

Florida State Probation and County Sheriff's Offices: Partners in Public Safety

Ken LaPee

Abstract

This project looks at the relationship between State Probation and County Sheriff's offices in an effort to identify what is working and what needs to be done to increase effectiveness. A brief overview of existing strategies is provided, followed by the survey results of those in the trenches of the Sheriff's Offices and State Probation offices across the state. The insights of those who actually do the work are indicative of what must be done to enhance public safety by offender accountability.

Introduction

In a time where Public Safety agencies' budgets and assets are stretched thin, crime rates, prison population and probation admissions are on the rise. It is imperative to find ways to provide an acceptable level of community safety with assets available. A close partnership between Florida Sheriff's Offices and the regional Probation Offices could make better use of existing resources while increasing public safety.

State probation officers are charged with monitoring violators who are under a court ordered term of community supervision. The order includes a specific time period and specific conditions. In addition, probation officers monitor persons who have been released from prison on parole or conditional release. In either situation, they are looking after persons who have already demonstrated a disregard for the law on at least one occasion. It is in the best interest of community safety, that these persons be effectively monitored.

Florida Sheriff's Offices are charged with the safety of their counties in general. A significant portion of that safety involves prevention and detection of criminal activity. Given the fact that those under the supervision of the Probation offices have already exhibited the propensity for violating the law, they should be of great interest to those Sheriff's offices. It is then immediately apparent that both agencies have a vested interest and shared responsibility regarding the monitoring of probationers.

Literature Review

In the year 2006-2007, there were more than 153,000 offenders in Florida communities under the supervision of the Florida Department of Corrections (DOC), Correctional Probation Officers. There were about 2,376 probation officers during the

same time frame, which averaged out to about 65 offenders per officer. (FL Dept of Corrections, 2007)

A defendant ordered into community supervision will be subjected to a number of standard conditions (see Appendix A) along with any special conditions deemed necessary by the court. Adherence to those conditions is the responsibility of the defendant, ensuring compliance falls to the probation officer. Probation officers use a variety of means to check compliance to include required reporting, where an offender is required to check in with the officer on a scheduled basis. In addition, the probation officer is authorized to make unannounced spot checks at a defendant's home, place of business or most anywhere the defendant may be. (Balingrud, 2006)

The success of these methods of ensuring compliance seems to be dependent on several factors, one of which is the number of cases each officer is responsible to manage. (Dickey & Smith, 1998) Logically, a higher caseload translates to less time devoted to each individual case. Another factor affecting compliance monitoring is the prevailing philosophy within the community and the probation offices. A recent philosophy has been dubbed Zero Tolerance and seems to have been fueled by public outcry regarding some particularly notable crimes committed by probationers. (Balingrud, 2006)

A zero tolerance philosophy of enforcement impinges upon an officer's ability to use full discretion and therefore increases the number of violations which must be processed and charged. This increases an officer's workload even more and could negatively impact the amount of available time to monitor the compliance of their probationers (Dickey & Smith, 1998)

There exists a debate within the field of community corrections as to the source of the changes in monitoring philosophy. One view has already been expressed that it is community driven. Another view is that the change is budget driven. This view holds that as resources become less available, the philosophy changes to address the case load burden. One of the means of relieving the burden is to change the standards of compliance monitoring to more permissive ones, allowing more discretion to focus on cases deemed to pose a higher risk. (Dickey & Smith, 1998)

There is a logical correlation between budget and the ability to effectively monitor probationers. New admissions to probation roles have increased every year since 2000 with one very minor exception in 2004, when they declined slightly. (FL Dept. of Corrections, 2007) Budget and manpower needs do not keep pace with increases in population. Even when adjustments are made, they are done by budget cycles and forecast, which do not match the work levels in real time. (Dickey & Smith, 1998)

All of these factors come together to illustrate that the effectiveness of monitoring probation compliance varies depending on circumstances and assets. Does the level of public safety vary as well? It would seem logically so.

Public safety is the primary function of law enforcement officers. It stands to reason that the effectiveness of probationer compliance would be of great concern to them. There have been a number of initiatives, nationwide, involving varying degrees of cooperation between probation officers and law enforcement officers. These initiatives illustrate some of the potential that partnership affords.

Much of the partnership effort has revolved around juvenile probation programs. Law Officers have conducted field checks of probationers and taken various compliance

actions. Those actions have included arrest of violators, reporting of violation to probation officers and courts. (Responding, 2005) There have been numerous partnerships established between these disciplines over the years. These partnerships however, are relatively short lived because they are based upon existing personal relationships between individuals and are often formed for a specific incident or instance. (Kim, Gerber, & Beto, 2007)

One of the notable standard conditions of probation is the order to allow the Probation officer to visit the defendant's home, workplace, or elsewhere. With a standard month consisting of about 20 work days; it is evident that conducting these field checks would leave little time for much else. An electable special condition of probation is the requirement to submit to a warrantless search at any time by a probation officer or any law enforcement officer. If a patrol officer is aware of this condition he or she must only satisfy a reasonable suspicion requirement to conduct said search. (Colbridge, 2003) It is obvious that the law enforcement agencies must be aware of this special condition to use this tool.

Several police probation partnership efforts in recent years have focused on law enforcement officers communicating intelligence information to probation officers. Probation officers could then act on the intelligence and conduct checks of their probationer's homes, cars, etc. This particular practice came under a great deal of scrutiny and criticism. Critics have claimed that this practice was simply law enforcement officers using probation officers as a "stalking horse" in order to further goals and circumvent the 4th amendment. (Murphy & Worrall, 2007) It seems as if this accusation may now be avoided by the Supreme Court's decisions, *U.S. vs Knights*, and *Griffin vs. Wisconsin*. These decisions are the basis for the reasonable suspicion based search conducted by law enforcement officers. (Zigmund, n.d.)

Another standard condition of probation is the prohibition on using intoxicants to excess. (see Appendix A) It is unlikely that probationers reporting for scheduled meetings would come after having used intoxicants to excess. It is much more likely that a patrol law enforcement officer will discover a probationer in violation of that particular caveat. Will the patrol officer know of the condition and what action will be taken?

A recent study conducted on the Georgia state probation system revealed several interesting factors which likely have nationwide similarities. Of reoffending probationers surveyed, 40 % cited hanging out with the wrong people as the primary reason for re-offending. 37% advised they reoffended due to alcohol and drug use. (Braucht & Bailey-Smith, 2006) Who is more likely to find the probationer in either of the circumstances listed, the probation officer or the patrol officer?

