The population of Norway reached five million in 2012. The prison population rate in 2010 was 75 per 100,000 inhabitants and the total rate for sentences served in both prison and the probation service were 125 per 100,000 inhabitants.

The prison and probation service in Norway is organized by the same body under the same Execution of Sentence Act. Crucial services for the reintegration of prisoners into society are delivered to the prisons by local and municipal service providers. The correctional service does not have its own staff delivering medical, educational, employment, clerical or library services. These are outsourced to the community (imported to the prisons).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity of main probation organization (when established)</th>
<th>First established in 1849 as a voluntary organizational unit. A part of the Correctional Service of Norway from 1st of January 1980.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of main probation organization (number of practitioners employed)</td>
<td>400 employees (356 man hours) working in 17 probation offices in 40 locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Context</td>
<td>Correctional Service of Norway, probation offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency type</td>
<td>Law enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Unit manager responsible to Regional Directors of the Correctional Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Department of Justice and Public Security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Correctional Service of Norway, Department of Justice and Public Security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of practitioners</td>
<td>Employees of the probation offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education</td>
<td>Social work and other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The probation organization in Norway began as local voluntary associations in the 1850s, aiming to give humanitarian aid to released prisoners, in order to reintegrate them into society. The aid was voluntary and released prisoners had to approach the probation organization themselves to get help. Released prisoners fell outside other social aid schemes. The few resources of the probation organization were reserved for those who could show they deserved it. The start came about at the same time as the establishment of several (and more modern) prisons, inspired by reforms in England.

The second phase in the history of the probation organization came as a result of legislative amendments in 1919 in which the probation service was included in the penal system. The number of local associations increased from 9 in 1916 to 99 in 1922 and led to the establishment of a national organization. The probation organization was given the task of conducting a pre-sentence report and supervising suspended sentences and convicts on parole. Nevertheless, the new tasks played a minor role in the activities of the probation organization, which in the main carried on with social supportive work amongst released prisoners and their families.

The Norwegian criminologist Ragnar Hauge (1974a, 1974b) is a substantial contributor to the documentation of the history of the probation organization, among other things through a specialist journal for the correctional service in the early 1970s (Tidsskrift for kriminalomsorg). Discussion about the future of the probation organization rose anew in the 1960s. A new statute of social services in 1964 gave all citizens the right to social aid and support regardless of what had caused their need. Many were therefore of the opinion that the tasks of the probation organization could be distributed to the social services and the police, while others meant that the probation service should be integrated into the prison service (Hauge, 1974a).

A new political wind blew in the 1970s: the result was that the voluntary probation organization was to be integrated into the governmental prison administration and more people were to serve their sentences in society. The probation organization became a key area for the new criminal justice policy in the government's white paper in 1978.¹ The probation organization was integrated into the prison administration in 1980, which changed its name to the Correctional Service on this occasion. The white paper stated that the reasons for this were the strong link between the care and confinement of convicts and society, as well as the correctional service's responsibility to prevent new crime (Hammerlin, 2008). At the same time, the probation organization was criticized for having unclear and contradictory goals and for a lack of follow-up with convicts and there was criticism that their collaborations with the social service, employment office and other municipal services were in conflict (Næss, 1979; Thorsvik 1980, 1984).

The new probation service became a more professional organization, and the justification for the work was gradually changed from a need to help to a need to control. From the end of the 1980s the community sentence was introduced as a separate kind of sentence. This led to a strengthened focus on the control tasks, wherein the prison service and the probation service had a shared responsibility for implementing sentences. This led to a further integration of the two services, which was formally put under the same management in 2001. At the same time, a new law of the implementation of sentences was introduced, in which the work part of the probation service was also included.²

² Straffegjennomføringsloven [The Execution of Sentences Act 2001].
The separation between the prison service and the probation service was terminated in a new governmental white paper. The activities of the correctional service were now to be a seamless organization responsible for various forms of sentences and the implementation of them. The probation offices are one of the arenas wherein this takes place. This is emphasized through the implementation of electronic monitoring (EM). Here the probation service has the authority to commute a prison sentence (of shorter than four months) to home serving with EM. At the same time, this sentence is implemented under the auspices of the local probation office.

