

FORGING NEW WORKING PARTNERSHIPS

**RESULTS
OF
A NATIONAL WORKING MEETING
OF
POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES**

SPONSORED BY

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

IN COOPERATION WITH

THE POLICE FOUNDATION

**November 2, 1994
Old Town Sheraton, Alexandria, Virginia**

REPORT PREPARED BY

**William R Drake
DRAKE Associates
Washington, D.C.**

PREFACE

This report records a “first” - the first time that a cadre of leading executives in the police, probation and parole professions joined in a national meeting to discuss how their functional agencies could enhance their mutual effectiveness. The meeting was held near Washington, D.C. under the sponsorship of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), in cooperation with the Police Foundation (PF).

NIC and the PF invited a group of participants who broadly represent the views of police, probation and parole executives from across the country. The participants came from large and small states and from urban suburban and rural jurisdictions. They brought years of experience in their professions and a deep understanding of the public safety problems they confront and the operating environments which shape their responses.

This report is intended for publication in appropriate media, as part of NIC’s, PF’s and the participants’ efforts to broaden the dialogue they helped initiate. The report consists of a narrative section, which highlights the lively discussion among the participants, along with a set of appendices that capture additional details about the meeting and the observations made by each of the attendees during their introductory remarks.

The author of the report was selected by NIC to help plan the meeting, interview a cross-section of participants in advance, facilitate the dialogue, help the participants reach agreements around key issues and, if the group so desired, help everyone identify a set of next steps that they could take together.

The contents of the report are the sole responsibility of the author, including any errors and omissions that might exist. The report is not intended as a statement of policy or program strategy by the sponsoring organizations, the NIC and PF.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

CONTENTS **ii**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS iii

INTRODUCTION 1

THEMES 2

KEY ISSUES 3

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS 6

APPENDIX - MEETING MATERIALS AND NOTES

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy Commissioner for Operations, Office of the Massachusetts Commissioner of Probation

Colonel Clarence Edwards, Chief of Police, Montgomery County, Maryland

Armando Gandarilla, Supervisor, Adult Probation Department, Maricopa County, Arizona

Susan J. Gionfriddo, Chief Probation Officer, Santa Barbara County Probation, Santa Barbara, California

Gary Hinsman, Director, Sixth Judicial District, Iowa Department of Correctional Services

W. Roland Knapp, Director, Maryland Division of Parole and Probation

Ron Lemley, Supervisor, Alexandria Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Alexandria, Virginia

David B. Mitchell, Chief of Police, Prince George's County, Maryland

Michael Nichols, Agent in Charge, Richland County, South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Services

Christopher F. Pate, Chief Probation Officer, Virginia Probation & Parole, Norfolk, Virginia

Frank Remington, Esq., Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Madison

Joseph Samuels, Jr., Chief of Police, Oakland, California

Benjamin Ward, former Police Commissioner, New York City; former Commissioner of Corrections, New York State

Elizabeth M. Watson, Chief of Police, Austin, Texas

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

Larry B. Solomon, Deputy Director

George M. Keiser, Chief, Community Corrections

J. Richard Faulkner, Jr., Program Manager

Ed Barajas, Program Manager

POLICE FOUNDATION

Hubert Williams, President

Bill Matthews, Executive Assistant

Tony Pate, Ph.D., Director of Research

Peter Scharf, Ed.D., Director, Technology and Technical Assistance

DRAKE ASSOCIATES

William R. Drake, President

FORGING NEW WORKING PARTNERSHIPS

RESULTS OF A NATIONAL WORKING MEETING OF POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES

INTRODUCTION

Fourteen police, probation and parole executives from throughout the United States gathered in November 1994 under the auspices of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and the Police Foundation (PF).¹ Their purpose was twofold: to join in the first structured dialogue about issues and needs of mutual concern to their professions and to begin thinking together about future strategies.

