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Abstract

The Versatility of Location Monitoring

Nicholas A. Tuma

Under the Supervision of Dr. Michael Klemp-North

Statement of the Problem

A fair amount of research has been developed on location monitoring in the criminal justice system. Location monitoring is a versatile tool community corrections programs can utilize to monitor their clients.

This paper takes a fresh look at the history of location monitoring along with new innovative equipment being developed. This paper also discusses the net-widening effect along with recidivism rates, cost, and public perception of location monitoring. Overall, this paper touches on the main aspects and versatility of location monitoring along with the shortcomings.

This paper will begin by discussing what electronic monitoring is and how it works. Then there will be a discussion about the differences of GPS tracking and Radio Frequency monitoring. The types of offenders on monitoring will be discussed as well as the cost of the programs and its effectiveness. The public perceptions of monitoring will also be touched upon along with the future of monitoring.

Methods of Approach

An extensive literature review is provided on the development and current status of location monitoring equipment and their uses in the field for community corrections officials. An evaluation of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections monitoring center is
discussed. A theoretical perspective of crime control is explored along with concepts of community supervision and net-widening.

**Contribution to the Field**

Location monitoring is a tool to help the officers monitor offenders and defendants. Location monitoring is very complicated having many different uses and goals. Each supervision officer or judge using location monitoring will have a different reason for every different offender. To have location monitoring be the most effective, the right program, in conjunction with the right goals of the program, have to be applied to the correct offender. This is a hard task in itself considering every person has different needs. If the needs are met properly there is less of a chance for recidivism which keeps the community safe, and helps the offender reintegrate back into the community. All this meets the goals of community corrections departments proving that location monitoring is a good tool.

Bonta et al. (2000) posits that the public expects that community sanctions, like electronic monitoring, will not only prevent offenders from committing crime while under supervision, but also will successfully reintegrate them into the community. A main goal of community supervision is reintegration. Electronic monitoring is an aid in the supervision almost forcing offenders to follow work schedules and curfews set by the supervising agent helping with reintegration while keeping the community safe.

Location monitoring is versatile and can fit the mold of each offender but it has to be applied correctly to be used successfully reducing recidivism, being punitive, cutting costs and keeping the public safe. The most effective way of educating the public about the sanction should be looked into for effective awareness and support of the sanction.

Net-widening can be a cause for concern when it comes to alternative sentencing
methods. Some point out that electronic monitoring widens the net of criminal justice control and subsequently punishes offenders who would not have been punished in the past (Maineprize, 1992). Maineprize (1992) further argues that many of the individuals monitored by electronic monitoring would not have been part of the justice process if alternative sanctions did not exist. Tonry and Lynch's (1995) study made a distinction between “front-end” and “back-end” net-widening. “Front-end” net-widening is defined as the use of enhanced penalties for offenders who would not otherwise have received a prison sentence. “Back-end” net-widening is just the opposite where there is an increased likelihood of an eventual prison sentence for technical violations of the offenders monitoring program. These facts show that many offenders might end up going back to prison if released on electronic monitoring as a sanction because the supervision is so intense the offender will be caught for every little infraction leading to eventual revocation, essentially widening the net and keeping offenders in the justice system longer than they should be if there was no sanction like electronic monitoring.
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SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

The Versatility of Location Monitoring

Ankle bracelets are almost fashionable these days. Martha Stewart wore one on her television show. Lindsay Lohan and Paris Hilton may have converted them into a rite of passage, but ankle bracelets are not about glamour. UCLA’s Mark Kleiman stated that you can fully punish a person for what they did in the past and prevent them from what they might do in the future without paying their room and board. Others see location monitoring as a panacea do the problems in our prison system—low cost, technology, smart way to ameliorate state budget crisis, ensure public safety, and give criminals a chance to put their life back together. This sounds good but let us paint the full picture.

Going back to the case of people on parole. Before location monitoring, people on parole had some freedom. They have to report to their parole officer, get occasional home visits, and were unable to leave the community without permission. On a day-to-day basis they were free to visit friends, go to the hospital if necessary, and pretty much do what they wanted. Now the person with the bracelet lives under a rigid schedule. On the technology side, the person wears a lightweight black box about the size of cigarette box all day every day. They are to be at home at certain times and the supervising officer can set the rigidity of the schedule to include no time out or only for certain things such as treatment, Court, or job searching.

