

53485

JAN 9 1981

ACQUISITIONS

DECISION ITEM NARRATIVE

PROGRAM Division of Corrections

SUBPROGRAM Bureau of Community Corrections

DECISION ITEM Staffing by Workload

FUNDING SOURCES

	<u>1979-80</u>	<u>1980-81</u>	<u>Positions</u>
GPR	730,600	538,900	86
PRO			
PRF			
TOTALS	730,600	538,900	86

NARRATIVE AND JUSTIFICATION

OBJECTIVE:

To deploy Bureau of Community Correction field staff based upon (1) the projected increase in client population, (2) the amount of time needed to perform each task in accordance with improved standards of service and, (3) to assure compliance with the mandate of the 1973-75 Legislative Budget Bill which required "implementation of a workload inventory system."

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

1. Throughout the period ending June 30, 1981, provide a system of differential supervision of all probation and parole clients based upon individual client needs and risk of continued unlawful behavior.
2. Throughout the period ending June 30, 1981, assure that staff has time available to perform such non-case related activities as professional development, program and community development, and administrative tasks.
3. Throughout the period ending June 30, 1981, provide for staff compliance with minimum standards of supervision as detailed in the budget supplemental material, page 2.
4. Throughout the period ending June 30, 1981, provide higher quality presentence investigations to the courts as stated in the budget supplemental material, page 7.

53485

NEED FOR SERVICES:

Legislative authority to supervise probation and parole clients carries the responsibility to improve services, and to assure that staff is given the time necessary to perform this task. In the past, additional services were added to the duties of probation and parole staff without providing additional time, with the result that agents have been forced to prioritize their work and function on a crisis intervention basis. Accurate time study data is now available to deploy staff so that services will meet the goals of the Division of Corrections, namely, public safety and conservation of human resources.

STAFFING BY WORKLOAD

INTRODUCTION

While Corrections has long attempted to define the optimum, ideal, or maximum caseload that probation or parole agents should be assigned, most professionals have maintained that any standard client-to-agent ratio is an inadequate method of staff deployment because it assumes that all other workload is distributed equally. This, in fact, seldom occurs. The courts' utilization of pre-sentence investigations, for example, can vary substantially among counties.

Perhaps the most conspicuous flaw in equalizing caseloads among all probation and parole staff is that differences in offenders are ignored. It is obvious that all clients are not alike and, therefore, do not require the same kind, or amount of service. Also, the assumption is made that random assignments will approximate equalization of workload in the long run which ignores administrative prerogative to utilize special abilities of certain staff members and, more importantly, it fails to recognize local problems, mores and law enforcement practices. However, consideration of local differences is vital if workload is to be equalized. Clients placed on probation in rural Wisconsin may be substantially different in both need and risk factors from Milwaukee or Madison probationers.

The Wisconsin classification system is designed to identify differences in offenders which will have an impact on the amount of time needed for supervision. It is then possible to ascertain the total workload of each probation and parole office by establishing time requirements for each supervision level, as well as for all other agency functions. This makes it possible, for the first time, to allocate agent positions on a workload, rather than a caseload, model.

Time studies conducted throughout the state provide an extensive data base for budgeting purposes. In a recent study, approximately 250 agents accounted for all time spent on ten randomly selected clients each, over a two month period. Investigations were also time studied; 401 presentence reports, 221 probation socials and 49 admission investigations. These time studies yield the average amount of time devoted to maximum, medium and minimum supervision clients and to the various types of investigations which provides the basis for workload budgeting. The budget presented is for the state as a whole and for each region, representing different minimum standards of supervision in contrast to the traditional Bureau of Community Corrections standards as stated in the Field Manual, which required that all clients, regardless of needs or risk, were to be seen once per month with a home visit once every two months, and submittal of a monthly report.

The budget is based on minimum standards first initiated in 1976 by Case Classification/Staff Deployment Project, as follows:

Maximum - at least one face to face contact every 14 days by a representative of the agency; home visits as appropriate; monthly verification of residence and employment; collateral contacts as appropriate; staffings at request of agent or supervisor; submittal of a monthly report.

Medium - at least one face to face contact every 30 days; monthly verification of employment and residence; home visits and collateral contacts as appropriate; submittal of monthly report.

Minimum - client shall be seen at least once every 90 days in a personal, face-to-face contact by representative of the agency; home visits as appropriate; verification of residence and employment every 90 days; submittal of a monthly report (by mail during "off" months).