Richard Faulkner, Program Manager for NIC, opened the meeting and thanked the participants for their willingness to take part in an exciting, exploratory meeting. He noted that, as best it could be determined, this was the first gathering of its kind. "NIC," said Faulkner, "hopes that the leaders in the room will share observations and generate information which can help NIC stimulate new approaches for enhancing community corrections."

¹Also attending and participating were an academic expert on policing, senior staff from the National Institute of Corrections and the Police Foundation, and a professional facilitator.

Faulkner pointed out that, “Police, probation and parole need the greatest cooperation, because the personnel of each agency often know important -- but different - details about the lives and current behavior of released offenders who are still under supervision.”

Hubert Williams, President of the Police Foundation, thanked NIC for supporting this meeting and cited how beneficial the gathering could be for the field of policing. “Police officials,” he said, “need to have all possible information on released offenders if their line officers are going to be fully effective. It is well known that a small number of violent, repeat offenders produce a disproportionate amount of serious crime. Yet we often do not even know they are back in our communities until it is too late.”

THEMES

The need for cooperation emerged early and became the dominant theme of the gathering. As one participant summed up the feelings of most participants, “This meeting is timely and needed. We need to talk more, to explore how to improve cooperation, particularly regarding the violent offender returning to the community.” Another pointed out that, “The need for close cooperation and information sharing seems obvious. Yet I wonder why so little of it seems to occur.”

A second theme for the meeting also emerged quickly: the view that the mutual interest of all three professions lies in the shared mission of “public safety” and “enforcement.” The third theme was the recognition that all are searching for ways to respond positively, and effectively, to community and political pressures for preventing and controlling crime.

The three themes echoed the key observations that a cross-section of participants had made during pre-meeting interviews with the facilitator and provided the framework for discussion throughout the gathering. The facilitator asked the participants to use this information as a starting point for discussion’ and invited each person to introduce him/herself and offer additional comments about “needs and opportunities” for action that they believe existed nationally and in their immediate jurisdictions.

KEY ISSUES

A lively series of individual statements and an extended discussion followed the introductory comments. Virtually everyone began by enthusiastically endorsing the purpose and value of the meeting. As they continued’ each added personal observations about his or her own experiences with inter-agency cooperation and offered comments about the need for new and more effective approaches.

Numerous observations and proposals were recorded during these introductory statements. By mid-morning the participants began to review this roster of ideas and

decided to group them into eleven topics which they felt captured the essence of the discussion. The eleven topics emerged in no particular order, as follows:

- o The 4-C's - communication' cooperation' coordination' collaboration
- o Influencing the public and public officials
- o Vision
- o Overlapping jurisdictions
- o Community mobilization and partnerships
- o Technology
- o Problem orientation (focus), e.g. types of offenders after release into community
- o Leadership
- o Resources
- o Unions
- o Prevention

Before they agreed finally that these items should be the focus of further discussion' the participants reviewed the list and articulated what concepts they believed each topic included. They then selected a group of five topics that they felt deserved high priority for immediate discussion. They agreed that they would defer discussion of the remaining six topics to a future occasion, in order to devote sufficient time to the priority group. The five topics are:

1. ***Offender-oriented approach.*** This concept involves a coordinated approach to keying police, probation and parole strategies toward specific types of offenders. When selecting it' the participants refined the term "Problem Orientation" which was used above and gave it this more specific caption.

2. ***Overlapping jurisdictions.*** The participants cited the existence of numerous police, probation and parole agencies and noted the complexities of the intergovernmental system in which they operate. They noted that this operating environment produces enormous challenges for executives and their personnel in responding to fragmented political jurisdictions, organizational structures and communities.
3. ***Influencing public officials and the public.*** This topic reflects the desire to increase the understanding of the critical roles and contributions of each profession in public safety and criminal justice, and to educate the public about how better to allocate resources for crime prevention and control.
4. ***Community.*** The desirability of improving the focus on community needs and enhancing ways to involve the community, broadly construed' are the key elements of this topic.
5. ***Resources.*** The concern with resources involves the challenge of maintaining essential resources and doing more with less, while continuing to innovate in a period of severe budget retrenchment in most jurisdictions.