Some people say this is too hard on people because of the lack of freedom and other say it is not hard enough because when given time out offenders and defendants can do what they want without the officer knowing. This is where the tool of location monitoring can be considered versatile and is able to adapt to most offenders and defendants needs.
**Purpose of the Study**

There are many location monitoring programs and equipment out in the field today. This research paper will address several of the equipment issues as well as the different programs to find out the best solution to adapting this tool towards the needs of a specific program or offender in the community.

**Significance and Implications**

The significance of this research paper is to address why and how location monitoring is a versatile tool in community corrections. This writer anticipates that this research paper will encourage practitioners and policy makers to think carefully about the role location monitoring has in both pretrial and post conviction release. It is also expected that this paper will encourage researchers to produce enhanced studies that will begin to fill the current evidence gap about the impact and effectiveness of location monitoring. Subsequently, theoretical, empirical, and practical data and research will be explored to obtain a better grasp to determine the efficacy of existing location monitoring programs.
SECTION II: LITERATURE REVIEW

History

The development of the "electronic bracelet" was inspired by a 1977 Spiderman comic strip, read by a New Mexico district court judge, Jack Love. In the comic strip, Spiderman was being tracked by a transmitter worn on his wrist; the current transmitters are worn on the ankle (Gable, 1986). The judge persuaded Michael Goss, a computer salesman, to develop a similar device. In 1983, the first of these new electronic monitors was developed by Goss for monitoring five offenders in Albuquerque, New Mexico (Gable, 1986). The National Institute of Justice (NJJ) evaluated the effort and concluded that the equipment operated successfully, and that it was legally acceptable and cost-effective as an alternative to incarceration (Ford & Schmidt, 1985).

A second system was developed by Thomas Moody for use in Key Largo, Florida (Gable, 1986), where twelve offenders were monitored over a six-month period. This program achieved similar success to that of New Mexico. By 1985, five states (Florida, Kentucky, Oregon, Utah, and Michigan) had implemented electronic monitoring programs. By February 1987, 21 states had electronic monitoring programs, supervising more than 900 offenders (Schmidt, 1988). Today there are tens of thousands of offenders on electronic monitoring programs throughout the states (Schmallager, 1997). It is difficult to tell exactly how many offenders are being monitored at any given time due to the constantly changing numbers. The last reported numbers had increased from 826 in 1987 to 2,277 in 1988 to 6,490 in 1989 and to an estimated 12,000 in 1990, according to Renzema and Skelton (1990).
Originally developed by the military, Global Positioning Systems (GPS) are increasingly being used by the criminal justice system to monitor sex offenders and high risk offenders. NAVSTAR GPS utilizes 34 US military defense satellites and can triangulate the position of a portable tracking device worn by the offender to track location, speed, and direction of this offender in real-time (Nunn, 2001). With the highly publicized sexual battery and murder of a nine year old, Jessica Lunsford, in 2005, Florida legislation required sex offenders who molest children to wear satellite tracking devices for the rest of their lives (Padgett, Bales, & Blomberg, 2006). Eleven additional states considered GPS tracking of sex offenders after the incident.

Currently, there are numerous states tracking hundreds of offenders using the GPS technology. Today, not only high risk sex offenders are being tracked by GPS. Now other high risk offenders, such as flight risk or high profile stalkers, or murders wear the GPS tracking equipment. This equipment is fairly new and not many studies have been done on its effectiveness. The remainder of this section will focus on radio frequency monitoring, more commonly known as, electronic monitoring but the principals can be applied to GPS tracking just as electronic monitoring.

This equipment, both radio frequency and GPS, is versatile. The equipment can be used to track offenders at three stages of the justice process. Specifically, the equipment can be used prior to trial, immediately after conviction, and post incarceration (Payne, 2004). This allows for a cost effective strategy, effective supervision tool, and a reintegration strategy all helping defendants and offenders alike to successfully complete their portion of the justice process.

**Equipment**
Radio-frequency equipment has three parts. The transmitter is worn by the offender, usually on the ankle. The home monitoring unit (HMU) is connected to the phone line in the offenders’ home. The transmitter uses radio-frequency signals to communicate with the HMU. From there, the telephone dials the monitoring center, where the offenders schedule is stored electronically. The HMU reports to the monitoring center whenever the offender arrives or leaves the home. If the offender is not home during their scheduled time the monitoring center is notified and in turn takes whatever action is deemed necessary by procedures and the offenders’ specific monitoring conditions.

Much like the radio-frequency equipment, GPS equipment can track offenders’ movement in and out of the residence but also has the added feature to track the offenders’ movements out in the community. The GPS signals determine the offender’s location every one-to-ten minutes, within 10 meters (BI Inc., 2002). When the offender returns home, the tracking unit is docked into the base station. While docked, it charges its battery and uploads tracking data to the central monitoring computer using the offender’s home phone line. The central monitoring computer compares the location data to the offender’s authorized schedules and locations to detect violations.