Or - receipt of a mailed-in report every 30 days; home visits as appropriate; verification of residence and employment at least once prior to discharge.

A needs scale which identifies client problem areas, and a risk scale which is based upon the possibility of continued unlawful behavior, have been developed. These scales designate the appropriate differential supervision category for each case received on probation or parole. This system, which requires compliance with the above standards, was implemented statewide as of October, 1977.

CASELOAD COMPARISONS

Workload vs. Caseload Budgeting

<u>Base</u>		<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
60:1 Region 3	Caseload	19,502	20,544
44:1 Regions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6	Staff	411.5	432.8
27:1 Juveniles	Adult Caseload Ratio*	49.55	49.55
Workload Budgeting	Caseload	19,502	20,544
	Staff	429.8	451.4
	Adult Caseload Ratio	47.41	47.51

NUMBER OF POSITIONS, BY REGION

	<u>REGION</u> <u>1</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>2</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>3</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>4</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>5</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>6</u>
Base** 1980	58.7	60.5	172.5	42.5	38.7	38.5
Workload Budgeting	57.7	58.4	188.0	44.8	39.3	41.6
Base** 1981	61.9	63.6	181.4	44.7	40.6	40.4
Workload Budgeting	61.0	61.4	197.4	46.8	41.3	43.5

*Projected Adult Population divided by Total Agents minus Juvenile Specialists.

**Adults divided by 49.55, + Juveniles divided by 27.

TIME STUDY RESULTS - CLIENTS

The following two adjustments were made to the raw time study data:

1. The time studies from which budget data was derived were longitudinal studies, that is, agents were not required to account for all time during working hours but instead, recorded to the minute, all time directly relatable to any client selected for inclusion in the study. Time spent waiting for clients who were late for, or missed appointments and time between contacts was not recorded. It is reasonable to expect that employees who have contact with the public, need time between contacts. This is especially true for employees who deal with involuntary clients. Consultation with the Dean of the College of Industrial Engineering, University of Wisconsin and the Director of Management Analysis, Department of Industry and Human Relations revealed that while the need for time between activities is well recognized, there appears to be no existing objective measure of how much time should be allowed.

In earlier time studies, agents were required to record all time during working hours, allowing short intervals between activities, (e.g., instructions to a secretary, conversation with a supervisor, etc.,) to be included in the preceding activity time. Time per contact in these studies averaged nearly six minutes more than time per contact in the longitudinal studies. Hence, the longitudinal studies were adjusted to reflect this factor.

2. Client records were deleted when the required number of contacts was not met. Some agents who participated in the time studies had excessive workloads, and complete compliance with the standards was not possible.

The base time utilized for each level of supervision is a statewide average of client and collateral contact time, recording time and case study time. The average travel time recorded in each region was then added to the base to derive the recommended standards for each region. Regions were combined under the same standards whenever possible. Table 1 outlines the results of the client related time studies.

TABLE 1
TIME STUDY RESULTS
 (Hours per Month)

	MAXIMUM SUPERVISION CLIENTS			MEDIUM SUPERVISION CLIENTS			MINIMUM SUPERVISION CLIENTS		
	Base	Travel	Total	Base	Travel	Total	Base	Travel	Total
Region 1	2.55	+ .55	= 3.10	1.02	+ .18	= 1.20	.45	+ .13	= .58
Region 2	2.55	+ .38	= 2.93	1.02	+ .17	= 1.19	.45	+ .10	= .55
Region 3	2.55	+ .31	= 2.86	1.02	+ .05	= 1.07	.45	+ .03	= .48
Regions 4,5,6*	2.55	+ .56	= 3.11	1.02	+ .30	= 1.32	.45	+ .14	= .59

TABLE 2
WORKLOAD STANDARDS
 By Level of Supervision
 (Hours per Month)

	MAXIMUM	MEDIUM	MINIMUM
Regions 1, 2, 3	3.0	1.2	.55
Regions 4, 5, 6	3.1	1.3	.60

*Regions 4, 5, and 6 were combined due to similarities in data and relatively small sample sizes.