In 1996, Boston Police partnered their anti gang squads with juvenile probation officers in a pilot program aimed at increasing the community's safety by enhancing the effectiveness of both agencies. A study a year later revealed that juvenile probation compliance had increased by about 33% and there had been a noticeable impact on juvenile related crime. Researchers identified intensive communication and a unified mission as key factors in its success. Additionally, both entities communicated with the judiciary to craft applicable and enforceable conditions of probation as tools for the partners. This effort has served as an example to agencies nationwide. (Jordan, 1998)

These are but a few examples of the need and potential benefits of increased collaboration between law enforcement and probation officers. There are 20 regional or circuit Probation offices and about 150 local offices throughout the state. There are offices in each of Florida's 67 counties. (FL Dept. of Corrections, 2007) Each county has a Sheriff's office or metropolitan police force as well. Each local office and correlating Sheriff's office have a vested interest in monitoring the supervised offenders.

Method

The purpose of this research is to examine current practices and determine commonalities in the mission, services and functions that exist between State Probation and Florida Sheriff's offices. The research illustrates possibilities for cooperative efforts that will allow the respective agencies to achieve greater success in their shared responsibility for public safety.

A survey was constructed through Survey Monkey and sent to each of the sixty seven Sheriff's offices in Florida. Another similar survey was sent to 154 local State Probation offices serving those same counties. The surveys were designed to be completed by those who work in a line capacity, dealing with supervised offenders, in each discipline. In addition, interviews were conducted with judicial advisors to consider whether various strategies were in keeping with Florida Statutes. These interviews were also used to identify and interpret applicable case law.

The Sheriff's office surveys were used to determine a line officer's experience, information access level and reporting frequency as applied to felony probationer contacts. In addition, officers were to indicate the general trends within each agency relating to managing those under State probation within the community. The survey demonstrated the level of communication and cooperation between the Sheriff's office personnel and state probation officers. The goal was for two deputies from each agency to respond.

The probation officer survey was designed to gauge the communication and information sharing from line law enforcement and identify areas of shared responsibility. This survey was also used to determine the current level of communication between agencies and identify strengths and weaknesses of existing systems. Additional information was gathered from the surveys regarding best practices and identifying future goals and potential processes for enhanced performance. The goal was for one probation officer from each local office to respond.

The surveys included a confidentiality notice to ensure greater accuracy by reducing fear of reprisal. The survey took about 15 minutes to complete. A copy of each survey is included as Appendix B & C.

Table 1- Survey Distribution and Response

Organization	Sample Size	Completed	Return Rate
Florida Sheriff's Offices	67 Counties x 2 Deputies =134	57	42%
Florida Local State Probation Offices	1 per office =154	116	75%

Results

There are 67 County Sheriff's offices and 154 local State Probation offices in Florida. Each office was provided the applicable survey with instructions on the preferred respondent type and number. The surveys were sent through the respective administrative offices for dissemination to the target respondents. The response rate for Sheriff's offices was 42%, while the state probation officers showed a 75% response rate.

The two surveys were very similar but crafted to obtain the perspective of each discipline on the same issues. The surveys differed in the respect that probation officers were asked to provide specific probation related information to illustrate the task that they are faced with. The responses illustrated some very specific characteristics for individual officers. These characteristics include; rank/title, case load and experience. In addition, time available for specific job functions was reported. All of these attributes appear to be related.

The job titles reported appear to be directly related to experience, tenure and type of case load. The titles provided are as follows; Correctional Probation Officer (CPO), Correctional Probation Senior Officer (CPSO), and Correctional Probation Specialist (CPSP). The survey did not ask for specific types of probation cases assigned to each rank of officer, but several respondents included information that illustrates a difference. The CPO appears to be assigned general probation cases deemed to be a lower risk. The CPSO appears to handle cases requiring more intense monitoring like Community Control cases. The CPSP seems to be tasked with the higher risk offenders like Sex Offender cases. Table 2 below illustrates the relationship between the ranks, experience and average case load.

Table 2- Experience & Caseload

Rank	Avg Experience	Avg Case Load
CPO	6.1 years	86
CPSO	12.6 years	47
CPSP	17.1 years	41
Overall	11.2	59

The probation survey also included questions regarding the amount of time officers are able to spend on specific aspects of supervising probationers. Probationers are required to report to their officer periodically and the officers are authorized to conduct field spot checks. Both of these aspects are important for offender accountability. Probation officers were asked to estimate the percentage of their work time they could dedicate to personal contact with their probationers. This contact usually occurs in the office setting during probationer reporting. In addition, they were asked to estimate the percentage of work time they were able to dedicate to field spot checks of offender's homes and work places.

The majority of officers (68%) spend 50 % or less of their work time conducting personal contacts with their offenders. In addition, most (60%) are able to dedicate 30% or less work time on field spot checks. Assuming an 8 hour work day, the average officer spends 80 hours or less per month on personal contact. 48 hours or less per month would be used for field and spot checks of their charges, in their home environment. Using the overall average case load from table 2, we see that, on average, a probation officer could dedicate 1 hour per client, or less, per month for personal contact with an additional 48 minutes for field checks. These calculations are based upon the overall average case load. Applying the same calculation to the average CPO carrying a case load of 86 persons there is indication that regular personal contact with clients is not feasible.

Another survey question used to identify a need for action was asked to both groups of respondents. The respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of felony probationers who would violate at least once during their term. Half of probation officer respondents estimated that more than 50% of probationers will violate during their term of probation. 88% of deputy sheriffs polled estimated that more than 50% of probationers will violate.

Deputy Sheriff's were asked how often they encountered felony probationers during the course of their duties. 40% advised they came into contact with probationers every work day. 44% reported weekly encounters. Together, 84% report at least weekly contact. By comparison, probation officers were asked how often they are notified by law enforcement of incidental contact with their probationers. 46% of probation officers reported that they are never or rarely advised by law enforcement of field contact with probationers. 45% indicated 1-4 such reports per month. Together, 91% report 4 or less reports from law enforcement a month.

Both respondent groups were provided a list of three potential goals of probation and asked to rank them by importance. The results showed agreement on the goals in order of importance as listed in table 3 below. Table 3 reflects the ranked choices of each group. The majority of both groups agreed, albeit with less conviction among the law enforcement group.

Table 3- Goals

	Public Safety through Accountability	Rehabilitation	Collection of Fines/Restitution
Probation Officers	88%	67%	56%
Deputy Sheriffs	83%	40%	35%

Another goal of the survey was to determine the level of cooperation that already exists between the agencies. The law enforcement officers were asked how responsive their local state probation officers are to requests for information or assistance. 40% of the respondents answered very responsive. An additional 44% answered somewhat responsive. A total of 84% found them at least somewhat responsive. The probation officers were asked the same question regarding their local law enforcement agencies

being responsive to their requests. 53% of the probation officers found local law enforcement to be very responsive. 46% answered somewhat responsive.