Notice that the five priority topics do not include “communication’ cooperation’ coordination and collaboration,” the “4-C’s” as one participant called them. This apparent omission flows from a key conclusion reached by the participants. They concluded that while improved communication’ cooperation’ collaboration and coordination are badly needed, the key questions really are: “For what purpose? Toward what end?”

The participants agreed firmly that the five topics represent the ends they believe they and their professional peers should seek. The “4-C’s” became the critical elements of the “means” in the minds of everyone who attended the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The future became clear as one participant stated’ “It is almost bewildering to realize that there has been so little focus on joint strategies and the basic operating approaches that “the 4-C’s” represent. We now are committed to changing that.”

The final question for the group was, “What should happen next?” Larry Solomon and George Keiser of NIC asked whether the group “wanted to continue the process begun today?” There was unanimous and enthusiastic support for doing so. This set the stage for the last segment of the meeting, involving a brainstorming session designed to help the participants generate a list of possible actions they could take following the meeting. This session produced the unedited list that follows:

1. Written report
2. Share report with professional associations
3. Conduct focus groups on “five topics” selected above
4. Create sixth topic on “consequences”
5. Create inventory of existing models and experiments and disseminate
“Perspectives” - type article
Would be effective with profession
6. Capture examples of what used to happen “in 50’s and 60’s”
7. Historical perspective
8. Articulate a position on why it is in our interest to do this work together
9. Staff (NIC and Police Foundation) do some of these things, e.g. data collection

9. Produce a position paper on interdisciplinary professional interests
10. Create 2-3 pilot programs nationally, e.g. large, medium' small jurisdictions
11. Do "Experiment" similar to the Kansas City police experiment:
 - Different community policing/community corrections approaches
 - Focus on "impacts"
12. Talk Common Sense to Political Commentators
13. Understand to whom we are talking within agencies, in terms of the unique cultures of our professions and different types of agencies; improve how we frame key issues and concepts when stimulating dialogue across agency and professional boundaries
14. Use pilot projects to attract executives' attention
15. Compare level of citizen satisfaction re: violent crime enforcement compared to minor/nuisance crimes
16. Do follow-up and prep -- 3-4 months; send ideas for next meeting out to group
17. Keep same group for a few meetings, then expand

-or-

Broaden group's representation for future meetings, based on new people reading report and being briefed prior to joining dialogue

18. Identify any risks of cooperation

This 18-point agenda for collective action was adopted as the working framework for future discussions, along with the five priority topics selected earlier and the six additional topics which could not be discussed due to time constraints.

The participants asked the National Institute of Corrections and the Police Foundation to provide the group with further support. NIC and PF executives responded to this request by agreeing to produce a report about the meeting, arrange for the report to be published' collect more data on existing programs, conduct preparations for a future

meeting and send ideas for a next meeting out to this group for comment in advance in order to shape the meeting agenda.

It seemed that everyone was reluctant to see the meeting conclude. There appeared to be a shared sense that an important beginning had been accomplished. This feeling was summed up by one participant who observed that “We all face five challenges -- professional, political, cultural, philosophical and jurisdictional. This meeting gave us fresh ideas about how to take those challenges on and strengthen our combined effectiveness. I’m glad that I was able to be here with all of you’ and I hope we can involve many more people in our future discussions.”

#####

**APPENDIX
TO
REPORT**

FORGING NEW WORKING PARTNERSHIPS

**RESULTS
OF
A NATIONAL WORKING MEETING
OF
POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES**

SPONSORED BY

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

IN COOPERATION WITH

THE POLICE FOUNDATION

**November 2, 1994
Old Town Sheraton, Alexandria, Virginia**

PREPARED BY

**William R. Drake
DRAKE Associates
Washington, D.C.**

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

(All materials from handouts and flipcharts used at the meeting)