TIME STUDY RESULTS - INVESTIGATIONS

Analysis of investigation time study figures indicated a considerable divergence in time spent on each report. This could not be explained in terms of urban-rural differences. A random analysis of the quality of felony presentence investigations revealed that reports which averaged three to four hours to complete were consistently less acceptable than those which took nine to ten hours to complete. The standard for presentence investigations should be upgraded in order to improve service to the courts and to the clients. The Milwaukee Intake Unit, which specializes in presentence investigations, utilizes a standard format which will be adopted statewide. Minor modifications to this format will be made for probation social and admission investigations. Therefore, the budget recommendations are based on time study information from the Milwaukee Intake Unit.

The following standards are recommended for all regions:

	<u>Recommended Standards</u>	<u>Time Study Milwaukee</u>
Presentence Investigations	9.0 Hours	9.23 Hours
Probation Social Investigations	8.0 Hours	
Admission Investigations	8.0 Hours	
All Partial Investigations	5.0 Hours	4.80 Hours

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The method for computing time needed for professional development in each region was developed in accordance with the Division of Corrections Training and Staff Development Plan and after consultation with the Bureau of Community Corrections' administrators and supervisors and the Project Steering Committee. It is directly related to staff turnover and the number of Social Workers I in each region.

A. New Agents:

1. New agents should begin with small workloads with gradual increases in assignments. Full workload for a Social Worker I is attained in six months.
 - a. For the first three months new agents should average 1/3 workload. This allows approximately 250 hours for on the job training and orientation.
 - b. For months 4 through 6 agents should average 2/3 workload. This allows for approximately 125 hours in on the job training.
 - c. All Social Workers I will be required to complete 350 hours of training over a three year period in order to advance to Social Worker II. This amounts to 117 hours per year.

Result: (a+b+c) New agents would be allowed 27% of total time for training during the first year of employment.

B. Other Social Workers I:

1. Social Workers I (agents in their second and third years of employment with the Bureau of Community Corrections) should also be allowed increased training time.
 - a. Time studies indicate that agents spend 3% of their time in informal on the job training.
 - b. Social Workers I will also be required to complete one-third of 350 hours needed to advance to Social Worker II status each year. This amounts to 117 hours, approximately 6% of total time.

Result: (a+b) Social Workers I in their second and third year of employment will be allowed 9% of total time for professional development.

C. Social Workers II and III:

1. All professionals need time to stay abreast of new supervision techniques and changes in the law and to acquire additional skills.

Result: Social Workers II and III will be allowed 4% of total for professional development. This figure is based on time studies of Social Workers II and III.

This results in the following percentages of time budgeted for professional development in each region:

<u>REGION</u> <u>1</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>2</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>3</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>4</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>5</u>	<u>REGION</u> <u>6</u>
6%	7%	10%	5%	4%	6%

The 10% of total time required for professional development in Region 3 (Milwaukee) reflects an unusually high turnover rate there. Twenty percent of Milwaukee staff were hired in 1977 and another 25% have less than three years experience. Region 2 (Waukesha) also experienced considerable turnover in 1977 but the other regions have fewer new or inexperienced agents.

COMMUNITY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

(Activities involving the development and mobilization of resources to meet the needs of a number of clients and non-case-related activities which enhance or further the image of probation and parole in the community; or activities which strengthen working relationships between the agent and individuals, firms or agencies to facilitate the delivery of services and/or the processing of cases): The Bureau of Community Corrections has recently assumed many new functions placing more emphasis on the development of metro centers, halfway houses, work release centers, etc., all of which will require substantial time for Bureau Staff. Strong relationships with the community, law enforcement and the courts can aid substantially in carrying out other agent functions and also help the general populace to understand the role of probation and parole in the community. Agents reported 5.3% of their time in Community and Program Development. Due to increased emphasis in this area a standard of 7% is recommended.

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

(Non-case-related tasks, e.g., daily logs, expense accounts, survey forms, etc.): Agents reported 14% of total time for these activities, but a close examination of actual time study records revealed considerable miscoding of client related paperwork as administrative tasks. Since case-related paperwork is included in the time allotted to supervise each client, the standard suggested for administrative tasks was reduced accordingly to 3% to reflect the actual time required by these tasks.

PERSONAL TIME

In accordance with the union contract, a standard of 6% is recommended.

VACATION, SICK LEAVE, HOLIDAYS AND PERSONAL LEAVE

Sick leave used in 1977 was obtained for each agent and CSA and averaged for the whole state. Vacation time (1978 eligibility) was obtained for each agent and CSA and averaged for each region. Holidays and personal time were added to these figures and an average total time off computed for each region.

PROJECTIONS

The following population projections were obtained from the Office of Systems and Evaluation.