In an attempt to gauge the level of field cooperation, a question focused on how likely local law enforcement officers were to assist probation officers with spot or field checks of their probationers. 64% of the deputy sheriffs advised their agencies would be very likely to assist probation officers with the checks. Probation officers seemed to agree with 51% finding local law enforcement very likely to assist and an additional 40% answering somewhat likely. Both groups were asked how often they had worked together on specific problematic probationers. The majority of both groups answered "occasionally." 50% of probation officers selected occasionally and an additional 36% said "quite often." 42% of the deputies answered "occasionally" and an additional 19% said "quite often."

Given that the group of deputy sheriffs were very likely to come into field contact with probationers violating the terms of their probation, each group was asked how likely the law enforcement officers were to make a probable cause arrest for the violation. 54% of the deputies advised they were "very likely" to make the arrest. 27% of the probation officers agreed. The majority of the probation officers, 46%, felt that the deputies were "somewhat likely" to make the arrest. Arguably the most noteworthy aspect of this question is that 31% of the deputies stated that they were "not likely" to make the arrest. 28% of the probation officers agreed that the arrest was "not likely."

Several questions were asked of the groups regarding intelligence and information sharing. Both groups were asked if law enforcement officers were likely to have 24 hour access to the specific terms and conditions of probation for individual probationers. The majority of both groups answered that they would not have that access. Of note, is the fact that 25% of the deputies that responded selected "I don't know."

Probation officers were asked if they had on demand computer access to local law enforcement agencies' data records. Specifically, records of arrests, offense reports and field interviews. The overwhelming majority, 61%, advised they did not have such access.

Given that communication is imperative for the success of the mission for both groups, the respondent groups were asked for their preference of communication methods when corresponding with the other. The answers were an exact match in the order of preference between the options provided. The communication methods, in order of both groups preference, are listed below.

- Most Preferred In Person
- 2nd By Telephone
- 3rd Interoffice Email
- 4th Through Communications (dispatch)
- Least Preferred NCIC/FCIC Teletype

As a follow-up to that question, the deputies were asked what resources they were most likely to use to obtain information regarding probationers. Five common sources of probation information were included; NCIC/FCIC, Contact the Probation Officer, Interview of the Probationer, Department of Corrections website, and Clerk of Court records.

Ironically, the option selected as the most likely was NCIC/FCIC, the least preferred of the communication options. The second most likely to use was personal contact with the probation officer. The last three options had no clearly distinguishing order of preference. Why are law enforcement officers most likely to use the option they least prefer, to obtain the information?

Both groups were asked several questions regarding existing and potential collaboration opportunities, benefits and disadvantages. The answers were free form and respondents were allowed the opportunity to skip each one.

Both groups were asked to identify existing responsibilities and duties that are shared and/or duplicated between them. 79% of the deputies and 83% of the probation officers elected to dedicate the time to answer the question. Due to the narrative nature of the answers, they are summarized and grouped into categories for both respondent groups. The summary of answers, by discipline, is provided in table 4 below.

Table 4-Shared Responsibilities

Probation Officer	Sheriff's Deputies
Sex Offender Tracking	Sex Offender Tracking
VOP Arrests	Warrant Service (VOP)
Report Violations	Curfew Checks
Criminal Registration/Intake	Warrantless Searches
Photographing	Violator Transport
DNA Collection	Spot Checks
Fingerprinting	Intelligence Sharing
Residence/Curfew Checks	
Court Appearance	
Information Sharing	
13% answered "none"	20% answered "none or unknown"

The next narrative question asked focused on resources held or needed by either group. Both groups were asked to identify existing resources which could be shared to enhance effectiveness. 83% of probation officer respondents and 75% of the deputies opted to answer the question. Again the responses were summarized and grouped by discipline in table 5 below. The deputies, by overwhelming majority cited access to the specific conditions of probation as the resource most needed. Probation officers had a more diverse list but the most common resource was immediate access to law enforcement records through computer networks.

Table 5-Existing Resources to be Shared

Probation Officer	Sheriff's Deputies
Computer Records Access	Probation Conditions
Field Intelligence	Computer Records Access
Report Violations	Tracking Devices
Grant initiatives	Intelligence
Firearms Training	Communications Center
Defensive Tactics Training	Spot Checks
Transportation	Intelligence Sharing
Community Policing Initiative	
Regional Approach	
Referral Programs (offender)	
Compatible Communication	
Canine assets	
6% answered "none or unknown"	5% answered "none or unknown"

Both groups were asked to list potential advantages of sharing facilities with one another. The definition and specifics of “sharing facilities” was left intentionally vague. 91% of the probation officers and 79% of the deputies provided an answer. The summarized answers are listed in table 6 by discipline and in the order of frequency.

Table 6-Advantages of Sharing Facilities

Probation Officer	Sheriff's Deputies
Enhanced Communication	Enhanced Communication
Increased Information Availability	Increased Information Availability
Data Base Accessibility	Data Networking
Better Rapport	Save Money
Officer & Public Safety	Investigative Capability
Ease of Transportation	Better Rapport
Save Money	More VOP arrests
2 answered "none "	1 answered "unknown"

As a logical follow up to the previous question, both groups were asked to list any disadvantages in sharing facilities. 74% of deputies and 83% of probation officers

answered the question. The summarized answers are listed in table 7 by discipline and in the order of frequency.

Table 7-Disadvantages of Sharing Facilities

Probation Officer	Sheriff's Deputies
Intimidating Offenders	Role Confusion
Role Confusion	Lack of Space
Cost Sharing Disputes	Cost Sharing Disputes
Lack of Space	Intimidating Offenders
Wrong Public Perception	Higher VOP Arrests
37% saw no Disadvantages	33% Saw no Disadvantages

The final narrative question presented was to determine what joint training and/or strategic planning the disciplines had engaged in with the other. 81% of the deputies and 87% of the probation officers elected to answer the question. The summarized answers are listed in table 8 by discipline and in the order of frequency.

Table 8-Current Inter-agency Joint Training and/or Strategic Planning

Probation Officer	Sheriff's Deputies
Planned Compliance Initiatives	Specific Incident Planning
Gang Initiatives	Gang Initiatives
Sex Offender Management	Warrant Sweeps
Warrant Sweeps	Child Abduction Reaction Team
Specific Incident Planning	
General Incentive Courses	
28% said None	70% Said None

Discussion

The results of the surveys illustrate, in stark relief, the necessity of collaboration between law enforcement and probation officers for effective supervision of offenders. In addition, the resounding tone of responses from both disciplines was that communication and information interchange was mandatory for that successful collaboration. The statistical data regarding the caseload assigned to individual probation officers and the time they are able to devote to each one illustrates they cannot effectively supervise them all.