1. The roles, characteristics, recruitment and training of key actors in the delivery of offender supervision [who may be located in public, private and/or third sector organisations; ‘characteristics’ could include things like skills, values etc.]

Traditionally, employees in the probation service have an educational background in social welfare studies, most often with a bachelor’s or master’s degree in social work, many with further education in social work in housing, family therapy, mental health care, substance abuse treatment, etc. Several have worked in the municipal services, such as social welfare offices, employment offices or treatment services. Employees with a background in social welfare studies are mainly educated at university colleges, but a few also have courses from the universities (criminology, law, sociology). Yet few academic works concern the activities of the probation service:

Anne Schøyen (1984) in her master’s thesis has studied changes in the work with clients under the supervision of the probation service, especially the contradiction between working with change and control. The study is based upon interviews, observations and secondary data.

Kim Helene Olsen (2011) is writing her master’s thesis on social work as a professional field for the implementing activities of sentences. She studies the contradiction between social work and the implementing of sentences in light of the development of the probation service and asks if the social worker has sufficient (or the right) competence to solve the tasks that the probation service is instructed to solve.

In 2005, 80 % of the staff at the probation offices had a social welfare education. 12 % were employed in management positions and 8 % in administration. With the onset of home serving with electronic monitoring, a new group of workers entered the probation service, namely workers educated as prison officers. They form half of the staff in the EM teams and at small offices they may constitute a substantial employee group.

In an evaluation of the serving of sentences with electronic monitoring, Tore Rokkan (2010) shows how differences in educational background create differences in the EM teams where the work process to a larger degree includes planning, implementing and controlling sentences, and to a lesser degree following-up with convicts.

In an evaluation of measures taken towards reoffenders, a project (TOG) in Oslo prison is described: prison staff and probation service staff share the tasks in a collaborative measure (Nesvik, 2005; Ødegaardshaugen, 2005). The probation officers and the prison officers were to work together around the return of inmates to society and cooperate with others inside and outside the prison. The collaboration was founded on a social welfare model, focusing on the content of the structured conversations with the inmate, rather than the practical facilitation of the process (Hammerlin & Nesvik, 2005). The evaluation reports also point to cooperative problems between TOG and other collaborative measures, especially the social services.

Courses and conferences on planning and cooperation with other services have been topics for the further and supplementary education of probation officers. The Correctional Service of Norway Staff Academy (KRUS) is responsible for the further and supplementary education of all staff in the Correctional Service. KRUS is otherwise certified as part of a bachelor’s degree for prison officers. KRUS is also responsible for training staff who conduct programmes like the DWI/DUI programme, cognitive programmes and the use of support systems. Probation officers may also take courses or further and supplementary education offered at other university colleges and universities.

2. Interactions and relationships between key actors in the delivery of offender supervision and other relevant professionals [e.g. sentencers; police; social workers etc.]

There is little research on the cooperation between the probation service and others. In its assignment, the probation service often cooperates with the police, the courts, the social services, NGOs and other voluntary associations. At some probation offices, the focus on conversational techniques like Motivational Interviewing is greater, whilst other offices focus on cognitive programmes and techniques.

One of the few reports that include the matter of cooperation with others concerns pre-sentencing (Bjerkem, Råen, Skjetne, Sletten, Sletterød, Stene & Tungseth 2012); this report is an evaluation tied to a project with a greater degree of cooperation between the police, the courts, the probation service and the Norwegian mediation service when meting out sentences in order to secure more ‘differentiated sentences with emphasis on individual prevention and rehabilitation’. The report is a review of practice and a follow-up evaluation of the project. There are plans for additional publications on the project.

In the book Virker straff? [Does Punishment Work?], deputy director in the Ministry of Justice and Public Security Jan-Erik Sandlie (2012) writes about attempts at a seamless organization of the probation service as a part of the Correctional Service's operation. The chapter is a description of the activities of the probation service and the political provisions for the future. Implementation of sentences with electronic monitoring is emphasized as a measure that leads to the increased interaction between the two parts of the Correctional Service's operation.