	<u>June 30,</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>June 30,</u> <u>1981</u>
A. Adults	18,442	19,465
B. Juveniles	1,060	1,079
C. Incarcerated Adults	3,837	4,114
D. Incarcerated Juveniles	705	701
E. Out of State Clients*	972	1,026
F. Absconders*	2,067	2,820

REGIONAL CASELOAD BREAKDOWN

(Averaged November 1977 through April 1978)

	<u>MAXIMUM</u>	<u>MEDIUM</u>	<u>MINIMUM</u>
Region 1 (Madison)	35%	44%	21%
Region 2 (Waukesha)	26%	43%	31%
Region 3 (Milwaukee)	38%	42%	19%
Region 4 (Green Bay)	28%	42%	30%
Region 5 (Eau Claire)	28%	40%	32%
Region 6 (Rhineland)	31%	39%	30%

*Out of State Clients and Absconders are not OSE projections, but are straight line projections based on current ratios.

OUTCOME DATA

The Comparison Group table refers to the outcome data collected from the Madison/Green Bay Comparison groups*. Madison clients were first matched to Green Bay clients by age (± 2 years), sex, supervision level, and whether client was on probation or parole. Within supervision level clients were matched on total risk (± 3 points) and total needs (± 5 points). In addition clients were matched with three items on both the Needs and Risk scales. The Risk scale items included Age at First Conviction (or Juvenile Adjudication), Number of Prior Periods of Probation/Parole Supervision, and the Convictions score. The Needs scale items included Academic/Vocational Skills, Alcohol Usage, and Other Drug Usage.

It was hypothesized that the individuals classified as maximum and placed under maximum supervision would have a lower amount of assessed criminal activity than the comparison group clients classified as maximum but supervised in the usual manner. The data does, in fact, support this hypothesis. For each indicator of assessed criminal behavior a lower percentage of the clients supervised as maximum (Madison Region) exhibited such behavior.

A significant decrease in new offenses was reported for Madison Region clients under maximum supervision. The number of people in this group committing new offenses (12%) is just over one-half of the Green Bay percentage (23.0%).

*Clients in the Madison Region were supervised under the differential Case Classification/Staff Deployment standards while all clients in the Green Bay Region were supervised under the old Division standards of one contact per client per month and one home visit every two months.

The "Felony" and "Misdemeanor" categories should be noted: The regional differences for felonies are slight, but a substantial difference in the misdemeanor category raises questions about the types of criminal behavior that can be controlled while under supervision.

The data also supports the hypothesis that the assessed criminal behavior of the clients classified as requiring minimum supervision, and supervised in such a manner, would be no higher than the clients of the comparison group (Green Bay) classified as minimum but supervised in the usual manner.

It should be noted that because of the stringent matching criteria, the matching was not completed at the time of data collection. Therefore the sample sizes are smaller for the Madison Region. Women clients and older first offenders were very difficult to match because they constitute such a small proportion of the total Community Corrections population. Historically revocation rates for these clients are quite low, hence all categories of assessed criminal behavior rates of the Madison Region Group will probably decrease, when these clients are added to the sample.

MADISON/GREEN BAY COMPARISON GROUP
OUTCOME DATA

Status at Data Collection:	<u>MAXIMUM</u>		<u>MEDIUM</u>		<u>MINIMUM</u>	
	<u>Green Bay</u>	<u>Madison</u>	<u>Green Bay</u>	<u>Madison</u>	<u>Green Bay</u>	<u>Madison</u>
	N = 113	N = 87	N = 71	N = 59	N = 58	N = 52
Discharged*	22.2%	41.3%	33.8%	37.3%	56.8%	59.6%
Early Discharge	0.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.9%
Revoked	10.6%	8.0%	1.4%	3.4%	1.7%	1.9%
Absconder	4.4%	3.4%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	3.8%
Transferred Out	3.5%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%
Deceased	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Still Active	58.4%	44.8%	59.2%	57.6%	37.9%	30.8%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Assessed Criminal Behavior:						
<u>Any</u> New Offense	23.0%	12.0%	9.9%	13.0%	5.2%	4.0%
Assaultive Offense	6.2%	4.6%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Felony	11.5%	11.4%	2.8%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Misdemeanor	13.3%	1.1%	7.1%	10.2%	3.4%	3.8%
Any Absconsions Reported During Supervision	11.5%	6.9%	0.0%	6.8%	3.4%	3.8%
Arrests	19.5%	NA	9.9%	NA	5.2%	NA
Rules Violations	27.4%	24.4%	9.9%	20.3%	3.4%	5.7%

*Includes closed and off records.