The results of the survey indicate agreement between probation officers and deputies on most aspects. There is agreement on the conceptual goals of the probation program and preferences for communication methods.

There is a significant amount of research required to further explore the possibility of these entities sharing facilities and responsibilities. However, this research illustrates a number of issues that are immediately actionable. All of these issues revolve around a central theme; communication. Why do the majority of the deputies report that they have incidental contact with probationers on at least a weekly basis and the majority of probation officers report that they are rarely or never contacted by law enforcement? The problem could be illustrated with the comparison of the preferred methods of communication and the method most often used. NCIC/FCIC was the least preferred but most likely method. What is the reason the most preferred methods are not used?

Suggestions for immediate improvement include a mandate for law enforcement to notify probation officers of each incidental contact. In addition, a method for the notification must be established, to include a probation officer indication of reception.

Data sharing is a significant issue that should be addressed immediately. The survey data indicates that the majority of respondents from each discipline do not have timely access to the detailed records of the other. Given the extensive capabilities of the current technology in place in both arenas, it is incomprehensible that there is not widespread data sharing in place. The officers in the trenches, who are most likely to come into contact with probationers, do not have access to the specific terms of their probation. Conversely, if a probationer is arrested or merely mentioned in an offense, arrest or intelligence report, most probation officers have no way to proactively search law enforcement records for timely, actionable information. They are left to rely on law enforcement or corrections officers to notify them of such information.

The results of the narrative questions indicate recognition on the part of both disciplines that there are commonalities in mission, duties and responsibilities. In addition, there are commonalities in resources, equipment and training needed. There was an air of frustration with the lack of communication and information sharing in the answers from each side. There was also an air of hope and an expressed need for such collaboration.

Recommendations

There is a great deal of potential improvement to be gained if the issues illustrated in the research are studied further and plans implemented to address them. The areas that appear to have the most potential for a timely and noticeable improvement are listed below.

- **Communication:** This is by far the most prevalent need expressed by this research. It is imperative that communication improve drastically and immediately. Improvement could be made immediately by recognizing the need and establishing mandates and protocols for communication on an agency level. "Street level" relationships between the disciplines would develop and only serve to increase communication effectiveness. Problem identification is the responsibility of both disciplines and the results of the process must be shared for maximum community safety.

► **Data Sharing:** It is imperative that the disciplines share data freely. The local law enforcement officers should have 24 hour access to individual probationer information. The information should include all conditions, standard and special, and any other information useful for officer safety and/or enforcement considerations. On the other hand, local probation officers should have on demand connectivity to the local law enforcement agencies' data bases to access information on their cases as it becomes available.

► **Training:** There are a number of job functions that are common to both disciplines. Opportunities for joint training should be sought to reduce costs and foster local relationships.

► **Best Practice Identification:** An in-depth study should be conducted on existing partnership efforts. Successful partnerships should be analyzed and efforts made to implement such programs statewide.

► **Feasibility Studies:** A study should be conducted to determine if a facility sharing strategy could be employed statewide. Indications of this research are that officers from both disciplines are open to the idea and more importantly see more potential advantages than disadvantages. This process would likely increase effectiveness and reduce costs. This study should include ways to mitigate potential disadvantages.

Officers of both disciplines who responded to this survey have displayed a sense of pride in their respective functions. In addition, they have illustrated a need and desire for improvement. These professionals are on the front lines of the battle to provide public safety. They deserve to be allowed to work with all of the potential tools and methods that can be offered. It is the hope of the author that those tools are developed and provided in a timely manner.

Lieutenant Ken LaPee began his law enforcement career in 1988 as a Military Police Officer in the United States Army. In 1994 he began his civilian law enforcement career with the Okaloosa County Sheriff's Office. He has served in a variety of positions within the agency to include patrol, field training, community policing and criminal investigations. He is currently the lieutenant assigned to the Narcotics Division. Ken is a certified instructor in several law enforcement specialties and instructs at the Northwest Florida State College, Public Safety Branch. Ken holds an Associate of Arts Degree in Criminal Justice Technology from the Okaloosa Walton Community College.

References

Ballingrud, D. (2006, January 15). Judgement calls. *St Petersburg Times*, Retrieved August 21, 2008 from http://www.sptimes.com/2006/01/15/Perspective/Judgement_calls.shtml

- Ballingrud, D. (2006, January 15). On the job with probation officers Rebecca Wolf and Joe Sabella. *St Petersburg Times*, Retrieved August 21, 2008 from http://www.sptimes.com/2006/01/15/Perspective/On_the_job_with_proba.shtml
- Braucht, G. & Bailey-Smith, K. (2006, June). Reentry Surveys: A reality check. *Corrections Today*, 68(3), 88-89. Retrieved November 4, 2008, from Criminal Justice Periodicals database. (Document ID: 1071770671).
- Colbridge, T. (2003, July). Probationers, parolees, and the Fourth Amendment. *FBI Law enforcement Bulletin*, 72(7), 22. Retrieved November 4, 2008, from Criminal Justice Periodicals database. (Document ID: 373184271).
- Dickey, W.J. & Smith, M.E. (1998, December). Rethinking probation: Community supervision, community safety. Retrieved October 4, 2008, from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Web site: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/probation/rethink.pdf>
- Florida Department of Corrections, 2006-2007 Annual report. Retrieved November 19, 2008, from Florida Department of Corrections Web site: <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/pub/annual/0607/index.html>
- Jordan, J. (1998, August). Boston's Operation Night Light: New roles, new rules. *FBI Law enforcement Bulletin*, 67(8), 1-5. Retrieved November 20, 2008, from Criminal Justice Periodicals database. (Document ID: 33200353).
- Kim, B., Gerber, J., Beto, D.R. (2007, January 1). Collaboration between Law enforcement and Community Corrections Agencies. *TELEMASP Bulletin*, 14(1), 1-11. Retrieved November 20, 2008, from Criminal Justice Periodicals database. (Document ID: 1216031481).
- Murphy, D. & Worrall, J.L. (2007). The threat of mission distortion in police-probation partnerships. *Policing*, 30(1), 132-149. Retrieved November 4, 2008, from Criminal Justice Periodicals database. (Document ID: 1226786551).
- Responding Against Delinquency and Recidivism. (2005). Retrieved July 6, 2008, from West Palm Beach Police Department Web site: <http://www.wppolice.org/pppprogram.php>
- Zigmund, E. (n.d.) Warrantless probation and parole searches: A police investigative tool. Retrieved July 6, 2008, from International Association of Chiefs of Police Web site: http://www.polic chiefs.org/documents/index.cfm?document_id=202&document_type_id=6&fuseaction=document

Appendix A

Conditions of Probation Order

STATE OF FLORIDA
Plaintiff

IN THE FIRST JUDICIAL
CIRCUIT COURT, IN AND FOR
COUNTY

-VS-

CASE NUMBER _____

Defendant

DC NUMBER _____

ORDER OF PROBATION

This cause coming before the Court to be heard, and you, the defendant, being now present before the court, and you having

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> entered a plea of guilty to | <input type="checkbox"/> been found guilty by jury verdict of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> entered a plea of nolo contendere to | <input type="checkbox"/> been found guilty by the court trying the case without a jury of |

Count _____
Count _____
Count _____
Count _____

Count _____
Count _____
Count _____
Count _____

SECTION 1: JUDGMENT OF GUILT

- The court hereby adjudges you to be guilty of the above offense(s).