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES	i
SUGGESTED AGENDA (Adopted)	1
SUGGESTED GROUNDRULES (Adopted)	2
LEVELS OF CONSENSUS (Adopted as an aid to decision-making, if needed)	3
NEEDS -- As Expressed to Facilitator During Pre-Meeting Interviews	4
SELF-INTRODUCTIONS, WITH COMMENTS ON “NEEDS”	5
RECAP OF PROBLEMS AND NEEDS	11
GROUP’S RANKING OF TOPICS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION	13
BRAINSTORMED LIST OF POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO FOLLOW-UP MEETING	15
ATTENDEE LIST	17

**WORKING MEETING
OF
POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES**

November 2, 1994
Old Town Sheraton, Alexandria, Virginia

SUGGESTED AGENDA

- 8:00 AM **COFFEE AVAILABLE IN MEETING ROOM**
- 8:30 AM **OPENING REMARKS** Rick Faulkner and Hubert Williams
- 8:45 AM **FACILITATOR'S COMMENTS AND INTRODUCTIONS** Bill Drake
- Role of Facilitator and Suggested Groundrules for the Meeting
 Suggested Agenda
 Consensus Model (Handout)
 Self Introductions and Expectations of Participants
- 9:00 AM **NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES - FACILITATED ROUNDTABLE
DISCUSSION**
- Overview of Responses from Interviews (Bill Drake)
 Additions and Reactions from Participants
 Discussion
 Recap of Major Observations
 Exploration of Areas of Agreement on Mutual Needs and Opportunities
- 12:00 PM **LUNCHEON IN HOTEL RESTAURANT AND FREE TIME**
- 1:30 PM **THINKING ABOUT THE FUTURE- FACILITATED ROUNDTABLE
DISCUSSION**
- What approaches might address the needs and opportunities identified?
 What challenges would we need to overcome to put these into practice?
 What can we as a group of leaders do to improve conditions and effectiveness?
 Where should we begin? Who needs to be involved?
- 4:30 PM **NEXT STEPS**
- 5:30 PM **CONCLUDING COMMENTS** Rick Faulkner and Hubert Williams

**WORKING MEETING
OF
POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES**

November 2, 1994

SUGGESTED GROUNDRULES (Adopted)

1. The meeting is exploratory.
2. The purpose is to share information and observations among experienced executives and provide input to NIC and the Police Foundation.
3. The outcome desired is to generate information which can help NIC and the Police Foundation consider further steps which might enhance the effectiveness of the police, probation and parole functions and the respective leaders of such agencies.
4. Everyone should participate, while keeping in mind that the attendees who are police, probation and parole executives deserve ample opportunity to engage each other in dialogue.
5. Discussion will be limited in order to generate an inventory of needs, opportunities, possible new approaches and actions which may be agreed upon.
6. A consensus method of decision-making shall be used if the participants wish to seek agreements on issues, priorities, actions or other types of conclusions.
7. The facilitator will help us manage time and move through the agenda.

LEVELS OF CONSENSUS

(Attributed to Dee Kelsey of Portland, Maine)

- “1” I can say an unqualified “yes” to the decision. I am satisfied that the decision is an expression of the wisdom of the group.**

- “2” I find the decision perfectly acceptable.**

- “3” I can live with the decision. I’m not especially enthusiastic about it.**

- “4” I do not fully agree with the decision. However, I do not choose to block the decision. I am willing to support the decision because I trust the wisdom of the group.**

- “5” I do not agree with the decision and feel the need to stand in the way of this decision being accepted.**

- “6” I feel that we have no clear sense of unity in the group. We need to do more work before consensus can be reached.**

MEETING NOTES FROM FLIPCHARTS

NEEDS - As Expressed to Facilitator During Pre-Meeting Interviews

- 0 Meeting is timely, needed
- 0 Need to talk more
- 0 Cooperation
- 0 Bewildered
- 0 Few examples of cooperation, joint programs
- 0 Public Safety, enforcement are is needs, roles which both professions share
- 0 Effectiveness
- 0 Respond better -- political and community
- 0 Do more with less
- 0 Challenges:

- Professional
- Political
- Cultural
- Philosophical
- Jurisdictional

**SELF-INTRODUCTIONS (In order presented), WITH BRIEF
'HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMENTS ABOUT OWN AGENCY'S PROGRAMS
AND REACTIONS AND ADDITIONS CONCERNING NEEDS LISTED
ABOVE FROM PRE-MEETING INTERVIEWS**

GARY HINSMAN, Director, Sixth Judicial District, Iowa Department of Correctional Services and a former police chief

- 0 Maintains cooperative agreements with all law enforcement agencies
- 0 Holds weekly coordination meetings, especially concerning drugs
- 0 Need vision of where we want to be in 20 years
- 0 Include community in cooperative strategies

JOSEPH SAMUELS, Jr., Chief of Police, Oakland, California and previous chief in Fresno, CA

- 0 Power of unions re: community corrections and community policing, particularly community corrections
- 0 Ethnic and racial sensitivities, e.g. who is in prisons? Who are the personnel?
- 0 Prevention, e.g. technological links

ARMANDO GANDARILLA, Supervisor, Adult Probation Department, Maricopa County, Arizona

- 0 Adult probation and police working hand-in-hand
- 0 Notes that this is not new
- 0 Focus on how to use and empower the community (All agencies)

ELIZABETH M. WATSON, Chief of Police, Austin, Texas

- 0 Gives example of cooperation and supervision concerning a rape offender
- 0 Asks how do this for all?
- 0 Engage community
- 0 Share info
- 0 Technology, e.g. information, interface

BENJAMIN WARD, former Police Commissioner, New York City, and
Commissioner of Corrections, New York State

- 0 TIME -- It's time to address cooperation; feels he's been talking about this for a long time
- 0 Do more with less
- 0 Role of sheriffs
- 0 Need national forum
- 0 Coordination (even when have information shared)
- 0 Need demo projects (notes there are 4,000 "runaways" out of 26,000 persons in community corrections in New York State)
- 0 Cross-jurisdictional roles

W. ROLAND KNAPP, Director, Maryland Division of Parole and Probation

- 0 Not new, e.g. beat officers in Baltimore
- 0 Don't have a criminal justice system; don't communicate
- 0 Problems not criminal justice system but community, e.g. solve from inside the community
- 0 Communications, need to talk, have dialogue
- 0 Distrust
- 0 Prevention, needs more emphasis

SUSAN J. GIONFRIDDO, Chief Probation Officer, Santa Barbara County
Probation, Santa Barbara, California

- 0 County of 475,000
- 0 Responsibilities include probation and local parole; adult and juvenile
- 0 She is immediate past president of state association
- 0 Automated data sharing in place in county
- 0 Electronic monitoring
- 0 Canine Drug Sniffers program in cooperation with sheriff and police agencies
- 0 Rivalry -- state and local
- 0 Union issues
- 0 Turf issues, e.g. competition for funding
- 0 Political climate and how probation, parole, police contribute
- 0 Gang patrols in place, cooperatively
- 0 Still not a "system"

RONALD P. CORBETT, Deputy Commissioner for Operations, Office of the
Massachusetts Commissioner of Probation

- o Current President of NAPE
- o 351 cities and towns -- no info provided to local police and between locals
re: offenders

0 Recent development in Mass. :

Joint Police and probation efforts in gang areas
10 most wanted list from 10,000 outstanding warrants in state
(priority is on cooperation, low tech approach) - effective

0 Close the credibility gap with citizens re: probation and parole

DAVID B. MITCHELL, Chief of Police Prince George's County, Maryland

- 0 County of 760,000 adjoining District of Columbia
- 0 Central/regional booking frees resources
- 0 Communication
- 0 Duplication of effort
- 0 Work smarter
- 0 Public anger and frustration, e.g. abolish parole campaign and "Drop the Hammer" attitudes
- 0 Vision of results, e.g. not going to arrest our way out of this

MICHAEL NICHOLS, Agent in Charge, Richland County, South Carolina,
Probation, Parole and Pardon Services

