neighbors and those who will benefit from the produce grown, and last but not least, the gratifying feeling of community and sense of pride it renders to our probation work crews.

Above: The beginning: removing years of junk and debris from the CARE Partnership property!

Right: Preparing a place to plant the garden took some time as it was all done by hand!
The Garfield Probation Center is located at 1022 E Garfield in Phoenix. There are three major components to the Center:

Education Center that offers classes on Wednesdays and Thursdays of every week

Community Restitution Program that provides opportunities for probationers to complete community restitution seven days a week at the facility and in the surrounding neighborhood.

Residential program that provides transitional/emergency housing to appropriate probationers.

The residential program has been highly successful in assisting individuals who have no support system and few resources. Residents are expected to maintain employment and sobriety and work toward case plan goals while participating in the program. They can complete education and/or community restitution goals on site. Residents pay rent at the rate of $1.00 a day and come to appreciate this greatly as they try to save money and move on their own. The extremely dedicated staff is committed to assisting everyone who comes through the door.
Criteria for Entry:

The Garfield residential program is a unique environment; therefore, specific criteria have been established to accept probationers while ensuring the safety and well being of staff, residents, and community.

- Probationers with sex or arson offenses are disqualified.
- If a probationer is on psychotropic medication, he or she needs to be set up with the Terros medication monitoring program prior to admittance to Garfield.
  If a probationer is on any other type of medication, he or she is disqualified.

Screening Process:

The screening process starts with the assigned probation officer faxing a copy of the criminal history to Garfield. We then review it and contact the PO for any additional information or to discuss concerns. Probationers are screened on a case by case basis, and we consider risk and needs when determining suitability for the program. Once a probationer is accepted into the program, the assigned probation officer is expected to work closely with the Garfield staff to ensure compliance and progress on the part of the probationer.

The Garfield Probation Center also houses probation officers from standard, IPS, Re-entry, and the SMI units. These officers and their supervisors are a part of the Garfield team and work closely with us in maintaining a positive presence in the neighborhood.

The Garfield Probation Center is an integral part of the Garfield community and participates in community restitution projects and other community events. Garfield has been a mainstay in this community for a long time and has contributed greatly to the revitalization of the neighborhood. This is attributed to all the hard working staff who have worked at this facility throughout the years!

If you have any further questions about Garfield, feel free to contact me, or better yet, come on down for a tour.

Janet Kasha
Garfield Supervisor, 602-619-9785
The Chronicle

EBP Spotlight Nomination

Nominee: Jason Walker

Nominator: Peter Sanborn

Present position: Jason was identified early on as possessing admirable interviewing and case planning abilities, and he showed an interest in further developing these skills by becoming a facilitator of EBP/FROST/Case Plan classes. His demonstrated willingness to step outside his comfort zone in support of the implementation of Evidence Based Practices is both impressive and inspiring.

2010 MPAEA Awards

By Lindell W. Rhodes

April 21 – 23 the Mountain Plains Adult Education Association (MPAEA) held their annual conference in Tempe. Founded in 1945, the MPAEA serves members in an eight-state region. The organization promotes and provides professional development opportunities for adult educators and is on the cutting edge of research-based successful adult education tactics.

At the Conference, MCAPD’s Education Program and three of its staff won awards. Bill Pebler, Dan Sitzler and Kristi Wimmer were recognized for their participation in the 2009 Teachers Investigating Adult Numeracy (TIAN) project. TIAN is a professional development initiative that teaches research-based mathematic principals to instructors of adults. Research-based TIAN is a way for our teachers to effectively show the probationers how to solve math problems in the classroom, at home and on the job. In addition APD’s Education Program was also recognized for exceeding all the Arizona State Performance goals.

These awards are well deserved; the teachers and education support staff in the Education Program have over 250 combined years of experience educating adults. They take an innovative approach in presenting Basic Education, GED and ESOL classes. The program has once again been honored for its initiative and proving that your clients can be successful in a comprehensive, academically oriented curriculum, irrespective of their criminal background.

If you happen to see Kristi, Dan or Bill, please congratulate them on a job well done and send your probationers down to the education centers. The teachers will determine what teaching style works best with each of your clients. Then they will create an innovative educational study path to keep your clients actively involved in advancing their education goals.
Please join us in congratulating and welcoming our newest probation officers!

From left to right: Chad Beeman, Dawn McCullar, Jackie Novak, Brian Thomas, David Gonzalez, Achi Yapo, Perla Florez, Sierra Flores, Beth Cervantes, Judge Granville.

They graduated on March 12th, 2010.

Congratulations on Your New Birthday, APSO Israel Fierros!
By Sarah Golabiewski

The smile from Israel's face could not be erased or missed. On Friday April 16, 2010, Israel Fierros had what he referred to as his "new birthday." He became an American citizen.

Born in July 1977 in Ciudad Guzman, Jalisco, Mexico, Israel earned his college degree in the Science of Communication. He wanted to work in media, but jobs were not available. There were, however, jobs open in the Sonora City Police Department. He applied, and Israel found his new passion, law enforcement. He served with the Sonora City Police for four years.

In 2002, Israel brought his wealth of experience and education to the United States. Israel works in MCAPD's GPS Sex Offender unit. He considers this his first career and loves working with his team and coworkers within the Sex Offender Division. He admits it can be stressful at times, but it's still all worth it.

GPS and Dispatch will be celebrating Israel's birthday, new birthday, and his love of his new country, the United States, on July 1, with food, fun and festivities. Congratulations Israel!!
Congratulations!

5 YEARS OF SERVICE
- KORIK ANDERSON
- KIMBERLY CONNOR
- CHRISTINE FREY
- MARGARET HENDERSON
- JASMINE HERRERA
- ROCIO MEJIA
- JULIE PIONTKOWSKI
- SHAUN ROBAR
- DEBORAH ROLLINS
- CHRISTI SEGER
- JOEL THURSTON
- REGGI WILLIAMS

10 YEARS OF SERVICE
- PATRICK DAILY
- MICHELLE MAYER
- HAROLD MONGOVAN
- MARISELLA RODRIGUEZ
- JOYCE TISDALE

15 YEARS OF SERVICE
- DAVID SERVILICAN

20 YEARS OF SERVICE
- PATTY BARNFIELD
- DENEEN BERTUCCI
- PAUL GUADAGNINO
- SETEARA HADDOCK
- BRIAN HERLIHY
- YVONNE WEST
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