Now, therefore, it is ordered and adjudged that the imposition of sentence is hereby withheld and that you be placed on Probation for a period of _____ under the supervision of the Department of Corrections, subject to Florida law.

SECTION 2: ORDER WITHHOLDING ADJUDICATION

- Now, therefore, it is ordered and adjudged that the adjudication of guilt is hereby withheld and that you be placed on Probation for a period of _____ under the supervision of the Department of Corrections, subject to Florida law.

SECTION 3: INCARCERATION DURING PORTION OF SUPERVISION SENTENCE

It is hereby ordered and adjudged that you be:

- committed to the Department of Corrections
or
 confined in the County Jail
for a term of _____ with credit for _____ jail time. After you have served _____ of the term, you shall be placed on Probation for a period of _____ under the supervision of the Department of Corrections, subject to Florida law.
or
 confined in the County Jail
for a term of _____ with credit for _____ jail time, as a special condition of supervision.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that you shall comply with the following standard conditions of supervision as provided by Florida law:

- (1) You will report to the probation office as directed. Not later than the fifth day of each month, unless otherwise directed, you will make a full and truthful report to your officer on the form provided for that purpose.
- (2) You will pay the State of Florida the amount of \$ _____ per month, as well as 4% surcharge, toward the cost of your supervision in accordance with s. 948.09, F.S., unless otherwise exempted in compliance with Florida Statutes.
- (3) You will remain in a specified place. You will not change your residence or employment or leave the county of your residence without first procuring the consent of your officer.
- (4) You will not possess, carry or own any firearm or weapon, unless authorized by the court.
- (5) You will live without violating the law. A conviction in a court of law shall not be necessary for such a violation to constitute a violation of your probation/community control.
- (6) You will not associate with any person engaged in any criminal activity.
- (7) You will not use intoxicants to excess or possess any drugs or narcotics unless prescribed by a physician. Nor will you visit places where intoxicants, drugs or other dangerous substances are unlawfully sold, dispensed or used.
- (8) You will work diligently at a lawful occupation, advise your employer of your probation status, and support any dependents to the best of your ability, as directed by your officer.
- (9) You will promptly and truthfully answer all inquiries directed to you by the court or the officer, and allow your officer to visit in your home, at your employment site or elsewhere, and you will comply with all instructions your officer may give you.
- (10) You will pay restitution, court costs, and/or fees in accordance with special conditions imposed or in accordance with the attached orders.
- (11) You will submit to random testing as directed by your officer or the professional staff of the treatment center where he/she is receiving treatment to determine the presence of alcohol or illegal drugs.
- (12) You will submit two biological specimens, as directed by your officer, for DNA analysis as prescribed in ss. 943.325 and 948.014, F.S.
- (13) You will report in person within 72 hours of your release from incarceration to the probation office in Okaloosa County, Florida, unless otherwise instructed by the court or department. (This condition applies only if section 3 on the previous page is checked.) Otherwise, you must report immediately to the probation office located at 74 3rd Street, Shalimar, Florida 32579.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. You must undergo a Drug and Alcohol evaluation and, if treatment is deemed necessary, you must successfully complete the treatment, and be responsible for the payment of any costs incurred while receiving said evaluation and treatment, unless waived by the court.
Additional instructions ordered: _____
2. You will make restitution to the following victim(s), as directed by the court, until the obligation is paid in full:
NAME: _____
TOTAL AMOUNT: \$ _____
Additional instructions ordered, including specific monthly amount, begin date, due date, or joint & several: _____
- NAME: _____
TOTAL AMOUNT: \$ _____
Additional instructions ordered, including specific monthly amount, begin date, due date, or joint & several: _____

SPECIAL CONDITIONS – CONTINUED

- 3. You will be required to pay for drug testing unless exempt by the court.
- 4. You will enter the Department of Corrections Non-Secure Drug Treatment Program or other residential treatment program/Probation and Restitution Center for a period of successful completion as approved by your officer. You are to remain until you successfully complete said Program and Aftercare. You are to comply with all Rules and Regulations of the Program. You shall be confined in the county jail until placement in said program, and if you are confined in the jail, the Sheriff will transport you to said program.
- 5. You will abstain entirely from the use of alcohol and/or illegal drugs, and you will not associate with anyone who is illegally using drugs or consuming alcohol.
- 6. You will submit to urinalysis testing on a monthly basis to determine the presence of alcohol or illegal drugs. You will be required to pay for the tests unless exempt by the court.
- 7. You will not visit any establishment where the primary business is the sale and dispensing of alcoholic beverages.
- 8. You will successfully complete ___ hours of community service at a rate of ____, at a work site approved by your officer.
Additional instructions ordered: _____
- 9. You will remain at your residence between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. due to a curfew imposed, unless otherwise directed by the court.
- 10. You will submit to electronic monitoring, follow the rules of electronic monitoring, and pay \$_____ per month for the cost of the monitoring service, unless otherwise directed by the court.
- 11. You will not associate with _____ during the period of supervision.
- 12. You will have no contact (direct or indirect) with the victim or the victim's family during the period of supervision.
- 13. You will have no contact (direct or indirect) with _____ during the period of supervision.
- 14. You will maintain full time employment or attend school/vocational school full time or a combination of school/work during the term of your supervision.
- 15. You will make a good faith effort toward completing basic or functional literacy skills or a high school equivalency diploma.
- 16. You will successfully complete the Probation & Restitution Program, abiding by all rules and regulations.
- 17. You will attend Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous meetings at least monthly, unless otherwise directed by the court.
- 18. You must successfully complete Anger Management, and be responsible for the payment of any costs incurred while receiving said treatment, unless waived. If convicted of a Domestic Violence offense, as defined in s. 741.28, F.S., you must attend and successfully complete a batterer's intervention program, unless otherwise directed by the court.
Additional instructions ordered: _____
- 19. You will attend an HIV/AIDS Awareness Program consisting of a class of not less than two (2) hours or more than four (4) hours in length, the cost for which will be paid by you.
- 20. You shall submit your person, property, place of residence, vehicle or personal effects to a warrantless search at any time, by any probation or community control officer or any law enforcement officer.
- 21. If you have been found to have committed a crime on or after October 1, 2008 for the purpose of benefitting, promoting, or furthering the interests of a criminal gang, you are prohibited from knowingly associating with other criminal gang members or associates, except as authorized by law enforcement officials, prosecutorial authorities, or the court, for the purpose of aiding in the investigation of criminal activity.
- 22. Other: _____
- 23. Other: _____
- 24. Other: _____