STATEWIDE BUDGET

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

Adults

Maximum	3.03 hrs/mo
Medium	1.23 hrs/mo
Minimum	0.55 hrs/mo
Juvenile	4.50 hrs/mo

Incarcerated Adults	0.25 hrs/mo
Incarcerated Juveniles	2.25 hrs/mo
Absconders	0.25 hrs/mo
Out-of-State Cases	0.25 hrs/mo

Investigations

Presentence	9.0 hrs.
Admission	8.0 hrs.
Probation Socials	8.0 hrs.
All Partialis*	5.0 hrs.

TOTAL AGENT TIME AVAILABLE

52.2 weeks x 40 hours = 2088 hours/year
 (Less vacation, sick leave, holidays) - 259 hours
1829 hours/year

Less

<u>TIME REQUIRED FOR:</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>
Professional Development Program and Community Development	7.6%	138
Administrative Tasks	3.0%	55
Personal Time	<u>6.0%</u>	<u>110</u>
	23.6%	431

Equals

TIME AVAILABLE TO SUPERVISE CLIENTS OR TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS:
1798 ÷ 12 = 116.5 hours/month

END POINT CASELOAD:

Adult	18,442	19,465
Juvenile	1,060	1,079
Incarcerated Adults	4,014	4,312
Incarcerated Juveniles	705	701
Absconders	2,667	2,820
Out-of-State	972	1,026

PROJECTED CASELOAD BREAKDOWN:

Maximum Supervision	33%	6,086	6,424
Medium Supervision	42%	7,746	8,175
Minimum Supervision	25%	4,610	4,866

INVESTIGATIONS:

Presentence Investigations	4,782	5,021
Probation Socials	6,074	6,377
Admission Investigations	1,230	1,291
All Partial Investigations	1,297	1,363

INTAKE:

Transfer-In Cases	5,455	5,728
New Cases	13,217	13,876

RESULTING AGENT POSITION REQUEST:

Maximum Supervision	160.0	169.2
Medium Supervision	83.2	87.8
Minimum Supervision	21.7	23.1
Presentence Investigations	30.7	32.1
Probation Socials	34.7	36.5
Admission Investigations	7.1	7.3
Partial Investigations	4.6	4.9
Juveniles	40.9	41.7
Incarcerated Adults	8.6	9.3
Incarcerated Juveniles	13.5	13.5
Absconders	5.7	6.0
Out-of-State Clients	2.1	2.1
Intake**	17.0	17.9
Total Positions	429.8	451.4

June 30, 1980 June 30, 1981

*Agent in one area completes court history section while an agent in another area completes family and background section of report.

**First 30 days of supervision.

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

**REGION 3
Milwaukee**

June 30, 1980 June 30, 1981

Adults

Maximum 3.03 hrs/mo
Medium 1.23 hrs/mo
Minimum 0.55 hrs/mo
Juvenile 4.50 hrs/mo

Incarcerated Adults 0.25 hrs/mo
Incarcerated Juveniles 2.25 hrs/mo
Absconders 0.25 hrs/mo
Out-of-State Cases 0.25 hrs/mo

Investigations

Presentence 9.0 hrs.
Admission 8.0 hrs.
Probation 8.0 hrs.
 Socials 8.0 hrs.
All Partial* 5.0 hrs.

TOTAL AGENT TIME AVAILABLE

52.2 weeks x 40 hours = 2088 hours/year

(less vacation, sick leave, holidays) - 244 hours
1844 hours/year

Less

<u>TIME REQUIRED FOR:</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>
Professional Development Program and Community Development	10%	184
Administrative Tasks	3%	55
Personal Time	6%	111
	<u>25%</u>	<u>479</u>

Equals

TIME AVAILABLE TO SUPERVISE CLIENTS OR TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS:

1365 hrs/yr ÷ 12 = 114 hours/month

END POINT CASELOAD:

Adult	7,746	8,175
Juvenile	436	443
Incarcerated Adults	1,686	1,811
Incarcerated Juveniles	289	287
Absconders	1,120	1,184
Out-of-State	408	431

PROJECTED CASELOAD BREAKDOWN:

Maximum Supervision	30%	2,943	3,107
Medium Supervision	43%	3,331	3,515
Minimum Supervision	19%	1,472	1,553