---

4 Quote translated for this report. The original quote is ‘differensierte straffer med vekt på individualprevensjon og rehabilitering’, p. 3.
An evaluation of the introduction of the community sentence in Norway is summarized in three reports. Torunn Højdahl & Ragnar Kristoffersen (2003) used interviews with employees, participant observation and registered data in their review of the experiences in the project period. The same was done in a subsequent report (2004) that summarizes results and challenges ahead, especially challenges with regards to individually tailored content of sentences and cooperation with the social services and others.

Aarvold & Solvang (2008) and Østberg (2008) are two reports on the cooperation between the Red Cross’ Networking-activity After Imprisonment and the probation service. Both reports are from a collaboration project involving the Red Cross as a voluntary participant and the probation service; a project that was established as a permanently offered service. The study included questionnaires, interviews and observations.

In an evaluation of electronic monitoring (EM) (Rokkan, 2012a), those who served their sentences with EM in the try out period 2008–2010 were studied with a special focus on the effect in comparison with other forms of sentences and implementation forms in the correctional service. In some places there was a decrease in community sentences in the same period. The evaluation also shows who apply for transfer from prison as well as the consequences for the composition of inmate populations in the low security prisons after the introduction of the serving of sentences with EM.

3. The delivery/practice/performance of offender supervision [this will include specific aspects of ‘offender supervision’ such as assessment processes, face to face supervision of individual offenders, group work, enforcement etc.; but it should also include any studies of ‘practice cultures’ more generally]

Several of the previous reports on the work of the probation service had a focus on the content of the activity and how the offered service was tailored to the released convicts, their families, etc. (Hauge 1974a, 1974b). Also, the critique of the probation service’s activity in conflict with other universal services (Thorsvik 1984, Næss 1979) describes the practice from the receiver’s point of view.

A bit later, studies of who the probation service’s client is and what needs he/she has were conducted. Inger-Marie Fridhov’s mapping from 1992 is in this respect one of the few living-condition studies in the probation service (Fridhov, 1993). This study was carried out as a questionnaire survey with a selection of 285 clients who were either serving community sentences, attending obligatory meetings, or complying with the conditions of a suspended sentence.

In 1999 Ragnar Kristoffersen conducted a study of conditional sentences with the DWI/DUI programme. The probation service implements a one year programme for people convicted of driving under the influence. Interviews were used in the gathering of data. The study was later followed up by a measuring of recidivism among 250 who participated in the programme (Kristoffersen, 2002).

Højdahl og Kristoffersen (2006) conducted a questionnaire survey with 268 participants undergoing the community sentence in 2005. The survey included both the background of the convicts, their experience of the content, and a measuring of recidivism in the group. The report concludes with recommendations for alterations to the content of the sentence.
The evaluation of measures towards reoffenders (TOG) consists of three reports: Hammerlin & Nesvik (2005), Nesvik (2005) and Ødegaardshaugen (2005). These are based on interviews, participant observation and registered data about these collaborative measures between the probation service of Oslo and Oslo prison, directed at inmates with 3 or more previous sentences (reoffenders). The evaluations also contained recommendations for alterations to the measures.

Thomas Ugelvik (2006) evaluated measures towards young convicts serving sentences in prison or serving community sentences, who were offered follow-up under the auspices of the probation service. The project was a part of a particular follow-up project for young convicts. The survey was conducted as an interview study and by participant observation. The report gave recommendations for new practices.

Tore Rokkan (2012) has evaluated the content of the service offered and taken up by convicts to serve their sentences with electronic monitoring (EM). The study was conducted as a questionnaire survey of 782 convicts who took part in the EM scheme. The study also compares the content of EM with the alternative in low security prisons and reviews the differences between the two ways of serving a sentence. The report also contains a measuring of recidivism and recommendations for alterations to the content of the sentence.

