

Federal Judicial Center
Off Paper Episode 1

Mark Sherman: From the FJC in Washington D.C., I'm Mark Sherman and this is *Off Paper*. Today, we explore how officers conducting community supervision with high risk individuals can serve as agents of change. Our guest, Dr. Guy Bourgon, is a clinical psychologist specializing in correctional and criminal justice psychology. For over 25 years, he has been dedicated to the development and implementation of empirically validated correctional services. He is widely published and his extensive international experience in the training and supervision of frontline professionals helps facilitate the transfer of this knowledge to everyday practice. As co-lead for Canada's Strategic Training Initiative and Community Supervision, otherwise known as STICS, Guy is recognized for translating research into useful and practical concepts, skills and techniques intended to promote client engagement and facilitate prosocial change. So stay tuned folks. It's going to be a good one.

Guy Bourgon, welcome to the program.

Guy Bourgon: Hi, Mark.

Mark Sherman: So I want to begin by asking you about a concept that you've been writing about and training officers on for a number of years now which is about the transformation of

the officer from case manager to change agent. So first, what does that mean? And second how can the change agent approach potentially improve client engagement?

Guy Bourgon: Well, when you think about community supervision over the last couple of decades, we're starting to see a significant change over the course of at least the last five years or so. Case managers are often what people talk about when they talk about probation itself. You ask a probation officer what are they, what do they do, and they say they're case managers. What exactly does that mean? When you look at the business of what they actually do, to a large extent, they are sort of collectors and storers of information and they share this information, and that's become their primary focus and job task over the last little while.

You look back and see where that took place. Of course, the history of it is back in the '60s, probation officers were essentially friends of their clients. They were trying to be good friends to help them grow. But then after Martinson's nothing works, which I'm sure everybody is very, very familiar with, the whole notion of changing criminals was like, oh my God, it's not going to work.

So what did they end up doing? Of course, what they ended up doing was all about the order itself. What do you do? What are you supposed to be doing? What are you not supposed to be

doing in terms of the clients? And the probation officers were essentially collecting information about whether or not they did what they were supposed to be doing or not doing, and they would share this information with the courts. So it became very administrative in nature.

Of course, towards the late '80s, the whole notion of Risk-Need-Responsivity came out. That was to basically counteract the nothing works debate. With that, probation corrections in general recognized that people should be assessed through their needs. The risk principle was that high risk people need more services, and, of course, the need principle which was referring to some needs are more important than others when it comes to offender [sounds like].

But the essence of what they were doing didn't change much in terms of collecting and storing of information. There was now a lens in terms of identifying people who were more at risk, not at risk, or less risky. The focus was still on administrative, identifying who was more at risk, less risk, and figuring out what needs had to be addressed. And the case manager was sort of the point person. This person would just essentially collect this information and funnel or direct people to the right places. And the case manager was essentially not doing much of the change per se. They weren't the active participant. Rather they were directing them to the

right resources. Let's say you have a substance abuse problem. They would direct them to substance abuse program. So, most of those services were outside of probation itself.

Mark Sherman: So, you're saying that we are sort of witnessing in the transformation of officer from case manager to change agent. Originally, the officer was sort of the broker of information, the broker of services, and that gradually we're moving into a space where the officer is more directly engaged with the client. So let's talk about that a little bit. At what point did that change occur? Is it still a work in progress?

Guy Bourgon: I think it is still very much a work in progress. I think what systems and organizations are recognizing is that probation officers are the key. They are the ones who actually see the people most often over the course of the lengthy period of time. Here you have this great opportunity for them to actually get active and be down and dirty in terms of providing services to clients and starting to facilitate change.

So in terms of the change agent approach, it's rather than just being what I call a travel agent, where are you going to go? What do you want? What does this person need? Sort of brokering those services and helping them get to those services, and almost washing their hands. This guy is in a

treatment program that those treatment providers are the expert of change. Now, we go, well, probation officer itself, we can tap into and leverage their expertise with offenders. Well, they know them really well. Let's provide them with the skills and abilities to start facilitating change.