INVESTIGATIONS:

Presentence Investigations	1,449	1,521
Probation Socials	2,621	2,752
Admission Investigations	542	569
All Partial Investigations	491	516

INTAKE:

Transfer-In Cases	2,129	2,236
New Cases	5,630	5,900

RESULTING AGENT POSITION REQUEST:

Maximum Supervision	78.2	82.6
Medium Supervision	35.9	37.9
Minimum Supervision	7.1	7.5
Presentence Investigations	9.5	10.0
Probation Socials	15.3	16.1
Admission Investigations	3.2	3.3
Partial Investigations	1.8	1.9
Juveniles	17.2	17.5
Incarcerated Adults	3.7	4.0
Incarcerated Juveniles	5.7	5.7
Absconders	2.5	2.6
Out-of-State Clients	0.9	0.9
Intake**	7.0	7.4

Total Positions

188.0 197.4

*Agent in one area completes court history section while an agent in another area completes family and background section of report.

**First 30 days of supervision.

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

**REGION 4
Green Bay**

END POINT CASELOAD:

June 30, 1980 June 30, 1981

Adults

Maximum 3.10 hrs/mo
Medium 1.30 hrs/mo
Minimum 0.60 hrs/mo
Juvenile 4.50 hrs/mo

Incarcerated Adults 0.25 hrs/mo
Incarcerated Juveniles 2.25 hrs/mo
Absconders 0.25 hrs/mo
Out-of-State Cases 0.25 hrs/mo

Investigations

Presentence 9.0 hrs.
Admission 8.0 hrs.
Probation Socials 8.0 hrs.
All Partialials* 5.0 hrs.

TOTAL AGENT TIME AVAILABLE

52.2 weeks x 40 hours = 2088 hours/year
(less vacation, sick leave, holidays) - 279 hours
1809 hours/year

Less

<u>TIME REQUIRED FOR:</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>
Professional Development Program and Community Development	5%	90
Administrative Tasks	3%	54
Personal Time	6%	109
	<u>21%</u>	<u>379</u>

Equals

**TIME AVAILABLE TO SUPERVISE CLIENTS OR TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS:
1430 hrs/yr ÷ 12 = 119 hours/month**

Adult 1,844
Juvenile 144
Incarcerated Adults 401
Incarcerated Juveniles 96
Absconders 267
Out-of-State 97

1,844 1,946
144 147
401 431
96 95
267 282
97 103

PROJECTED CASELOAD BREAKDOWN:

Maximum Supervision 28% 516 544
Medium Supervision 42% 775 818
Minimum Supervision 30% 553 584

INVESTIGATIONS:

Presentence Investigations 838 880
Probation Socials 479 503
Admission Investigations 221 232
All Partial Investigations 176 185

INTAKE:

Transfer-In Cases 844 886
New Cases 1,058 1,111

RESULTING AGENT POSITION REQUEST:

Maximum Supervision 13.4 14.2
Medium Supervision 8.5 8.9
Minimum Supervision 2.8 2.9
Presentence Investigations 5.3 5.5
Probation Socials 2.7 2.8
Admission Investigations 1.2 1.3
Partial Investigations 0.6 0.6
Juveniles 5.5 5.6
Incarcerated Adults 0.8 0.9
Incarcerated Juveniles 1.8 1.8
Absconders 0.6 0.6
Out-of-State Clients 0.2 0.2
Intake** 1.4 1.5

Total Positions 44.8 46.8

*Agent in one area completes court history section while an agent in another area completes family and background section of report.

**First 30 days of supervision.

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

**REGION 5
Eau Claire**

June 30, 1980 June 30, 1981

Adults

TOTAL AGENT TIME AVAILABLE

END POINT CASELOAD:

Adult	1,660	1,752
Juvenile	141	144
Incarcerated Adults	361	388
Incarcerated Juveniles	94	93
Absconders	240	254
Out-of-State	87	92

Maximum	3.10 hrs/mo
Medium	1.30 hrs/mo
Minimum	0.60 hrs/mo
Juvenile	4.50 hrs/mo

52.2 weeks x 40 hours = 2088 hours/year
(less vacation, sick leave, holidays) - 268 hours
1820 hours/year

Adult	
Juvenile	
Incarcerated Adults	
Incarcerated Juveniles	
Absconders	
Out-of-State	

