

U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections

# Planning and Evaluating Prison and Jail Staffing

Volume 1

94721

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC

U. S. Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

PLANNING AND EVALUATING  
PRISON AND JAIL STAFFING

VOLUME I

F. WARREN BENTON, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
DIRECTOR, OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, 1975-1979

OCTOBER 1981

This project was supported by Grant Number CB-3 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

94721

# Planning and Evaluating Prison and Jail Staffing

Volume 1

94721



94721

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC

U. S. Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

PLANNING AND EVALUATING  
PRISON AND JAIL STAFFING

VOLUME I

F. WARREN BENTON, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
DIRECTOR, OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, 1975-1979

OCTOBER 1981

This project was supported by Grant Number CB-3 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

ABSTRACT

Planning and Evaluating Prison and Jail Staffing has three major purposes. The first is to identify methods of analysis and evaluation of staffing levels. These include task analysis, motion and time study, productivity auditing, outcome analysis, process analysis, and comparative analysis. A specific method is presented, called the Multiple Methods Approach because several staff evaluation techniques are independently applied. The report provides instructions and necessary forms so that an institutional manager may apply this approach. The second purpose is to describe alternative methods of organizational structure and shift or roster management for prisons and jails. Concepts presented include traditional, project, and matrix organizational structures, unit management, as well as specific approaches to staffing housing units. The third purpose is to document current staff levels of twenty institutions representing jails and prisons which are both new and old, and large and small. The staffing patterns are presented and compared within the following categories: administration, business management, support operations, programs and services, medical and treatment, control points, perimeter security, unit supervision, internal activity and yard, and external positions. In addition, summary tables are presented illustrating rates of employment per hundred prisoners from several other studies, including a survey of 162 prisons. The monograph is divided into two volumes. The first contains all of the material except for the specific staffing patterns themselves. These have been placed in the second volume.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. INTRODUCTION	1
B. BACKGROUND	2
II. DETERMINING AND EVALUATING STAFF REQUIREMENTS	5
A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES	5
B. METHODS OF STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS	8
1. Task analysis	8
2. Motion and time study	12
3. Productivity auditing	13
4. Outcome analysis	14
5. Process analysis	14
6. Comparative analysis	17
C. SUMMARY	20
III. ORGANIZATION OF CORRECTIONAL POSTS AND POSITIONS	23
A. INTRODUCTION	23
B. HIERARCHICAL AND FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATION	23
1. Traditional model	23
2. Project model	25
3. Matrix model	25
4. Functional decentralization	27
5. Functional hierarchy	28
6. Unit management	28
7. Team model	28
8. Shift model	28
C. SHIFT PATTERNS	29
1. Continuity: posts and positions	29
2. Calculation of coverage factors	30
3. Shift cycles	35
4. Shift patterns	36
5. Productivity improvement factors	39

NCJRS

JUL 18 1984

ACQUISITIONS

IV. AN EXAMINATION OF SPECIFIC STAFFING ISSUES	43
A. INTRODUCTION	43
B. REVIEW OF STAFFING LEVELS BY FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY	45
1. Administration	45
2. Business management	47
3. Support operations	49
4. Programs and Services	50
5. Medical and treatment	53
6. Control points	55
7. Perimeter security	56
8. Unit supervision	57
9. Internal activity and yard	60
10. External and other	61
11. Total positions	62
C. ADDITIONAL TABLES	65
V. IMPLEMENTATION	73
A. INTRODUCTION	73
B. PLANNING AND EVALUATING STAFF LEVELS	74
C. EXAMPLE	76
D. APPLICATION TO POSTS	87
E. FINAL OBSERVATIONS	88
VI. APPENDIX	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
BLANK TASK ANALYSIS FORMS	91

CHAPTER ONE  
INTRODUCTION

A. INTRODUCTION

The most important and most expensive resource in a prison or jail is its staff. Over one-half of an institutional budget usually is spent for employee salaries and benefits. Thus, a proper staffing pattern is a necessary condition for the achievement of most other institutional objectives, and the evaluation of staff deployment is the best approach to achieving cost savings or productivity improvements. The goal of this manual is to assist managers in the development and evaluation of prison and jail staffing patterns. The material in this manual should aid managers as they grapple with the basic but difficult questions of "How many staff members are needed?", or "What is the best way to organize the workforce?", or "How can we tell if our staffing pattern is effective?"

Volume I discusses methods for determining proper staff levels and organizational structures, and presents information based upon staffing patterns currently in use. For this project, information on staffing was obtained from twenty jails and prisons, as well as from reports developed in previous projects by other organizations. Summaries of the staffing patterns are presented in Volume I, and specific and detailed descriptions are presented in Volume II.