The GPS equipment has two types of tracking: active and passive. The active tracker includes an ankle-mounted transmitter; a lightweight, tamper-resistant portable GPS tracking unit which can be clipped to a belt or purse; and a base station at home (BI Inc., 2002). The passive tracker works a little differently. GPS data points are captured in the tracking unit throughout the day and matched against the offender’s "boundaries" and schedules when he or she returns home (BI Inc., 2002).
The GPS units can be programmed to have exclusion zones (those areas which the offenders are not allowed to enter) and inclusion zones (those areas where the offenders are allowed to enter) allowing for precise monitoring of the offender out in the community (Cotter & de Lint, 2005). If a zone is breached, the monitoring center will be notified who in turn follow specific procedures for the specific offender.

**Net- widening**

Since the 1980’s there has been a “get tough on crime” attitude causing more people to be affected by the criminal justice system. New laws were passed including the “three strikes laws”, the “truth in sentencing laws”, and the “war on drugs” creating longer sentences and broader range of offenders. Alternatives to incarceration such as electronic monitoring and drug courts, “widen the net” of the criminal justice system. These alternatives to incarceration cause more and more people to fall into the net of the criminal justice system.

At yearend 2008, there were an estimated 5,095,200 adults under supervision in the community either on probation or parole – the equivalent of about 1 out of every 45 adults in the U.S. (Bureau of Justice Statics). After more than a decade of rapid growth, the number of adults under State supervision has nearly stabilized -- increasing by 33,510 (0.7% per year) since 1992 (Bureau of Justice Statistics). These facts point out that many more people are falling into the “net” of the criminal justice system in the United States now compared to the past.

Probationers (4,270,917) represented the majority (84%) of the community supervision population at yearend 2008, while parolees (828,169) accounted for a smaller share (16%) (Bureau of Justice Statistics). This points to a higher number of probationers,
the less severe of supervision, increasing more rapidly than parolees. This leads to the fact that less severe crimes are being punished and caught in the “net” of the criminal justice system at a more rapid rate than more severe crimes.

The most common type of offense for which probationers (29%) and parolees (37%) were under supervision was drug offenses. Drug offenders represented a larger share of the probation population in 2008 compared to 2000 (24%), while the percentage of drug offenders on parole declined slightly since 2004 (38%) (Bureau of Justice Statistics). These drug offenders are most often not associated with violent offenses and have a wide range and different types of people. The majority of these drug offenders are not career criminals. Net-widening can be a cause for concern when it comes to alternative sentencing methods. Some point out that electronic monitoring widens the net of criminal justice control and subsequently punishes offenders who would not have been punished in the past (Maineprize, 1992). Maineprize (1992) further argues that many of the individuals monitored by electronic monitoring would not have been part of the justice process if alternative sanctions did not exist. Tonry and Lynch’s (1995) study made a distinction between “front-end” and “back-end” net-widening. “Front-end” net-widening is defined as the use of enhanced penalties for offenders who would not otherwise have received a prison sentence. “Back-end” net-widening is just the opposite where there is an increased likelihood of an eventual prison sentence for technical violations of the offenders monitoring program. These facts show that many offenders might end up going back to prison if released on electronic monitoring as a sanction because the supervision is so intense the offender will be caught for every little infraction leading to eventual revocation,
essentially widening the net and keeping offenders in the justice system longer than they should be if there was no sanction like electronic monitoring.

Other research points out that those on electronic monitoring, while not the most serious offenders are often offenders who have already had at least some contact with the justice system. This proposes that electronic monitoring participants are not individuals who would otherwise have been formally or informally dropped from the justice process (Petersilla, 1986; Payne & Gainey, 2000). Petersilla (1986) argues that widening the net is not terribly problematic, just a consequence of intensive supervision programs with the potential to reduce recidivism. These facts all point to offenders still not following their rules even though they are on the sanction and then being caught for violations because of the sanction proving its worth not just widening the net of the justice system.

