

Probation, parole, and intermediate sanctions

Law



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Probation, Parole, and Intermediate Sanctions The primary goal of all governments across the globe has is liberate their citizenry from criminal activities and ensure safety and peaceful coexistence among communities. The efforts have been making variable swings as at one moment the level of crime rises and at another the reduction of the same. In that perspective, this paper will discuss the modes of criminal justice and community safety that include parole, probation and intermediate sanction. The paper will focus on the potential similarities and differences of the three. The paper will also present my personal views on the best and favorable approaches to enforcement of criminal justice and community safety. Finally, the paper will close with a review on the ethical issues that surrounds the correction processes, approaches and facilities.

Probation, Parole, and Intermediate Sanctions

Crime and community safety have been the most disturbing issues across the entire world since time immemorial. Criminal activities carried within communities have caused unrest and state of confusion as most people fear for the safety of their lives and property. It is due to adverse effects of crimes on communities that legal professionals and security personnel came up with strategies of arresting, examining, rehabilitating and incarcerating individual criminals to restore peace, sanity and confidence in particular communities. Historically, criminal activities were assumed to be caused by evil spirits and therefore, individual criminals were taken to the public for severe punishment as deterrence to other potential activities. Revolution took place in history of crime justice and community safety and gave rise to alternative models of discouraging and ending criminal activities. Among the

notable revolutionized ways of handling criminal activities include parole, probation and intermediate sanctions. Schmallegger (2012) avers that the three methods of handling crime justice and community safety have been experiencing pendulum effects due back and forth review and exercise. Patersilia (1998) asserts that probation and parole have been misunderstood as the only approaches to ensuring community safety and criminal justice. Despite the similarities in the application of parole and probation modes of enforcing criminal justice, the difference occurs in the manner in which each is ignited and set to work. Probation according to Patersilia (1998) is an execution process involving the sentencing of criminal offenders to serve in the community projects as opposed to incarceration. Parole involves release of an offender from castigation before he/she serves full time of sentencing (Petersilia, 1998). In parole, an offender is released under conditions and self proclamation to abide by certain legal thesis while avoiding commission of any criminal activity. Criminals under parole do equally enjoy free life under strict supervision of law amenders. Parole and probation are similar in that, both aim at rehabilitating of the offenders (Schmallegger, 2012). Furthermore, both parole and probation modes of criminal justice and community safety require thorough counseling and job training of the offenders with explicit intent of deluding them from criminal activities and become good members of the society.

Petersilia (1998) reveals that certain community members were dissatisfied with the manner in which criminals were treated under parole and probation since they involved significant use of public funds. Thus, intermediate sanction was created and adopted alongside parole and probation. With

intermediate sanction, law enforcers were required to keep close surveillance and track of the offenders. With intermediate sanction, offenders missed the golden opportunity of being counseled and trained to take up various communal jobs. Intermediate sanction encompassed activities such as intensive probation, electro-monitory, daily reporting of offenders to particular centers and day fines (Tonry, 1997). Probation and parole bears similarity to intermediate sanction because involves setting the offender free but under strict supervision. Moreover, all the three approaches to criminal law enforcement involve vacating and reducing crowding in prisons and cells. However, the three approaches are different in that parole and probation unlike intermediate sanction where offender is not presented to court needs appearance of offenders before the judge.

Of all the three models of criminal justice enforcement and community safety, probation is the best and one that should be adopted in our communities. This is because; with probation the offender(s) is subjected to work for the same community that she/he offended. The benefits of the offenders' services are goes back to the community and alerts every member of the community about the hidden characters offender.

Correctional processes have been facing dire challenges from the society with regard to ethics. Ethically, offenders are regarded as human beings holding equal rights to a free man. In this regard, human rights activists have been continued to demand fair treatment of the offenders while rejecting intermediate sanction for its likelihood of encouraging corruption. The state of jails and custodial houses cumulates argument on the rights to good shelters for the offenders.

References

Petersilia, J. (1998). *Community Corrections: Probation, parole and intermediate sanction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmallegger, F. (2012). *Criminal Justice: A Brief Introduction* 9th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall

Tonry, M. (1997). *Intermediate Sanctions in Sentencing Guidelines*. Retrieved January 8, 2012 from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/165043.pdf>