Mark Sherman: So one of the things that's become quite clear both through the research and now through the training that U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services officers are receiving is the centrality of understanding cognitive behavioral therapy and principles related to it as sort of the core of the practices that at least in supervision officers need to engage in with clients. Can you talk a little bit about that and how that's played out?

Guy Bourgon: Sure. Cognitive behavioral approach, this is essentially the primary thing behind that or the essence of that is our thinking is what really drives behavior. This I think is one of the biggest challenges for people to get, to understand completely what that means. Too often when we ask people why they do what they do, their answers tend to be an explanation based on things outside of them.

I often do in training that I ask people to stand up and I ask them a simple reason why they stood up, and the answers are typically, well, you asked. I was being polite, so on and so forth. They typically respond it's the outside world caused me

or is the causal agent to why I did what I do. With the cognitive behavioral approach, it goes, well, yes, those factors are relevant context, but they are not the causal agent. When we start thinking about what's the causal agent from a cognitive behavioral perspective, it's the person themselves, the essence of taking responsibility and being responsible for our actions. The cognitive behavioral approach essentially goes the cause of our actions are internal. They are ourselves. They are what we think, what we feel, what's going on inside our heads.

This is an essence of -- when you think of offenders and all the reasons why they do what they do, we get all kinds of excuses from because somebody else did this, somebody else did this, and the cognitive behavioral approach goes, well, that's context. But the real reason is what you think and taking responsibility for all that you think and you feel, and you do.

Mark Sherman: This is interesting because there is certainly some thinking among the correctional community that taking that kind of an approach is perhaps letting the offender off the hook. But what you're saying is that taking the cognitive behavioral approach is actually really making sure that the responsibility is on the client, right? That they are taking responsibility for their thoughts and actions that they take based on their thoughts. It's not caused by some -- they

can't blame it on some outside force that caused it. The devil made me do it kind of thing.

Guy Bourgon: Exactly. This to me is the struggle because all of us have preconceived notions of why we do what we do, whether it's ourselves or somebody else. To truly understand it is if you take complete responsibility, some people go, well, that's being too responsible. I can't be responsible for let's say my parents and the dysfunction that occurred in my family of origin. No, you're not responsible for the dysfunction in your family origin. Yes, that provided context for what you grew up with. But people learn things.

In essence, whatever it is you learned during the course of your life, where does it get stored? It's stored inside of your brain. Ultimately, when push comes to shove, who decides whether you do something or don't do something? Who decides what you think? It's entirely up to you. It's almost like I want you to be responsible for your intelligent choices as well as your not so intelligent choices. But that's your choice. It doesn't mean that we're not empathic or take into consideration that you may have had a hard life or whatnot. That's not the point. The point is today, what are you going to do about it?

Mark Sherman: Right. So it really comes down to this concept of agency, right?

Guy Bourgon: Yeah.

Mark Sherman: And personal responsibility. And so I think that's valuable when we think about what the role of the officer is in this context and really what the responsibility and role of the client is.

So let me ask you, what does that look like? If I am an officer and I am engaging in cognitive behavioral approach in terms of my supervision practice with my client, what does that look like in contrast to the old dodge out [sounds like], or the old way of doing things?

Guy Bourgon: Well, in a quick nutshell, the old way of doing things was essentially we would dispense advice. We would give solutions to their problems and say go do this. We could be nice about it and be encouraging or whatnot. Or we can lay down consequences should they *not* do this particular strategies. In the cognitive behavioral approach, what we realize is that just like the offender needs to take responsibility for his choices, his thinking, and his behavior, so, too, does the officer. So the officer takes a different approach in terms of creating an environment in which the client himself starts to recognize what caused this behavior in this first place.