4. The role of tools and technologies in the delivery of OS [e.g. manuals; programmes; assessment instruments – what is known about how these are used; their impact on discretion etc.]

Kristoffersen (1999) has evaluated the DWI/DUI programme, and Højdahl & Kristoffersen (2003, 2004, 2006) have evaluated the community sentence. The reports gave recommendations for alterations to the programmes.

In her master’s thesis, Ingunn Børke (2004) has reviewed the introduction of the community sentence, how it is meant to function and how it functions in practice. The thesis is based on interviews with probation officers. Among the problems that are discussed are the roles of the probation officers, how control of those serving sentences is carried out and how the cooperation between the probation service, the police, the prosecuting authority and the judicial system functions.

Per Kristian Granheim, Åse Bente Rustad and Tore Rokkan (2010) evaluated the introduction of a new programme in the prison and probation service: the National Substance Abuse Programme (NSAP). The evaluation was based on interviews with participants, questionnaires and registered data. The report gave recommendations for alterations to the programme.

Stig Nesvik (2004) has previously evaluated drug abuse programmes used in prisons (RIF) and in the probation service (‘Mitt valg’ [‘My choice’]). The survey was based on interviews with participants and registered data. The report recommended alterations to the programmes.

Rokkan (2012) has evaluated the serving of sentences with electronic monitoring based on questionnaires in prison and in the probation service. The report gave recommendations for alterations.

Anne Bakosgjelten (2010) has interviewed people who served their sentences with electronic monitoring. She studies how they experience measures and services in the scheme. Lise Billington Vik (2010) has studied electronic monitoring as a way of serving sentences and has reviewed judicial challenges in the practice.
5. The management, supervision and/or regulation of practitioners and their practice.

Marianne Øster and Tore Rokkan (2012) have summarized the introduction of electronic monitoring in Norway (2012) based on experiences in the Correctional Service and results from the evaluation of the EM scheme (Rokkan 2012a, 2012b).

Tore Rokkan (2008) has evaluated violence and threats against probation officers. The survey is based on interviews with probation officers and registered data in the period 2004–2008. The report also contains reports from the survey of national safety training interventions in the probation service (SIFO).

Hilde Iversen, Kristin Hellesø-Knutsen, Ida Stendahl og Janne Helgesen (2012) have reported the final results from the safety training interventions in the probation service (SIFO).


A Nordic survey (Graundbøl, Kieldstrup, Muiluvuori et al., 2010) summarized the numbers of recidivism to new sentences in prison and the probation service, at a minimum of 2 years after finishing a previous sentence. The survey showed that there were differences in the percentage of recidivism between the various Nordic countries with regards to people who had served sentences (both in prison and in the probation service). There were also differences between the countries with regards to who serve sentences in prison and in the probation service respectively. The surveys are based on registered data in each of the countries.

Several of the research reports mentioned above provide guidelines for new practices. This is due to the fact that most of them are commissions related to projects, alterations in legislation, or practices. Thus, the purpose of the reports is also to promote or contribute to new practices. This is especially applicable to the area of returning sentenced people to society, which is also one of the main issues in White Paper no. 37 (2007–2008). Evelyn Dyb and Katja Johannessen (2011) have written a bibliography that reviews 20 Nordic projects on the release of sentenced people. Of these 20, 11 are from Norway, and 5 of them include the probation service directly or indirectly: Uglevik (2006) on young inmates, Hammerlin & Nesvik (2005) and Nesvik (2005) on measures towards reoffenders (TOG), as well as Aarvold & Solvang (2008) and Østberg (2008) on networking activities in cooperation with the Red Cross. All of these have been commented on previously in this report.

6: Reflections / contextual issues

a. Who does research into practice?

There are several research circles that have interests in the field that includes practices in prison and the probation service (the Correctional Service):

The Correctional Service of Norway Staff Academy (KRUS) conducts research on commission from the Ministry of Justice and Public Security. KRUS has also an independent responsibility for taking initiative in research that supports the development of knowledge in the field and/or the basic education of prison officers as well as the further education for the prison and probation service.
The university colleges pursue research within the fields of pedagogic activity and social work. Some of the university colleges pursue research on social work related to the care and confinement of convicts, mainly social work in prison and/or related to living conditions for convicts.