AND, IF PLACED ON DRUG OFFENDER PROBATION, YOU WILL COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION OF SUPERVISION IN ADDITION TO THE STANDARD CONDITIONS LISTED ABOVE AND ANY OTHER SPECIAL CONDITIONS ORDERED BY THE COURT:

(14) You will participate in a specialized drug treatment program, either as an in-patient or out patient, as recommended by the treatment provider. You will attend all counseling sessions, submit to random urinalysis and, if an in-patient, you will comply with all operating rules, regulations and procedures of the treatment facility. You will pay for all costs associated with treatment and testing unless otherwise directed.
Additional instructions ordered: _____

(15) You will remain at your residence between _____ p.m. and _____ a.m. due to a curfew imposed, unless otherwise directed by the court.

AND, IF PLACED ON COMMUNITY CONTROL, YOU WILL COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS, IN ADDITION TO THE STANDARD CONDITIONS LISTED ABOVE AND ANY OTHER SPECIAL CONDITIONS ORDERED BY THE COURT:

(14) You will report to your officer as directed, at least one time a week, unless you have written consent otherwise.

(15) You will remain confined to your approved residence except for one half hour before and after your approved employment, public service work, or any other special activities approved by your officer.

(16) You will maintain an hourly accounting of all your activities on a daily log, which you will submit to your officer on request.

(17) You will successfully complete _____ hours of community service at a rate of _____, at a work site approved by your officer.
Additional instructions ordered: _____

(18) You will submit to electronic monitoring, follow the rules of electronic monitoring, and pay \$ _____ per month for the cost of the monitoring service, unless otherwise directed by the court.

AND, IF PLACED ON PROBATION OR COMMUNITY CONTROL FOR A SEX OFFENSE PROVIDED IN CHAPTER 794, s. 800.04, s. 827.071, or s. 847.0145, COMMITTED ON OR AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1995 YOU WILL COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING STANDARD SEX OFFENDER CONDITIONS, IN ADDITION TO THE STANDARD CONDITIONS LISTED ABOVE AND ANY OTHER SPECIAL CONDITIONS ORDERED BY THE COURT:

(14) A mandatory curfew from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. The court may designate another 8-hour period if the offender's employment precludes the above specified time, and the alternative is recommended by the Department of Corrections. If the court determines that imposing a curfew would endanger the victim, the court may consider alternative sanctions.

(15) If the victim was under the age of 18, a prohibition on living within 1,000 feet of a school, day care center, park, playground, or other place where children regularly congregate, as prescribed by the court. The 1,000-foot distance shall be measured in a straight line from the offender's place of residence to the nearest boundary line of the school, day care center, park, playground, or other place where children congregate. The distance may not be measured by a pedestrian route or automobile route.

(16) Active participation in and successful completion of a sex offender treatment program with qualified practitioners specifically trained to treat sex offenders, at the offender's own expense. If a qualified practitioner is not available within a 50-mile radius of the offender's residence, the offender shall participate in other appropriate therapy.

(17) A prohibition on any contact with the victim, directly or indirectly, including through a third person, unless approved by the victim, the offender's therapist, and the sentencing court.

(18) If the victim was under the age of 18, a prohibition on contact with a child under the age of 18 except as provided in this paragraph. The court may approve supervised contact with a child under the age of 18 if the approval is based upon a recommendation for contact issued by a qualified practitioner who is basing the recommendation on a risk assessment. Further, the sex offender must be currently enrolled in or have successfully completed a sex offender therapy program. The court may not grant supervised contact with a child if the contact is not recommended by a qualified practitioner and may deny supervised contact with a child at any time.

- (19) If the victim was under age 18, a prohibition on working for pay or as a volunteer at any place where children regularly congregate, including, but not limited to any school, day care center, park, playground, pet store, library, zoo, theme park, or mall.
- (20) Unless otherwise indicated in the treatment plan provided by the sexual offender treatment program, a prohibition on viewing, accessing, owning, or possessing any obscene, pornographic, or sexually stimulating visual or auditory material, including telephone, electronic media, computer programs, or computer services that are relevant to the offender's deviant behavior pattern.
- (21) A requirement that the offender submit two specimens of blood or other approved biological specimens to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement to be registered with the DNA data bank.
- (22) A requirement that the offender make restitution to the victim, as ordered by the court under s. 775.089, for all necessary medical and related professional services relating to physical, psychiatric, and psychological care.
- (23) Submission to a warrantless search by the community control or probation officer of the offender's person, residence, or vehicle.

EFFECTIVE FOR PROBATIONER OR COMMUNITY CONTROLLEE WHOSE CRIME WAS COMMITTED ON OR AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1997, AND WHO IS PLACED ON COMMUNITY CONTROL OR SEX OFFENDER PROBATION FOR A VIOLATION OF CHAPTER 794, s. 800.04, s. 827.071, or s. 847.0145, IN ADDITION TO ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THIS SECTION, YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION:

- (24) As part of a treatment program, participation at least annually in polygraph examinations to obtain information necessary for risk management and treatment and to reduce the sex offender's denial mechanisms. A polygraph examination must be conducted by a polygrapher trained specifically in the use of the polygraph for the monitoring of sex offenders, where available, and shall be paid by the sex offender.
- (25) Maintenance of a driving log and a prohibition against driving a motor vehicle alone without the prior approval of the supervising officer.
- (26) A prohibition against obtaining or using a post office box without the prior approval of the supervising officer.
- (27) If there was sexual contact, a submission to, at the offender's expense, an HIV test with the results to be released to the victim and/or the victim's parent or guardian.
- (28) Electronic monitoring when deemed necessary by the probation officer and supervisor, and ordered by the court at the recommendation of the Department of Corrections.
- (29) **Effective for an offender whose crime was committed on or after July 1, 2005, and who are placed on supervision for violation of chapter 794, s. 800.04, s. 827.071, or s. 847.0145,** a prohibition on accessing the Internet or other computer services until the offender's sex offender treatment program, after a risk assessment is completed, approves and implements a safety plan for the offender's accessing or using the Internet or other computer services.
- (30) **Effective for offenders whose crime was committed on or after September 1, 2005,** there is hereby imposed, in addition to any other provision in this section, mandatory electronic monitoring as a condition of supervision for those who:
 - Are placed on supervision for a violation of chapter 794, s. 800.04(4), (5), or (6), s. 827.071, or s. 847.0145 and the unlawful sexual activity involved a victim 15 years of age or younger and the offender is 18 years of age or older; or
 - Are designated as a sexual predator pursuant to s. 775.21; or
 - Has previously been convicted of a violation of chapter 794, s. 800.04(4), (5), or (6), s. 827.071, or s. 847.0145 and the unlawful sexual activity involved a victim 15 years of age or younger and the offender is 18 years of age or older.