- 0 County component of state agency (Columbia and surrounding area)
- 0 Communication, e.g. regular, not reactive; systematic
- 0 Understanding each others roles
- 0 Expectations
- 0 Start with communication
- 0 I.D. goals, shared goal(s)

RON LEMLEY, Supervisor, Alexandria Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court,
Virginia

- 0 Juvenile justice -- more focus
- 0 Placing probation officers in public housing
- 0 Community resistance

CHRISTOPHER F. PATE, Chief Probation Officer, Virginia Probation &
Parole, Norfolk, Virginia

- 0 Norfolk component of state agency
- 0 P.A.C.E. Program

- o Organizational culture(s)
 - e.g. line officers' views of other agencies' line officers
 - e.g. state systems -- execs always come from institutions and bring bias
- o Resources
- o Education -- inside and out, especially re: probation and parole

Colonel CLARENCE EDWARDS, Chief of Police, Montgomery County, MD

- o Community expectations and demands: How will they be met within existing and projected financial constraints?
- o Changing demographics: Will the criminal justice system be reactive or proactive in responding to this issue?
- o How will law enforcement leaders improve their capacity to more effectively manage in a constantly changing environment?
- o What are the implications for public sector agencies, if privatization continues to increase?
- o Opposition to community corrections from neighborhoods: Will law enforcement leaders oppose or support this initiative?

FRANK REMINGTON, Esq., Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin

- o Cooperation, communication, coordination -- for what purpose, goals?
- o History
 - 60's -- informal cooperation, especially rural areas
 - 70's - 80's -- demographic trends in corrections
- o Look at cooperation re: violent offenders, e.g. Madison Project and sex offenders
- o How sustain innovation
- o Vision -- (Trend - "minor" stay in community)
- o Other categories of crime/offenders
 - Property
 - Minor drug offenders
 - Persistent nuisance offenders
- o Madison Bicycle Project

- 0 Politics - e.g. Wisconsin Governor appointed task force of business leaders re: strategy, resources; believed can analyze and speak credibly
- 0 Need to reach to local, municipal level (NIC focus is at state level)

e.g. a lot to learn

LARRY SOLOMON, Deputy Director, National Institute of Corrections

- 0 Community as nexus point
- 0 Public policy
- 0 Prevention
- 0 Retrenchment
- 0 Legislative and public oversight of corrections

e.g. miss the volume of probation and parole in the community

- 0 Who gets in and out, and when?

TONY PATE, Ph.D., Director of Research, Police Foundation

- 0 Research questions:

Why do we do what we do?
What do we know about it?
What do differently?

- 0 Communications, coordination

PETER SCHARF, Ed.D., Director, Technology and Technical Assistance, Police Foundation

- 0 Goals -- different incentives in police, probation, parole

e.g. arrests
e.g. recidivism

- 0 Prevention, e.g. joint warnings
- 0 cost

o 4-C's:

Communication
Cooperation
Collaboration
Coordination

o Different partnerships

e.g. agencies
e.g. community

o Loop-back

ADDITIONS (re: needs) FROM GROUP DISCUSSION

o Seeking consensus from community and business leaders

o Age of offenders:

Going down
More Juveniles moved to adult jurisdiction
Increasing violence
Deal with offense rather than age

o Media

o Constraints on info sharing re: juveniles

o Family systems:

Multi-dimensional focus, including various agencies

o Impact of release into community of large numbers of minor drug and other offenders

note that drug treatment equivalent to the cost of only nine days incarceration
Note that Prince George's County, MD uses drug screening with everyday reporting

- o How can police, probation and parole work together around high-risk offenders?

If not incarcerate, what do?