With only a handful of empirical studies published to date, and only two that specifically test for an effect of location monitoring on technical violations, no firm conclusions can be drawn about its potential for “back-end” net widening. In those two studies that do examine location monitoring technical violations, the findings are contradictory. For example, Cooprider and Kerby (1990) find significantly higher rates of technical violations for pretrial release offenders on location monitoring than for those released into the community with no monitoring, whereas SPEC Associates (2002) find a significant negative effect of location monitoring on the likelihood of a parole violation. Two additional studies (Bonta et al., 2000; Finn and Muirhead-Steves, 2002) address technical violations in their examinations of location monitoring and “program completion”. Bonta et al. (2000) found no effect of technical violations when the offender’s risk score is controlled for. Finn and Muir-head-Steves (2002) report that 76% of their sample of
parolees placed on location monitoring completed the location monitoring program with no violations, but no comparable figures for parolees no on location monitoring are provided for comparison.

With regard to “front-end” net widening as a consequence of location monitoring, some findings have been reported by Berry (1985) and Schmidt (1991). However, the evidence reported to date had been limited to demonstrations of relative low risk of the offenders most often sentenced to location monitoring (Baumer and Mendelsohn, 1992; Bonta et al., 2000; Stanz and Tewksbury, 2000). No studies that we know of have systematically examined the mechanism that operates to widen the net, which Morris and Tonry (1990:225) contend lies in judicial decision making in the context of newly available intermediate punishments. However, a concern for potential front end net widening associated with location monitoring and other intermediate sanctions, especially in terms of the application to low risk offenders is expressed repeatedly (Baumer and Mendelshoh, 1992; clear et al., 1998; and Morris and Tonry, 1990)

Drug courts are another alternative to incarceration that widens the net of the criminal justice system. According to the National Drug Control Policy, 83% of state prisoners scheduled for release in 1999 were involved with alcohol or drugs at the time of their offense (Sanford & Arrigo, 2005). Drug courts treat offenders and impose immediate sanctions if the rules are not followed causing the offenders to be punished or accept the consequences of reoffending and using again.

The general public wants stricter and harsher punishments for the guilty, not rehabilitative measures for the addicted. The drug courts provide a way for addicts who are part of the criminal justice system to get the necessary help, yet be supervised. It is
important to note that drug court programs are considered to be stricter, providing quicker punishments for violations compared to the delays in probation violations and revocation (Kassebaum, G., & Okamoto, D. (2001).

Since these sanctions are available, more and more people fall into the “net” of the criminal justice system. People who would ordinarily receive a warning or ticket are being processed in the criminal justice system because of “get tough on crime” policy. These sanctions widen the net by having less harsh yet helpful ways to reduce cost of prison time yet keep more people under supervision of the criminal justice system.

**Recidivism**

According to Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, and Rooney (2000), the most common reason as to why electronic monitoring should reduce recidivism is that the threat of early detection deters the offender from further crime. In a study conducted by Payne and Gainey (2004) offenders on electronic monitoring report that they would not want to escape or commit new crimes because they were lucky they received electronic monitoring as punishment and would not want to risk a stiffer penalty. According to Andrews and Bonta (1998) and Gendreau and Goggin (1996), the empirical evidence indicates that sanctions or the threat of sanctions have little to no impact on recidivism. This shows that electronic monitoring does not reduce recidivism alone. Other treatment or sanctions in conjunction with electronic monitoring are needed for the program to be successful. Low recidivism rates would be a good measure of the successfulness of electronic monitoring as a sanction. The most critical determinant of success is whether services matched the needs of the offender, particularly those at the highest risk of recidivating. Programs that matched the offender’s needs with offered services were estimated to
reduce recidivism risk by as much as 50% (Andrews et al., 1990). This not only applies to programming and treatment but applying the theory to electronic monitoring or other sanctions could help the success rate and reduce recidivism of those offenders placed into electronic monitoring programs.

Not only the right programs have to match the offender’s needs, but the goals of the program should also be in conjunction with the needs of the offender (Payne, 2000). For example, electronic monitoring early release programs for juveniles are designed differently than early release programs for adult offenders (Charles, 1989). Similarly, pre-diversion program missions, purposes, objectives, and strategies are different from those post-conviction programs (Houk, 1984). In addition to the programs and goals being specific to each offender, Bonta et al. (2000) reports that recidivism rates are lowest among offenders when staff are helpful and care more about the offenders. It is not just the sanction that would reduce recidivism; the staff who monitor and enforce the sanction are a large part of the offenders success in lowering recidivism.

Many of the electronic monitoring programs only assign low risk offenders to the sanction possibly forcing lower recidivism rates. Bonta et al. (2000), also reports that it is difficult to ascertain whether the low recidivism rates are due to offender risk characteristics or to the program. Overall, treatment, support, offender attitude, and goals, in conjunction with monitoring, work the best to reduce recidivism. Electronic monitoring is an aid in supervision not a replacement for it.