I'd like to go to sort of four general steps to good cognitive behavioral program or intervention. The first step

is for the client as well as the officer to convince a client and for him to discover that the reason why you do what you do is because of what you think and nothing else. If they can accept that one particular step, this stops a lot of their old way of thinking, blaming someone, my friend, or this or that, and recognizing that, geez, I have a responsibility here in what I think and what I do.

Once they've gotten that first step of recognizing that the cause of their behavior is their thinking, the next step for the officer is to create an environment for the client to start examining what it is he thinks and what behaviors it leads to and the consequences it leads to.

One of my favorite things is does doing what you do get what you want, and not just in the short term but over the long term? And I often go if you buy a car, and let's say it's the same car, I can sell it to you for one dollar or I can sell it to you for \$1,000, what price do you want to pay? It's a no brainer question. It's the same car, right? There's no catch. No. I'll pay a dollar. So we get the clients to start examining their thinking and to see how much it's costing them and what it is they want. They can start identifying those thoughts that are helping them get closer to doing more crime and all consequences associated with that especially the negative ones.

We go, well, if you change what you're thinking, does that actually increase the chances that your behavior changes? That would be the third step, where they start practicing changing their thinking and practicing new behaviors that lead to the less costly car.

The last step, because it's cognitive behavioral, there is a lot of practice associated with this, which means you try, you try, you try, you get lots of feedback, and you become better and better at it and more efficient at it and more effective at thinking differently and behaving differently.

Mark Sherman: If you're just joining us, we're talking with Dr. Guy Bourgon, a clinical psychologist for Public Safety Canada. He specializes in translating research into useful and practical concept skills and techniques intended to promote client engagement and facilitate prosocial change. We'll be back to talk some more with Guy after a short break. This is *Off Paper*.

Female Voice: Successfully transitioning clients back into the community means staying on top of the latest research on substance use, mental health disorders, treatment services, and the development of job-related skills. To help officers do that, FJC Probation and Pretrial Services Education has developed treatment services, negotiating pathways and supporting successful transitions. This online course includes

resources, addressing topics like the science of behavioral health, treatment modalities, and medication assisted treatment among others. After taking the course, an officer should be able to better understand treatment modalities, match individuals to appropriate treatment services, and act as an agent of change in the supervision of treatment cases. The course can be found at fjc.dcn under Probation and Pretrial Services.

Mark Sherman: We're back with Dr. Guy Bourgon of Public Safety Canada. So, Guy, I want to take a step back for a moment and do a little or maybe a big reality check here. We're talking about officers supervising higher risk individuals. That usually means the person they are supervising is a man or a woman who will typically have multiple criminogenic needs and has a long rap sheet. They've been in and out of the criminal justice system for a number of years. Their lives are unstable. Maybe they have held a job or maybe they haven't. They might be children they're responsible for. It's likely that their previous interactions with the criminal justice system haven't been positive. They are not thrilled about being on supervision but they have no choice in the matter.

So when it comes to the relationship between the officer and the person on supervision, there is immediately an issue of

distrust, if not outright hostility and resentment on the part of the client. So how does the officer who wants to be a change agent deal effectively with this distrust?

Guy Bourgon: That's a great question, Mark. Certainly, in terms of all the research for many decades now, we know that the relationship between the person trying to facilitate change and the client is a really vital ingredient. For community supervision, we sort of start off in a hole because they walk in the door with these expectations. Our clients have expectations of what the officers are going to be like, what are they going to do, what's their goals, what's their purpose, and it's very, very distrusting.

So part of what we encourage, especially in a change agent perspective, is to try to start it off on the right foot, which means actually tackling their thoughts, attitudes about the criminal justice system and in particular the probation officer themselves. Part of that means having the client take a seat and the officer taking charge of this session in which he's going to try and tackle those negative expectations of the officer right off the hop. What they do is they go, look, in my profession, these are the things that I need to do in general. These are my responsibilities, my responsibilities to the court, my responsibilities to my organization, and my

responsibilities to you the client, and actually have them understand these are what my roles are.