PROJECTED CASELOAD BREAKDOWN:

Maximum Supervision	28%	465	490
Medium Supervision	40%	664	701
Minimum Supervision	32%	531	561

Incarcerated Adults	0.25 hrs/mo
Incarcerated Juveniles	2.25 hrs/mo
Absconders	0.25 hrs/mo
Out-of-State Cases	0.25 hrs/mo

Less

INVESTIGATIONS:

Presentence Investigations	592	622
Probation Socials	605	635
Admission Investigations	76	79
All Partial Investigations	63	66

Investigations

Presentence	9.0 hrs.
Admission	8.0 hrs.
Probation Socials	8.0 hrs.
All Partial*	5.0 hrs.

<u>TIME REQUIRED FOR:</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>
Professional Development Program and Community Development	4%	73
Administrative Tasks	7%	128
Personal Time	3%	55
	<u>6%</u>	<u>109</u>
	20%	365

INTAKE:

Transfer-In Cases	706	741
New Cases	1,159	1,217

Equals

RESULTING AGENT POSITION REQUEST:

TIME AVAILABLE TO SUPERVISE CLIENTS OR TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS:
1455 hrs/yr ÷ 12 = 121 hours/month

Maximum Supervision	11.9	12.6
Medium Supervision	7.1	7.5
Minimum Supervision	2.6	2.8
Presentence Investigations	3.7	3.8
Probation Socials	3.3	3.5
Admission Investigations	0.4	0.4
Partial Investigations	0.2	0.2
Juveniles	5.2	5.4
Incarcerated Adults	0.7	0.8
Incarcerated Juveniles	1.7	1.7
Absconders	0.5	0.5
Out-of-State Clients	0.2	0.2
Intake**	1.8	1.9

*Agent in one area completes court history section while an agent in another area completes family and background section of report.

**First 30 days of supervision.

Total Positions

39.3 41.3

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

**REGION 6
Rhineland**

END POINT CASELOAD:

June 30, 1980 June 30, 1981

Adults

TOTAL AGENT TIME AVAILABLE

Maximum	3.10 hrs/mo
Medium	1.30 hrs/mo
Minimum	0.60 hrs/mo
Juvenile	4.50 hrs/mo

52.2 weeks x 40 hours = 2088 hours/year
(less vacation, sick leave, holidays) - 274 hours
1814 hours/year

Incarcerated Adults	0.25 hrs/mo
Incarcerated Juveniles	2.25 hrs/mo
Absconders	0.25 hrs/mo
Out-of-State Cases	0.25 hrs/mo

Less

<u>TIME REQUIRED FOR:</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>
Professional Development Program and Community Development	6%	109
Administrative Tasks	7%	128
Personal Time	3%	55
	<u>6%</u>	<u>109</u>
	<u>22%</u>	<u>401</u>

Equals

TIME AVAILABLE TO SUPERVISE CLIENTS OR TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS:
1413 hrs/yr ÷ 12 = 118 hours/month

Investigations

Presentence	9.0 hrs.
Admission	8.0 hrs.
Probation Socials	8.0 hrs.
All Partial*	5.0 hrs.

Adult	1,660	1,752
Juvenile	135	137
Incarcerated Adults	361	388
Incarcerated Juveniles	90	89
Absconders	240	254
Out-of-State	87	92

PROJECTED CASELOAD BREAKDOWN:

Maximum Supervision	31%	515	543
Medium Supervision	39%	647	683
Minimum Supervision	30%	498	526

INVESTIGATIONS:

Presentence Investigations	403	423
Probation Socials	794	833
Admission Investigations	101	106
All Partial Investigations	152	160

INTAKE:

Transfer-In Cases	718	754
New Cases	1,487	1,561

RESULTING AGENT POSITION REQUEST:

Maximum Supervision	13.5	14.3
Medium Supervision	7.1	7.5
Minimum Supervision	2.5	2.7
Presentence Investigations	2.6	2.7
Probation Socials	4.5	4.7
Admission Investigations	0.6	0.6
Partial Investigations	0.5	0.6
Juveniles	5.2	5.2
Incarcerated Adults	0.8	0.8
Incarcerated Juveniles	1.7	1.7
Absconders	0.5	0.5
Out-of-State Clients	0.2	0.2
Intake**	1.9	2.0

Total Positions

41.6 43.5

*Agent in one area completes court history section while an agent in another area completes family and background section of report.

**First 30 days of supervision.

END