Gainey et al. (2000) conclude that research has not kept pace with the rapid implementation of the penal strategy, a conclusion reiterated by Vollum and Hale (2002). A meta analysis if the effect of various intermediate sanctions on recidivism by Gendreau et al.
(2000) includes only six effect size estimates for location monitoring (4% of the total number of estimates included in the analysis), estimated from data on only 1,414 offenders. 92.6% of the total number of offenders included in effect size estimates for all intermediate sanctions. In addition, their findings for the effect of location monitoring across these estimates ranges from a 2% decrease to an 8% increase in the rate of recidivism for offenders on location monitoring when the relative number of estimates is taken into account.

Given the arguments and research, why would one use location monitoring? First, let us consider the risk principle, which basically states that we should reserve our most intense treatment and interventions for our higher risk offenders. Evidence clearly demonstrates that focusing on higher risk offenders can produce the greatest reductions in recidivism. Likewise, providing intense services and interventions to low risk offenders often increases their failure rates. Using location monitoring for low risk offenders, however may not always be a bad idea, especially if those offenders would be incarcerated. Allowing low risk offenders to maintain prosocial ties helps keep them low risk. We also know that mixing low risk and high risk offenders together as is often done in jail or detention facilities can have a negative effect of low risk offenders. It is important to remember that even low risk offenders often have some risk factors that need to be addressed through treatment. For example and offender who has a drinking problem, but who is otherwise prosocial will still need to address their substance abuse issue is they want to stay out of legal troubles.

**Cost**
With the current budget crisis, there is a lot of talk about ways to save money, make cuts, and still keep the communities safe all while accomplishing the goals of corrections. Much research shows that house arrest with electronic monitoring can be a cost effective, punitive alternative to standard incarceration at least for some offenders (Gainey and Payne 2003). Most offenders released out into the community on electronic monitoring pay supervision fees which include the cost of electronic monitoring, while those in jail do not pay anything towards incarceration fees (Schmidt, 1998).

Reintegration is a big part of community corrections and electronic monitoring gives offenders a chance to be back with their family earning a wage, contributing to society in a positive way, and also fit more into a model of restorative justice (Sarnoff, 2001). By placing offenders on electronic monitoring, offenders are still held accountable for their past actions (i.e. crimes) and also held accountable for their current actions. The offenders will be almost forced to get a job or at least show up for it since the electronic monitoring bracelet will allow for strict monitoring of the offenders movement. Keeping pre trial defendants out of the jail will help reduce cost and also keep them from learning other criminal behavior while incarcerated. It also gives the defendants time to prepare their case with a lawyer.

It is argued that if electronic monitoring manages prison population growth and avoids some of the human and financial costs associated with imprisonment, then that is sufficient to affirm the worth of the program (Bonta et al., 2000). Electronic monitoring can provide an outlet to both the offender and the justice system as long as the offenders are following their community supervision, and electronic monitoring rules.
Overall, electronic monitoring is a cost effective alternative to incarceration because the offenders pay for the monitoring services themselves, the cost of incarceration is kept to a minimum because the offenders are out in the community, and the likelihood of recidivism is lower while on electronic monitoring stopping the revolving door of the justice system.

**Safety/ Public Perception**

Shifts in public opinion and in the political arena are calling for more severe responses to the crime problem leading to more of a reliance on incarceration (Payne, 2000). This “get tough on crime” approach in turn resulted in jail and prison overcrowding leading to a need for alternatives to incarceration. According to Gainey (2003), community support is needed above all for the sanction to be initiated. Also, the sanction needs to be punitive enough and tied to general and specific deterrence to get the community support. People are more likely to believe that electronic monitoring is more punitive, is an effective deterrent or method of control, is a rehabilitative tool, is cost effective, and are effective for family and work related reasons if they are educated about the sanction (Gainey, 2003). Bonta et al. (2000) posits that the public expects that community sanctions, like electronic monitoring, will not only prevent offenders from committing crime while under supervision, but also will successfully reintegrate them into the community. A main goal of community supervision is reintegration. Electronic monitoring is an aid in the supervision almost forcing offenders to follow work schedules and curfews set by the supervising agent helping with reintegration while keeping the community safe.

Some argue that the sanction fails to protect the public by allowing dangerous offenders to roam the streets. However, in general, only low-risk, nonviolent offenders are
assigned to the electronic monitoring programs (Jolin & Stipak, 1992; Loconte, 1998). A study conducted by Padgett, Bales, and Blomberg (2006), found electronic and GPS monitoring significantly reduced the likelihood of revocation for a new offense and absconding from supervision. This is true for violent, property, and drug offender groups. Electronic monitoring offers a solution for judges who believe that some offenders should not be incarcerated with other more serious offenders (Petersilia, 1986). With electronic monitoring, judges can adhere to this belief by sentencing less serious offenders to a sanction that is appropriate to their offences (Payne, 2000).