But part of building a relationship that is going to be effective to help facilitate change is you want to let the client know how are you going to be with them? Here's sort when you get the roles and responsibilities you got a big nutshell of this is what I do and why I do it.

Then the next question is how am I going to be when I'm going to be with you? So we use something called role clarification where you start to talk about not you and that you like long walks in the park and whatnot, but what is your professional personality is like because your client is going to know your professional personality over time.

So, why not you lay down your cards right off the top about this is my professional personality is like, who I'm going to be and how I'm going to act with you. Those particular activities start off right away of tackling those negative expectations and building more realistic ones. Then, of course, the officer's job is to follow through on those. Because typically when the client comes in, you just go, "This is what you're going to do." "This is not what you're going to do." You're going to report here. So it's all about the client behavior and the client focus.

We sort of flip it on its head. It's all about the officer themselves and this is the way I'm going to be. That starts the process of getting them to understand where you're coming from and changing those negative expectations. Of course, at the end of that role clarification is once the client can understand where the officer is coming from and how the officer is going to be, you then ask the client how are you going to be and what can they expect of you. This changes the dynamic from the power broker of the probation officer just telling the client what to do, making it more collaborative in nature, and addressing those negative expectations.

Mark Sherman: I assume that the research bears out that that approach, the beginning with role clarification is generally a successful way of beginning a relationship with an involuntary client. Somebody who is coming where there is this level of distrust coming into the relationship. So I can just sort of visualize folks listening to our conversation, they're thinking how on earth is that going to work with these guys, these men and women who come in to see me? They already hate me, right? So how on earth is that going to work?

Guy Bourgon: In the late '90s or early '90s, Chris Trotter sort of introduced the whole notion of role clarification with involuntary clients, and now it has been up two decades. This is certainly a way that actually helps

change the dynamic right away. Because when the client walks in the door, the dynamic setup, especially with high-risk client, it's set up for basically fighting. By doing it this way, oftentimes what clients will do is look at you like you're from Mars when you do this because this is something completely out of the ordinary of what they're used to.

When you think about when they get arrested, they are drilled with questions. They are interrogated, interrogated, and told what to do and told how to say it, everything like that. Then all of a sudden, it's not even about them. It's about the other person on the other side of the desk, and this stops them in their tracks to go, oh, something is different here, and it starts that process to allow engagement.

I'll go on a sidetrack here. If you think about responsivity, and responsivity itself is, what does that mean? Essentially, the original writing there were two aspects to it. The general responsibility about using cognitive behavior approach is because the research shows that this hands-on concrete kind of learning is going to be more effective at facilitating change with clients. The other part was more specific to trying to address the specific ways in which they learn. Whether it's cultural, gender-based, whatever it is.

Part of the research, I take our researchers - I'm one of them - we've done a poor job of illustrating of what that

actually means. Even if you're successful at it, what's the impact of being successful at responsiveness? To me, the first thing that you would see if you were successfully responsive to your client would be engagement. They're actually going to talk and listen to you. This is the first thing you would notice if you're being successful at them. If I am using highly technical, psychological terms, this is not responsive to them. They're not academically focused. They don't like words. They like concrete, easy to visualize kind of words that makes sense to them. When you do that, then it gives them the power to be able to use your vocabulary, describe their own experiences so you get engagement.

After engagement, if they're engaged, then the question becomes, well, if you're teaching them anything, they would start to learn something, whatever it might be. It doesn't necessarily mean you're following let's say the need principle. I can be talking about their mental health, or I could be talking about how to vacuum a room or something like, and they would learn how to do that better. So they're going to start to learn something. If you're actually targeting those criminogenic needs, then their learning is actually going to impact on those particular needs. If the need is correct, and it's a criminogenic need then you would likely see reduced re-offending.