The university circles also pursue some research related to the Correctional Service, mainly prison. This research takes place within the fields of criminology, sociology and law. This research most often focuses on the criminal justice system, living conditions for convicts and pure research related to sentences and criminal law. This is especially the case with the universities of Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim and Bodø.

There are various research activities that also have interests related to the Correctional Service, particularly prison. The most important are the Norwegian Institute of Urban and Regional Research (NIBR), Norwegian Social Research (NOVA), the Institute for Labour and Social Research (FAFO) and the Norwegian Institute of Alcohol and Drug Research (SIRUS).

In addition, there are several smaller research circles that pursue research within adjacent areas, related to the Correctional Service or convicts. These activities are often limited to special topics, demography or geography.
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The overview above shows all the mentioned reports in chronological order, sorted into the five main topics of the presentation. Most of the reports contain several topics, but have been sorted into one or two topics according to the focus of the research or target group.

In sum, the main part of the reports presented in this report are master’s theses or reports based on evaluations of projects and measures and other kinds of applied research. Almost none of the reports includes pure research.

b. How it is funded?

The Ministry of Justice and Public Security are about to develop a strategy for research on the care and confinement of convicts. The Ministry also supports the Research Council of Norway with funding that is included in larger research programmes. There is no special research programme for the care and confinement of convicts.

The Ministry of Justice and Public Security and the Correctional Service (KSF) order research from KRUS or other research circles. The Ministry also has funding for which interested research circles may apply. It is also possible to apply for funding from the Norwegian National Crime Prevention Council (KRÅD).

KRUS has a self-interest in initiating research that supports the development of knowledge and competence within the Correctional Service.

c. How much is there?

As this review shows, there is little research on the probation service. The volume is greater for the prison service, especially linked to educational institutions and university circles in particular. Much of this research has as its starting point the convicts, interaction and services and/or marginalization, substance abuse and crime.

Research that focuses on practice in the probation service will comprise 1–2 works per year. Research on practice in prisons might comprise 10–15 works per year. Research that includes the care and confinement of convicts in general will comprise more works.
d. **Why so much / so little?**

Research on practice is linked to the circles that can convert research into new competence. This is especially the case with the research at KRUS and at the university colleges that educate staff for the probation service. However, probation officers with an educational background in social welfare studies do not have the same education and/or practice.

e. **What are the main barriers to research into practice?** [practical; cultural; etc.]

The greatest challenge for research on the probation service is probably the differences between the local offices, backgrounds in different cultures, geographic differences and differences in the composition of the convicts and activities. New practices that are being developed in connection with the establishment of electronic monitoring contribute to a more homogenous practice.

f. **Are there any examples of research which has had an impact on practice or policy?**

Research on the probation service in the period 1970–1980 may have contributed to the need for management control of – and homogenous practice in – the probation service. Examples of this are Thorsvik (1984) and Næss (1974). When the community sentence was introduced, it was followed by extensive evaluations that assisted its implementation (Højdahl & Kristoffersen 2003, 2004, 2006). The introduction of electronic monitoring was supported by following evaluations that contributed to practice. This included especially the user surveys that gave feedback on the composition of the participants and how they experienced the measure (Rokkan, 2012).

g. **Is there any current / on going research into practice you are aware of?** [and if so, who is doing it; what are the research questions/topic and methods]

Evaluation of the implementation of sentences with electronic monitoring (EM) follows the extension of this form of serving sentences. Various categories of sentenced people are compared in the evaluation, i.e. those serving sentences in prison as opposed to those serving in alternative ways. The studies are based on registered data.

Measurements of recidivism are to be conducted, both on a national level with regards to various categories of convicts, and in a Nordic collaboration.

The try out, wherein the court, the police, the probation service and the mediation service cooperate on using pre-trials will continue and new reports will come.
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