You are hereby placed on notice that should you violate your probation or community control, and the conditions set forth in s. 948.063(1) or (2) are satisfied, whether your probation or community control is revoked or not revoked, you shall be placed on electronic monitoring in accordance with F.S. 948.063.

YOU ARE HEREBY PLACED ON NOTICE that the court may at any time rescind or modify any of the conditions of your probation, or may extend the period of probation as authorized by law, or may discharge you from further supervision. If you violate any of the conditions of your probation, you may be arrested and the court may revoke your probation, adjudicate you guilty if adjudication of guilt was withheld, and impose any sentence that it might have imposed before placing you on probation or require you to serve the balance of the sentence.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that when you have been instructed as to the conditions of probation, you shall be released from custody if you are in custody, and if you are at liberty on bond, the sureties thereon shall stand discharged from liability. (This paragraph applies only if section 1 or section 2 is checked.)

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the clerk of this court file this order in the clerk's office and provide certified copies of same to the officer for use in compliance with the requirements of law.

DONE AND ORDERED, on _____

NUNC PRO TUNC _____

, Circuit Judge

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this order and that the conditions have been explained to me and I agree to abide by them.

Date: _____

Defendant

Instructed by: _____
Supervising Officer

COURT ORDERED PAYMENTS

CHECK ALL THAT ARE ORDERED:

FINES

- \$ _____ Total of fines assessed in sentence, pursuant to s. 775.083 (1)(a) through (g) or Chapter 316, F.S.
- \$ _____ Statutorily mandated 5% surcharge/cost if fine assessed (on first line) pursuant to s. 938.04, F.S.
- \$ 20.00 Crime Stoppers Trust Fund pursuant to s. 938.06(1), F.S. Statutorily mandated if a fine is imposed

MANDATORY COSTS IN ALL CASES

- \$225.00 Additional court cost for felony offense, pursuant to s. 938.05(1)(a), F.S.
- \$ 60.00 Additional court cost for misdemeanor or criminal traffic offense, pursuant to s. 938.05(1)(b) or (c), F.S.
- \$ 50.00 Crimes Compensation Trust Fund pursuant to s. 938.03(1), F.S.
- \$ 50.00 County Crime Prevention Fund pursuant to s. 775.083(2), F.S.
- \$ 3.00 Additional Court Costs Clearing Trust Fund pursuant to s. 938.01(1), F.S.
- \$ 2.00 Per month for each month of supervision for Training Trust Fund Surcharge, pursuant to s. 948.09, F.S.

MANDATORY COSTS IN SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

- \$151.00 Rape Crisis Program Trust Fund, pursuant to s. 938.085, F.S. for any violations of ss. 784.011, 784.021, 784.03, 784.041, 784.045, 784.048, 784.07, 784.08, 784.081, 784.082, 784.083, 784.085, or 794.011, F.S.
- \$201.00 Domestic Violence Trust Fund, pursuant to s. 938.08, F.S. for any violations of ss. 784.011, 784.021, 784.03, 784.041, 784.045, 784.048, 784.07, 784.08, 784.081, 784.082, 784.083, 784.085, 794.011, or any offense of Domestic Violence described in s. 741.28, F.S.
- \$101.00 Certain Crimes Against Minors, pursuant to s. 938.10(1), F.S. for any violations of s. 784.085, chapter 787, chapter 794, s. 796.03, s. 800.04, chapter 827, s. 847.0145, or s. 985.701, F.S.
- \$135.00 DUI Court Costs, pursuant to s. 938.07, F.S. for any violations of ss. 316.193 or 327.35, F.S.
- \$ 3.00 State Agency Law Enforcement Radio System Trust Fund, pursuant to s. 318.18(17), F.S. for any violations of offenses listed in s. 318.17 including ss. 316.1935, 316.027, 316.061, 877.111, chapter 893, ss. 316.193, 316.192, 316.067, 316.072(3), 316.545(1), or any other offense in chapter 316 which is classified as a criminal violation.

MANDATORY COURT COSTS AUTHORIZED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES

- \$ 2.00 Criminal Justice Education by Municipalities and Counties, pursuant to s. 938.15, F.S.
- \$ _____ Additional court costs for local requirements and other county funded programs pursuant to s. 939.185(1)(a), F.S.
- \$ 3.00 Teen Court pursuant to s. 938.19(2), F.S.

DISCRETIONARY

- \$ 1.00 Per month during the term of supervision to the following nonprofit organization established for the sole purpose of supplementing the rehabilitative efforts of the Department of Corrections, pursuant to s. 948.039(2), F.S.: _____
- \$ 50.00 Public Defender Application Fee, if not previously collected or waived, pursuant to s. 27.52 and s. 938.29, F.S.
- \$ _____ Public Defender Fees and Costs, pursuant to s. 938.29, F.S. as determined locally.
- \$ _____ Prosecution/Investigative Costs, pursuant to s. 938.27, F.S.
- \$500.00 Okaloosa County Drug Court Fee, to be paid on a monthly basis at a minimum of \$50.00 per month.
- \$ _____ Cost of Transportation, to the Okaloosa County Sheriff's Office.

Other: _____

DISCRETIONARY COSTS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

- \$ _____ County Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Trust Fund, pursuant to s. 938.21 and s. 938.23, F.S. for violations of s. 316.193, s.856.011, s. 856.015, or chapter 562, chapter 567, or chapter 568, F.S.
- \$100.00 Operating Trust Fund of the FDLE, pursuant to s. 938.25, F.S. for violations of s. 893.13 offenses

PAYMENT IS TO BE MADE THROUGH AND PAYABLE TO: Department of Corrections or Clerk of Court

(If collected by the Department of Corrections, a surcharge of 4% will be added to all payments ordered by the court, pursuant to s. 945.31, F.S.)

- Court Costs/Fines Waived
- Court Costs/Fines in the amount of _____ converted to _____ community service hours
- Court Costs/Fines in the amount of _____ reduced to civil judgment.