Mark Sherman: So one of the things that you said that I think is quite intriguing is that by engaging in role clarification, the officer is taking that approach at the beginning of the relationship. It is almost like a form of psychological jiu-jitsu because when you're working with the client -- because the client is coming in expecting a confrontation. Is that fair?

Guy Bourgon: Yeah. It's fair.

Mark Sherman: And they're not going to get a confrontation. They are going to get, hey, how are you doing and let's start off talking about what my role as the officer is. That will undermine and perhaps throw the client off balance a bit because it's not a fight. It's not a confrontation. It's not me telling you I'm the authority figure and you're going to listen to me, right? This is actually about you. But in order for it to be about you I simply need to tell you what my role is going to be and how this process is going to work. Is that fair?

Guy Bourgon: That's fair. It is interesting. One of the things I noticed over the course of many years of working with people in the criminal justice system is we're too quickly to go into what are we going to do together. Whether it's a treatment provider or probation officer, it gets very tasked focused. The key to good role clarification is just talk about

how we're going to be, who we are, and how we're going to be together which really throws them for a loop because they're so used to directions or compliance and orders and that kind of thing.

So it starts off with just this who I am. And part of the process is recognizing the power imbalance by going, me as the probation officer, I'm going to throw my cards down the table first, as opposed to here's who I am, here's I'm going to be. We haven't even talked about during this process what are we going to do together, like our purpose behind it. I often use the phrase the judge sentenced you and also sentenced me for us to be together. So let's just talk about how we're going to be together before figure out what are we going to do together.

Mark Sherman: Right. The client might be involuntary so is the officer.

Guy Bourgon: Essentially yeah.

Mark Sherman: So that's very helpful. I want to move on and dig deeper into the responsivity principle. You mentioned it. I think it's central to this part of the discussion certainly. It's a principle that is quite different. We know this on the surface but as we dig deeper we really see a principle that is quite different from the risk principle and the need principle. Those are certainly related as all three of those principles are. So is it fair to say that with the

responsivity principle, you have written that the officer needs to create what you call the optimal learning environment. So it is fair to say then that the burden is on the officer to create that environment by being attuned to the client's attributes? That's one thing. Then is it also true that the client's optimal learning environment is not necessarily the same as the next client's optimal learning environment?

Guy Bourgon: Absolutely. One of the things that happened with the responsivity principle, which is really unfortunate, is we created this checklist of these are the attributes of the client. With the risk principle, it was very much client focused. These are the risk level of the client. Same thing with the needs, it's very much client attribute. With the responsivity principle, if we just leave it at the client attributes, it's almost what do you do with it? So you've got an inner city female who's living in poverty with a grade six education. That's the attributes. For me, the most important thing with responsivity principle is this is something actively that me as the probation officer has to do something. It's what I do that actually dictates whether I'm being responsive or not.

So it's not strictly about the client attribute. It's about what do I do? When I start thinking about what do I do, how do I help my client learn something whatever that happens

to be? It's a question of how do I set up an environment that's conducive for them to learn. Some clients they like it direct. They learn quicker when it's concrete and real. Others it might be a little bit more abstract or feeling associated. Some might learn quicker when they can understand things in terms of relationships versus strictly themselves.

When I think of a lot of the psychological terms that many treatment programs use, they're really technical terms. It's not the term. It's not the concept of the term itself that's the problem. You look at thinking errors. Many people are familiar with the term thinking error. The idea behind thinking error is that there are certain cognitions or thoughts that people have that create problems in your life, and we use the term thinking error. Well, if I'm going to create an environment that's conducive to my client learning, and I'm going to tell him, "You have a thinking error," first thing they think is now you're telling me I think wrong. Is this helpful for them to learn the concept? Let alone try to start applying it to themselves?