Public perception is mainly concerned with safety. There is a large degree of safety with community supervision, the public has to understand and be educated to the aspects of the system along with both the positive and negatives of monitoring. The majority of the research shows that monitoring is complicated because it is an aid to supervision and needs other aspects combined with monitoring to be successful.
SECTION III: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

B. F. Skinner (1969) emphasized that social behavior is shaped and maintained by the specific nature and timing of consequences. Akers (1994), and Bandura (1977) and others subsequently incorporated Skinners behavioral approach along with Sutherlands differential association theory, into a well-known social learning theory of crime. The swiftness of the supervising officer’s actions on violations will help offenders realize there are consequences to their behavior and the goal of the program is to help community supervision Agents catch the offenders immediately after the violations occur. This swift punishment is designed to curb recidivism and teach offenders how to properly live in the community.

Electronic monitoring also allows the offenders to socialize with their family, contribute to society by finding a job, and stay out of the prison or jail life. Francis Cullen (1994) integrates theories implying a common theme to crime. Social support, as Cullen points out, is the common theme or factor in many of the theories related to crime control. Cullen mentions 13 propositions regarding social support and the direct effect social support has on crime.

Summed up, Cullen’s 13 propositions indicate the following: the less support a society has the higher the crime rate will be, the more support a family provides the less likely a person will engage in crime, crime is less likely when there is more social support for conformity than that of crime, and lastly, with more social support there is more social control. All these variables show that with increased levels of positive support there will be less crime because there will be pressure to conform to society creating more control over crime.
This summation of theories leads to show support, either from society or family, will lessen crime. Current research also shows that with support from the more deviant side, there will be increases in crime because of the pressures to conform to the criminal lifestyle as opposed to conforming to society.

All of these social support points the offenders receive when they are placed out in the community on electronic monitoring. The offenders would not receive those support systems sitting in jail or prison. The community supervision Agents are also a tool the offenders have for a support system, helping to find jobs, manage money, and find treatment for their addictions or behavioral problems.
The following was all found from the Wisconsin Department of Corrections Electronic Monitoring history files. The Wisconsin Department of Corrections Electronic Monitoring Program has come a long way from its inception in 1987. It first started out as a Community Residential Confinement Program in Milwaukee with a grant from The National Justice Foundation. The Program then graduated to the Division of Intensive Sanctions where the Program developed into a Center being funded by the State Department of Corrections: Division of Community Corrections. The following will evaluate how the program assists Probation and Parole Agents in reducing recidivism and easing the increasing caseload burden.

In 1980, the former Division of Corrections (at that time part of the Department of Health and Social Services) implemented a high-risk supervision program. This program monitored offenders who had been paroled at their mandatory release date but who continued to pose a high risk to the community. Under this program, the caseloads were limited to two probation and parole agents for every forty offenders.

In 1989, the Department implemented he Community Structured Supervision Program (CSSP), another intensive supervision program. The objective of CSSP was to provide intensive community supervision to offenders who otherwise would continue to be incarcerated in state prisons until their mandatory release date. In this instance, the caseloads were set at one agent per twenty-four offenders. In 1990, the Department of Corrections implemented the Community Residential Confinement (CRC) Program, its mission being to administratively transfer inmates to the community by electronically
monitoring and supervising them through the use of an ankle bracelet. These "inmates" continued to be subject to rules of institutional conduct and could be administratively returned to prison for violations without the necessity of resorting to the revocation process.

Intensive Sanctions was specifically designed as a prison alternative for certain offenders who could be effectively monitored in the community while still satisfying the need for public safety. In considering the success of the Intensive Sanctions program, it is important to understand its evolution.

The Intensive Sanctions program gave the Department statutory authority to execute an alternative to prison for certain offenders. The Department then faced the task of implementing a program statewide so that by June 30, 1995, the program would contain 2200 offenders. The goal of statewide implementation required the creation of two separate committees to develop a successful game plan. The first committee consisted entirely of Department of Corrections personnel. The committee was in charge of designing all parts of the Program, including administrative tasks such as obtaining office space, vehicles, supplies, services, and personnel. Moreover, the internal committee designed the functional framework for the program. Ultimately, the program would consist of four distinct phases for each offender to progress through and four separate entry points by which offenders could begin the program.