- o How create shift in approaches, attitudes?
- o Concerns with range of definitions of community policing and community corrections

RECAP OF PROBLEMS AND NEEDS JUST IDENTIFIED

(Listed in no particular order, but numbered to simplify the process of selecting and ranking for further discussion and agenda-setting)

1. 4-C's (communication, cooperation, coordination, collaboration)
2. Influencing the public and public officials
3. Vision
4. Overlapping jurisdictions
5. Community mobilization and partnerships
6. Technology
7. Problem orientation (focus), e.g. types of offenders after release into community
8. Leadership
9. Resources
10. Unions
11. Prevention

**GROUP'S RANKING OF TOPICS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION
(With "vote" count resulting from each selecting his/her "top two")**

1. Offender-oriented approach (12)
2. Overlapping jurisdictions (agencies and intergovernmental) (10)
3. Influencing public officials and the public (8)
4. Community (4)
5. Resources (2)

BRAINSTORMED LIST OF POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO FOLLOW UP MEETING

Question addressed to participants: Should we continue the process begun here?
Participants expressed strong desire to do so. They identified possible actions:

1. Written report
2. Share report with professional associations
3. Conduct focus groups on “five topics” selected above
4. Create sixth topic on “consequences”
5. Create inventory of existing models and experiments

 “Perspectives” - type article
 effective with profession
6. Capture examples of what used to happen “in 50’s and 60’s”
7. Historical perspective
8. Articulate a position on why it is in our interest to do this work together
9. Staff (NIC and Police Foundation) do some of these things, e.g. data collection
9. Produce a position paper on interdisciplinary professional interests
10. Create 2-3 pilot programs nationally, e.g. large, medium, small jurisdictions
11. Do “Experiment,” e.g. the Kansas City police experiment

 re: different community policing/community corrections approaches
 Focus on “impacts”
12. “TCS...” -- Talk Common Sense to Conservative Talk Radio Hosts” (re: importance of community policing and corrections approaches)
13. Understand who talking to when disseminating information and designing programs

 e.g. professional/agency subcultures and how frame dialogue across boundaries
14. Use pilot projects to attract chiefs’ attention
15. Compare level of citizen satisfaction re: violent crime enforcement compared to minor/nuisance crimes

16. Do follow-up and prep -- 3-4 months; send ideas for next meeting out to group
17. Keep same group for a few meetings, then expand

-or-

Broaden group's representation for future meetings, based on new people reading report and being briefed prior to joining dialogue

18. Identify any risks of cooperation

#####

ATTENDEE LIST (Handout)

FORGING NEW WORKING PARTNERSHIPS

A WORKINGMEETING

OF

POLICE, PROBATION AND PAROLE EXECUTIVES

**SPONSORED BY
THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS
IN COOPERATION WITH
THE POLICE FOUNDATION**

November 2, 1994

Old Town Sheraton, Alexandria, Virginia

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.
Deputy Commissioner of Probation
state of Massachusetts

Colonel Clarence Edwards
Chief of Police
Montgomery County, Maryland

Armado Gandarillo
Supervisor, Adult Probation Department
Maricopa County, Arizona

Susan J. Gionfriddo
Chief Probation Officer
Santa Barbara County, California

Gary Hinzman
Director, 6th Judicial District
Iowa Department of Correctional Services

W. Roland Knapp
Director
Maryland Division of Parole and Probation

Ron Lemley
Supervisor, Alexandria Juvenile and
Domestic Relations Court, Virginia

David B. Mitchell
Chief of Police
Prince George's County, Maryland

Michael Nichols
Agent In Charge, Richland County
South Carolina Probation, Parole & Pardon Services

Christopher F. Pate
Chief Probation Officer, Norfolk
Virginia Probation & Parole

Professor Frank Remington, Esq.
Professor of Law, U. of Wisconsin
Madison Wisconsin

Joseph Samuels, Jr.
Chief of Police
Oakland, California

The Honorable Benjamin Ward, Esq.
Former New York City Police Commissioner and
New York State Commissioner of Corrections

Elizabeth M. Watson
Chief of Police
Austin, Texas

ATTENDEE LIST, *FORGING NEW WORKING PARTNERSHIPS*, Continued

National Institute of Corrections

Larry Solomon
George Keiser
Rick Faulkner
Ed Barajas

Police Foundation

Hubert Williams
Bill Matthews
Tony Pate
Peter Scharf

Facilitator

William R. Drake, Drake Associates