If we change the term, keeping the concept similar to that is something easier for them to understand, using a visual image. One of the things that I often encourage people to do is to use something like colors to describe attitudes as opposed to using the word positive and negative, there are just

four general colors. It's amazing how quickly they learn the language of colors and what it refers to, and then start applying it to themselves. This is a great example of responsivity because I'm using a concrete visual cue to help them understand a complicated psychological concept.

Mark Sherman: So it's in the responsivity principle that we are really getting at the engagement with the client, the teaching of the skills, the development of the relationship and ultimately, hopefully, the change in behavior. Is that fair to say?

Guy Bourgon: That is fair to say. I like what you said there because what it tells me and what I sort of always encourage is that before you can change your behavior, you need to change your thinking. Many of us have tried to either quit smoking, get healthier, do more exercise, lose weight. We all know what to do to get these things to actually happen, and what's the barrier to all that it's what we think. We think, yeah, I'll start my diet tomorrow. Oh, this cheesecake is talking to me. Whatever it happens to be, it's our thinking. If we can change the thinking that really makes it much more likely that our behavior is going to change. But if we don't change the thinking, that behavior is just sitting in the weeds, waiting to come out again at any moment in time.

Mark Sherman: My guest is Dr. Guy Bourgon, a clinical psychologist with Public Safety Canada. After a short break, we'll talk with Guy about the impact of the change agent approach on the officer's relationship with his or her supervisor and vice versa and what the supervisor's role is in this context? Also, what are some ways the Probation and Pretrial Services office as an organization can support officers as change agents? Finally, how does being a change agent affect an officer's relationship with the court and other stakeholders like prosecutors, defenders, and treatment providers? I'm Mark Sherman and this is *Off Paper*.

Male Voice: FJC Probation and Pretrial Services Education wants to provide officers as many services as it can and make them as easily available as possible. So we've developed a special topics page on fjc.dcn. There, you will find a menu of options allowing you to search for center programs and resources arranged by role for U.S. Probation and Pretrial officers. You can also browse streaming videos on criminal justice and leadership. There are also links to forums where you can find and share information about problem solving courts like drug courts, re-entry courts and the like, as well as best practices for various aspects of Probation and Pretrial Services. Take a look. You might find it useful and interesting. Search fjc.dcn.

Mark Sherman: Dr. Guy Bourgon of Public Safety Canada is our guest. I want to talk about some of the larger organizational issues that are relevant, Guy. But before I do that, I just want to go back briefly to our discussion about responsivity. Because you have written about this issue of, obviously, we officers want to target criminogenic needs but that there also might be -- we want to be strategic here if we're talking about changing thoughts and changing behavior in the client. We want to be strategic about that, and we're about developing a relationship and engagement. So what about the use of services that target non-criminogenic needs as a way of enhancing engagement? Here I'm referring to the study by Dr. Nena Messina of UCLA and co-authors that examined women assigned to a gender-responsive treatment group compared to woman assigned to a traditional therapeutic community. The outcomes were better for the women in the gender-responsive treatment group where those combined needs were addressed. What does it tell us both for direct supervision of clients, but also treatment services provided by treatment contractors?

Guy Bourgon: For me, again, it's under the umbrella of responsivity, one word, train to help a client, and help them change. It's the entire person. It's very holistic in nature. Our criminogenic needs are not in isolation from all the other problems that they have. One of the things that I see

especially in risk assessment is we're trying to break them down and trying to identify very specific things. It's almost like little mail slots [sounds like], and with those mail slots some of them are non-criminogenic. They are not much related to offending, and some are criminogenic. But when we're working with someone, all of them are all part of the person's life. What I often try to do is help them conceptualize a person as a whole. A great way for me to sort of describe that to people is what again it goes back to what drives behavior.

Well, it's your thinking. The thinking, if you think of a dart board, the bull's eye is their thinking. Whatever you think is going to permeate across the rest of your existence, your behavior, your interpersonal relationships, and so on and so forth. That will impact your criminogenic and non-criminogenic needs.