**Discussion of Program**

The Electronic Monitoring Program started out as the Intensive Sanctions Program, which consisted of different phases. Phase I was confinement and Phase II was intensive community supervision.
During Phase I, every inmate in the Intensive Sanctions program served an initial period of confinement. There were four entry points to intensive sanctions: (1) an administrative transfer from a prison to the program by the Department of Corrections, (2) a parole to the program by the Parole Commission, (3) an alternative to probation/parole revocation, or (4) a court sentence to the program. The amount of time that offenders will serve in confinement at the start of their terms in intensive sanctions depends on where they enter the program.

Currently the electronic monitoring program is under the Division of Community Corrections where all offenders have served their jail or prison time and are currently out in the community on probation or parole. The electronic monitoring program is used to monitor high-risk offenders as to when it was the Intensive Sanctions Program the lower risk offenders were monitored. The electronic monitoring program aids Probation and Parole agents in monitoring high-risk offenders out in the community. There are no current offenders on electronic monitoring who have jail time left to serve, they all are on probation or have been paroled. Electronic monitoring is used as an alternative to incarceration and a sanction for those offenders who are out in the community and still commit crimes or violate their conditions of probation or parole.

Wisconsin Department of Corrections also uses its electronic monitoring program to track high risk sex offenders out in the community. Offenders who statutorily meet the requirements are placed on GPS monitoring for life. The Probation and Parole Agents set a schedule for the offenders to be away from their residence as well as track them throughout the community on their way to work, school, treatment, etc. Even after their
maximum discharge date registrants are required to wear the monitoring bracelet and comply with the Sex Offender Registry Program.

Most offenders are placed on electronic monitoring for a minimum of 90 days. In most cases offenders first released from prison are placed on monitoring to apply some structure to the offender. In addition, electronic monitoring is used as an alternative to revocation. If offenders are not following their conditions of probation or parole the Probation and Parole Agent might request electronic monitoring or a period to time, usually 90 days. The conditions are at the Agents discretion as well as the Unit Supervisors. Agents then control the times the offenders is to be away from their residence.

The electronic monitoring program is staffed 24/7 to alert Probation and Parole Agents when offenders are not following their schedules or other issues arise. In addition, to electronic monitoring the Program is the Probation and Parole after hours Law Enforcement contact line. Here staff receive phone calls from Law Enforcement when someone on Probation or Parole have police contact. The staff at the monitoring center review the case plans for the offender in question and make decisions if the offender would be held in jail until their Probation and Parole Agent is able to investigate the violation. Most cases, the phone calls consist of offender receiving new changes not just violations of supervision.

**Other Programs**

Other electronic monitoring programs have been evaluated but none on the scale of how the electronic monitoring program assists Probation and Parole Agents in caseload size and management.
The rehabilitative model of indeterminate sentencing, discretionary parole release, and offender treatment was all but eliminated in the 1970s (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). The new model was determinate, punitive, and offense-focused. This increased the numbers of offenders who were locked up for longer terms causing the jail and prison populations to increase (Langan, 2005). Probation also saw significant increases in their caseloads (Livsey, 2006), and the driving philosophy of community supervision shifted away from rehabilitation to surveillance and enforcement.

This shift from rehabilitation to enforcement caused budget and space issues within the jail and prison systems. A solution to the overcrowding came through community supervision and probation and parole. According to Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, and Rooney (2000), early electronic monitoring programs came with the promise of a cost effective alternative to incarceration. The original intention of electronic monitoring was to enforce house arrest and later it became a community-based alternative to incarceration. This is true for the Wisconsin Department of Corrections where the program started as a prison program now graduated to Community Corrections or Probation and Parole supervision tool.

At first the electronic monitoring programs had trouble gaining popularity because it has been said that electronic monitoring threatens Probation and Parole Agents jobs as well as not keeping the community as safe as incarceration (Burrell & Gable, 2008). Burrell and Gable (2008) also mention that probation, with electronic monitoring as a condition, also provides an intermediate sanction between prison and traditional community supervision. The degree of inconvenience, discomfort, and restriction that electronic monitoring can enforce is one way to emphasize to the offender the seriousness of the
crime. Electronic monitoring is a tool for the Probation and Parole Agents to use it will not be a replacement and Bonta et al. (2000) found that electronic monitoring combined with treatment significantly reduced recidivism among moderately high-risk offenders.