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR PAYMENT: Financial Obligations shall be paid in the following order:

1. Restitution
2. Court Costs / Fines
3. Court Appointed Attorney's Fees
4. Cost of Supervision and any drug testing fees

Appendix B

Deputy Sheriff Survey

Deputy Sheriff

1. Introduction

1. What is your job title?
.....

2. What agency do you work for?
.....

3. How many years of Law Enforcement Experience do you have?
.....

4. If you are interested in the results of this research please provide your email address.
.....

Deputy Sheriff

2. Questions

Data collection

1. How often do you encounter felony probationers in the course of your duties?

- Weekly
- Monthly
- Each workday

2. Do you have 24 hour access to specific terms and conditions for individual probationers?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

3. How responsive are your local State Probation Officers to your requests for information or assistance?

- Very Responsive
- Somewhat Responsive
- Rarely Responsive
- Not at all responsive

4. How likely are you to notify probation officers when you have incidental contact with their probationers?

- Only specific incidents
- Not at all
- Most of the time
- Every time

5. If you encounter a probationer and have cause to believe they are violating conditions of probation, how likely are you to effect a probable cause arrest? (Not VOP warrant)

- Very Likely
- Somewhat likely
- Not Likely

Deputy Sheriff

6. The listed entities can be considered clients of the probation system. Please rank them in order of their importance.

	Highest Importance				Lowest Importance
The Community	<input type="radio"/>				
The Government	<input type="radio"/>				
The Probationer	<input type="radio"/>				
The Presiding Court	<input type="radio"/>				

7. Please rank the following goals of probation by importance.

	Most Important				Least important
Rehabilitation of offender	<input type="radio"/>				
Collection of fines/fees and restitution	<input type="radio"/>				
Public safety by offender accountability	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please explain below)	<input type="radio"/>				
Other goal of probation	<input type="text"/>				

8. How likely is your agency to assist Probation officers with field spot checks?

- Very Likely
- Somewhat Likely
- Not Likely
- I don't know

9. How often have you worked with Probation officers on specific problematic probationers?

- Quite often
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never

10. When communicating with local Probation officers, the following methods are available. Please rank them from most preferred to least.

	Most preferred					Least preferred
Telephone	<input type="radio"/>					
Email	<input type="radio"/>					
In person	<input type="radio"/>					
NCIC/FCIC Teletype	<input type="radio"/>					
Through Communications (dispatch)	<input type="radio"/>					

Deputy Sheriff

11. Of the following sources of probationer information, please rank them by which you are most likely to use?

	Most likely to use				Least likely to use	
Department of Corrections Website	<input type="radio"/>					
NCIC/FCIC	<input type="radio"/>					
Interview of Probationer	<input type="radio"/>					
Contact the Probation officer	<input type="radio"/>					
Clerk of Court records	<input type="radio"/>					

12. Based on your experience, rank the categories of offenders from most concerning to public safety to the least.

	Most Concerning			Least Concerning	
Sex Offenders	<input type="radio"/>				
Violent Offenders	<input type="radio"/>				
Drug Offenders	<input type="radio"/>				
Fraud/Theft Offenders	<input type="radio"/>				

13. Please estimate what percentage of felony probationers will violate probation at least once in their term.

- 0-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%

Deputy Sheriff

3. Short Answer

Recommendations

1. What duties and/or responsibilities are shared or duplicated between your agency and local State Probation officers?

2. What resources exist, in either agency which could be shared to enhance effectiveness?

3. If Probation officers shared facilities with local Sheriff's offices, what would be the advantages?

4. What would be the disadvantages?

5. What joint training and/or strategic planning do you engage in with local Probation agencies?

Appendix C

Probation Officer Survey

1. Introduction

*** 1. What is your job title?**

2. What Circuit do you work in?

3. How many years of Experience do you have?

*** 4. How many active probationers are you supervising currently?**

5. If you are interested in the results of this research, please provide your email address.

2. Questions

Data collection

*** 1. Do you have on demand computer access to the local law enforcement agencies' data records? (Arrest, Offense reports, Field interviews, etc.)**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

*** 2. How responsive are your local law enforcement agencies to your requests for information or assistance?**

- Very Responsive
- Somewhat Responsive
- Rarely Responsive
- Not at all responsive

*** 3. How likely is your local law enforcement agency to assist you with field spot checks?**

- Very Likely
- Somewhat Likely
- Not Likely
- I don't know

*** 4. How likely is a law enforcement patrol officer to have 24 hour access to the specific conditions of an individual on probation?**

- Somewhat likely
- Not likely
- I don't know
- Very likely

*** 5. If a Law Enforcement officer encounters a probationer and has cause to believe they are violating conditions of probation, how likely are they to effect a probable cause arrest? (Not VOP warrant)**

- Very Likely
- Somewhat likely
- Not Likely

*** 6. How often have you worked with Law Enforcement officers on specific problematic probationers?**

- Quite often
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never

*** 7. How many times a month are you contacted by Law Enforcement reporting field contact with your probationers?**

- never or rarely
- 1-4
- 5-8
- 9 or more

*** 8. On average, how many times per month do you have personal contact with each of your probationers?**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

*** 9. On average, how many days per month are you able to dedicate to field checks of your probationers at their homes/workplaces? (out of the office)**

- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-10
- 11 or more

*** 10. The listed entities can be considered clients of the probation system. Please rank them in order of their importance.**

	Highest Importance			Lowest Importance
The Government	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Presiding Court	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Probationer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*** 11. Please rank the following goals of probation by importance.**

	Most Important				Least important
Rehabilitation of offender	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Collection of fines/fees and restitution	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Public safety by offender accountability	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Other (please explain below)	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Other goal of probation					

*** 12. When communicating with local law enforcement officers, the following methods are available. Please rank them from most preferred to least.**

	Most preferred				Least preferred
Telephone	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Email	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
In person	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
NCIC/FCIC Teletype	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Through Communications (dispatch)	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

*** 13. Based on your experience, which offenders are of most concern to public safety? (Most concerning to least)**

	Most Concerning				Least Concerning
Sex Offenders	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Violent Offenders	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Drug Offenders	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Fraud/Theft Offenders	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

*** 14. Please estimate what percentage of felony probationers will violate probation at least once in their term.**

- 0-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%

3. Short Answer

Recommendations

1. What duties and/or responsibilities are shared or duplicated between your agency and local Law enforcement officers?

2. What resources exist, in either agency which could be shared to enhance effectiveness?

3. If Probation officers shared facilities with local Sheriff's offices, what would be the advantages?

4. What would be the disadvantages?

5. What joint training and/or strategic planning do you engage in with local Law enforcement agencies?