The second circle outside of the bull's eye is essentially all your interpersonal sphere, the people you choose to hang out with, your family members, how much time we spend with them, how much influence they're going to have, how much influence you're going to have with them, who your friends are. So your thinking influences your social sphere.

And then the wider one, the third circle is what I call lifestyle patterns, whether it's substance abuse lifestyle or aggressive lifestyle or chaotic lifestyle, these are the

things. But again, the bull's eye, the center part, what you think and your attitude will permeate all across the board.

One of the things I see that probation officers do, it almost goes back to the organization because we're so focused on just work on the criminogenic need, don't work on the person as a whole, officers will try to get the client to work on a specific criminogenic need and almost force that on them. I find that if you could just get a collaborative goal, one that is pro-social in nature, it doesn't matter how or whatever you describe it, every criminogenic need a client has --

I'll use an example because that's the best way to describe it. Let's say I have a client who wants to improve his relationship with his wife and improve his relationship with his kids. He wants to be a better husband and a better father. Even though he might have a multitude of criminogenic needs, do I need him early on in the process to recognize that his drinking and his drug use is really destroying that? I don't need to do that if I can get him to go, hey, I'm willing to help you improve that. I know for a fact that these criminogenic needs are going to permeate that as well as maybe some non-criminogenic needs.

That's fine. I don't have to get you yes sir, you're right, that's a problem for me at this point in time. Part of the process is for them is to start to discover that this is

problematic for their bigger overall goal. This way I've got a collaborative approach working on the person as a whole, knowing inside of my head that these things are going to come up and keep that -- the other utensils on the table that the person's going to have to address.

Mark Sherman: Wow. We human beings are complex entities, aren't we?

Guy Bourgon: We are.

Mark Sherman: I want to switch gears a little bit and talk about some of the larger organizational issues that are relevant here. As you know officers don't operate in a bubble. And at least in federal probation pretrial, the transformation of officers from case manager to change agent systemically is still quite new and a work in progress. So first, talk about what this means to the relationship, it's a key relationship between the officers with his or her supervisor, how the rules need to change and how that looks like.

Guy Bourgon: Well, part of this is, like you said, is an organizational context. For better or worse, our organizations have really got to a point now where they are entirely focused on administrative aspects of the job, this collecting and storing of information. Supervisors are often tasked with assuring the quality of service. And when it comes down to it, those quality of services that the supervisor gets concerned

about and is tasked with is making sure that their risk assessments are done on time, their case notes are done on time. All of these administrative aspects are done on time. In the old school, from the case manager perspective this was congruent with that approach. In a change agent approach, the focus now becomes what is the officer doing to facilitate change? How are they building a relationship so an engagement happens? What's the collaborative goal the two are working on? What are the tasks involved, and how is the client learning and starting to apply this learning to himself? These are foreign discussions between a supervisor and an officer because that's not part of their quality assurance mechanism.

So what I've noticed over the last five or six years is that supervisors want to help encourage and support this notion of change agent approach. They recognize that their old way of interacting with their officers was not conducive to it because, again, it got down into the weeds of administrative details. So they needed to have a better way to have discussions with officers that focused on the Risk-Need-Responsivity factor, and in particular what are the officers teaching their clients, and what are their clients learning? That's not really captured so much. We're worried about whether they're doing or not doing their conditions. Did a risk assessment get done? Did they service outside of them?

Now, the questions become can we have discussions about the client's process and progress in their change process?

Mark Sherman: So I get very much that transformation within the supervisor from the focus on administrative tasks and quality assurance, and checking the boxes in terms of the work the officer is doing, to working with the officer in terms of is the officer engaging with the client in a way to facilitate that pro-social change. I suspect that's a fairly big lift for most supervisors because that really hasn't been their role, at least from many, many years I can certainly say in the U.S. Probation and Pretrial system. What are the kinds of things that supervisors need to focus on and think about as they make that transition? They're still going to do the task stuff. That's core part of their job. But what kinds of things do they need to think about in making their own at least mental transformation from just focusing on the task-oriented administrative stuff and the quality assurance to perhaps working in a more developmental way with the officer?