Many electronic monitoring programs only monitor low risk offenders such as “driving while impaired” (Bonta et al. 2000). Many of the programs screen out offenders with a violent history which raises questions of about the programs effectiveness as a Community Corrections Program. Programs that accept the higher risk offenders are the exception rather than the rule. The Wisconsin Department of Corrections is that exception. All offenders are supposed to be out in the community on probation or parole but it is the highest risk offenders who wear the monitoring equipment.

As mentioned above the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, among other states place high risk sex offenders on GPS monitoring. With the advances in technology and equipment, for example GPS monitoring where offenders are about to be located 24/7 even out in the community. Florida Department of Corrections also permits the use of electronic monitoring for habitual violent offenders upon release from prison along with selected sex offenders (GAO Report 05-19, 2005).

Along with Wisconsin Department of Corrections electronic monitoring program the Florida Department of Corrections recommends using the technology to target those offenders who are that greatest risk to the public (Florida Department of Corrections, 2003). There is a shift in electronic monitoring for using the program as a tool to aide Probation and Parole Agents in supervising and monitoring dangerous offenders out in the community without sacrificing safety to the community. Florida Department of Corrections released a study in 2003 showing that community control offenders supervised with
electronic monitoring had fewer revocations than community control offenders who were not electronically monitored (Florida Department of Corrections, 2003). This shows that electronic monitoring offenders out in the community works on high risk offenders as well as low risk offenders.

There are some shortcomings to monitoring high risk offenders on Probation and Parole in the community. As DeMichelle, Payne, & Button (2007) point out in their study, given the high priority that sex offenders under GPS community supervision are supposed to receive, Probation and Parole Agents are likely to assign them to small caseloads with increased levels of supervision. This will compound the caseload growth by giving each sex offender's case added weight in calculating staffing needs.

In addition to more staffing needs of Probation and Parole Agents, the integrity of the entire program requires that violations receive a timely and appropriate response. If offenders can violate the terms of their supervision and no one takes note, those terms and the supervision lose credibility. Failure to respond in a timely manner also exposes the agency and staff to the possibility of a liability claim (Burrel & Gable, 2008).

Overall, according to the literature, electronic monitoring programs help community corrections officials supervise offenders out in the community.
SECTION V: RECOMMENDATIONS

Location monitoring is very complicated having many different uses and goals. Each supervision officer or judge using location monitoring as a sanction will have a different reason for every different offender. To have location monitoring be the most effective the right program, in conjunction with the right goals of the program, have to be applied to the correct offender. This is a hard task in itself considering every person has different needs. If the needs are met properly there is less of a chance for recidivism which keeps the community safe, and helps the offender reintegrate back into the community. All this meets the goals of community corrections departments proving that location monitoring as a sanction is a good tool.

Location monitoring is versatile and can fit the mold of each offender but it has to be applied correctly to be used successfully reducing recidivism, being punitive, cutting costs and keeping the public safe. The most effective way of educating the public about the sanction should be looked into for effective awareness and support of the sanction. Gainey (2003) shows support for formal education affecting attitudes toward the criminal justice system in general. The study also points to increased willingness from the public to implement alternative sanctions when educated about the sanctions goals.

In the future, more studies should be conducted looking at which offenders could fall into certain categories placing them into the sanction with specific goals helping the offender get the most out of the supervision tool. Having the offender maintain work, monitor their whereabouts, curfew etc. will all hold the offender accountable for their crimes. The main thing to keep in mind is the location monitoring is only an aid to community supervision not a replacement.
SECTION VI: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Electronic Monitoring has come a long way in the past 30 years and the future looks promising in many ways. With continued research, true best practices will emerge to guide the field regarding how to match the right offender with the right tool and supporting clinical services for the duration of their supervision that will produce optimal results. The technology will continually improve along with the scope of the research with evidence based practices.

The proper application of remote technologies in supervision is a cost effective way for officers to do a better job with the same or even fewer resources. Remote supervision technologies offer a reliable tool for officers to monitor compliance with location restrictions, such as those by which home confinement program participants must abide, or offenders who are given other travel or location restrictions as special conditions of court ordered supervision. The great part of this concept is that a particular remote technological application can be tailored on a case by case basis. Remote access to monitoring data eliminates many of the manual tasks officers previously performed with location monitoring systems. Remote technologies are a critical component of community supervision in this century.

The prior research on location monitoring outcomes indicates mixed evidence for its effectiveness in reducing the likelihood of recidivism for offenders on community supervision and weak evidence for its effect on widening the net or penal control. In addition, the data and methodological limitations of the prior studies demonstrate the clear need for more rigorous empirical research, including richer data and on a larger and more representative sample and an analytical technique that takes into account the complex
nature of the experience of convicted offenders on home confinement and location monitoring.
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