Guy Bourgon: This becomes one of the things I think is really critical not just for the supervisors but also the officers, the deputies, and the chiefs themselves. It's recognizing that the organization's sort of vision and mandate is changing. That's one in which we're trying to facilitate change in our clients and not simply be watchers. We're not

just human bracelets, electronic monitoring of our clients anymore.

So from the supervisors, one of the things I think they really appreciated is having not necessarily expertise at how to facilitate change, but knowing about the process itself and being curious to help their officers be able to take the moment in time to actually go, what am I doing and where am I going? How am I getting there with my client? Giving them time and space to recognize or at least evaluate their client's response to various efforts they make to facilitate that change. So they need a really good understanding of Risk-Need-Responsivity, especially that newer perspective and to start showing value to those change efforts as opposed to simply getting your paperwork done on time.

Mark Sherman: Culturally, that is a huge shift. Certainly, it's fair to say that U.S. Probation Pretrial just systemically has been a fairly -- the term I'm thinking of is progressive, not politically obviously, but in terms of the way it's been thinking about working with clients over the years. But even so, for an agency that has a very strong and important law enforcement role, that has got to be a major cultural change for that type of an organization which is trying to balance this law enforcement approach with the more change

agent, facilitating pro-social change type of approach that we're talking about today.

I suspect that organizations, probation and pretrial departments, let alone the individual supervisors who are supervising a unit, and the senior management, I suspect they're really struggling with this stuff.

Guy Bourgon: There is the constant struggle in this, especially in corrections. The notion that law enforcement -- and again it boils down, to me, it starts with what's your vision? What is the purpose of what it is you're doing? Are we simply a nanny? I can't think of a better word, the mommy of some kid watching over, ready to dispense consequences for behaviors or not behaviors. Yes, that is part and parcel of what we do. But simply what we know from the research is that simple approach is not going to make a difference in the long run of whether that person is going to re-offend or not re-offend. In fact, there are pretty decent research suggesting that's actually counterintuitive and counterproductive to our notion of making our society safer. That actually increases the probability of someone re-offending. As we start to grapple with that, it's an education process. It's not just an education with the officers, the supervisors, and the organization but it's also an education with the entire criminal justice system.

What I'm seeing now is that whole notion of being accountable for our business. People are asking more and more, is what we're doing actually doing what we wanted to do? That is, making crime less likely to happen. You're seeing this more and more going, well, if it's not then we should start reexamining what we are doing.

There has been literally, I mean we're approaching four decades, Don Andrews and Jim Bonta wrote their first article on the Risk-Need-Responsivity model in 1980. So we're approaching the 40-year mark. Since that time, we've gathered so much evidence that providing services within that concept of that model actually can reduce re-offending in our clients. To do that, we need to be doing that in all aspects of what we're delivering in terms of the criminal justice system. Yes, the courts got to go, you're guilty, you're not guilty, and here's the sentence. But especially when they are being reintegrated back into the community, our behaviors, our cast, our job is not to catch them after they've done something wrong but to make it less likely they're going to do that.

Mark Sherman: I want to thank you very much for talking with us.

Guy Bourgon: Thank you, Mark. It was a great pleasure.

Mark Sherman: Guy Bourgon is a clinical psychologist for Public Safety Canada. His work on the transformation of the

community supervision officer from case manager to change agent has had a significant influence on the use of evidence-based practice in U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services. His publications are widely available including *Federal Probation Journal* published by the AO. So check them out.

Our producer is Paul Vamvas [phonetic], the program is directed and edited by Craig Batten [phonetic]. I'm Mark Sherman. Thanks for joining us. See you next time.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]