Chapter Two reviews methods of determining the appropriate numbers of employees to devote to a task. Methods such as task analysis and comparison are described with reference to specific examples. After reading the chapter, the reader should understand the methods and procedures used for relatively simple evaluations, and should be equipped to make better decisions concerning more difficult problems of staffing.

Chapter Three reviews the organization of workers. Discussed are methods of organizing the workforce, both in terms of hierarchical structure, or chain of command, as well as in terms of shifts so that the proper levels of employees are on duty at all times.

Chapter Four reviews the staffing information from the institutions included in the project, according to specific functional categories such as administration, unit supervision, or control points. This allows for an examination of factors which are uniquely important to specific areas of institutional operation. Special attention is placed upon Unit Supervision staffing or staffing for housing units, because housing areas use between one-fifth to one-third of all positions in prisons.

Chapter Five provides a step-by-step example of a staffing analysis, and includes specific forms and procedures to enable a manager to complete such an analysis.



Questions about staffing levels, as discussed in the manual, generally occur during the planning of new facilities or programs, during budget proposal or justification processes, or during the ongoing administration of a budget when cuts or reallocations must be made. At such times, managers must justify levels of staffing, or suffer cutbacks in funding, or fail to receive even initial funding for a new project. This monograph is designed to assist managers as they face difficult budget situations and a variety of other staff management conditions. Thus, individuals may use the monograph in different ways depending upon their situation. The following are some suggested ways for applying the material:

A deputy warden, personnel manager, or security chief might use it as a guide to evaluating the need for a change in the level of staffing in a particular program. In this case the evaluation methods described in Chapters Two and Five would be particularly relevant.

The planner or administrative assistant who is developing a new program or institution might refer to Chapter Three on the organization of staff, and to the specific staffing patterns presented in Volume II. If the level of planning were very specific, to the point of defining specific numbers of positions, the methodology in Chapter Five would be important.

A trainer conducting a training session for middle managers might use the entire monograph as a resource for examples and content material. A program manager requesting additional staff for a new or existing project might be requested by the Warden to conduct an evaluation process such as that in Chapter Five to justify this budget request.

Over the last several decades, correctional managers have been challenged in various ways. In the 1960's, emphasis was placed upon the development of programs and services to fulfill the goals of resocialization or rehabilitation. In the 1970's, the problems of rapid population growth called for rapid expansion of correctional systems. In the 1980's, it appears that productivity improvement may be the challenge. Budget cuts, externally imposed standards, and the aspirations of correctional professionals to improve services will call for the careful examination of institutional operations. Since it is unlikely that large infusions of new funds will come from many external sources, administrators will be required to find resources from within.

#### BACKGROUND

The complexity of a prison staffing pattern and the difficulty of effective staff management generally escapes those outside of corrections. The citizen or legislator not yet exposed to prison management may view a correctional institution as if it operated for one shift, like a bank or a store, and as if its

only task were confinement security. There are several aspects of a correctional institution staffing pattern which make it both unlike these free-world institutions and very difficult to manage.

First, a correctional institution must support the complete spectrum of the activities of a small city. There are systems for food service, utilities, medical care, law enforcement, industry, and most other aspects of life in the free world. Each of these responsibilities must be implemented by the staff in such a way that the institution functions as a whole. As a result, the positions and shift patterns of many different industries and professions must be integrated. It is difficult to manage a restaurant, or a medical clinic, or a factory, or a counseling service. The challenge of a correctional institution staffing pattern is to develop a capacity to provide all of these services as parts of one organization.

Second, a correctional institution must operate on a continuous basis. Many posts and positions must be staffed around the clock. In an insurance company, for example, an employee is hired to do a particular job. If he or she must miss work one day, the workload usually is deferred until the employee returns. In a correctional institution, if a correctional officer must miss work, because of illness, training obligations, unauthorized absence, or other factors, the post generally must be filled, or an active adjustment must be made in some other officer's duties. The task of supervising prisoners cannot be deferred until the officer returns. In order to provide for continuous operation of these types of activities, the shift cycles and patterns of a correctional institution must be complex.

Third, the population of a prison presents obvious unique challenges. While the staff of a prison is providing supervision and basic services, the prison population has a continuous opportunity to plan dangerous and ingenious activities such as escapes, disruptions, covert organizations, and acquisition of contraband. In response, the staffing pattern of a prison must work consistently and thoroughly, and must successfully integrate security functions with many other skilled activities and professions. As a result, there is less opportunity for informal and spontaneous approaches to work problems. The shift patterns of the food service staff must be coordinated with those of the industry, education, medical, security, and administrative staff. In the free world, a restaurant staff would not have to consider such factors.

Finally, the employees of a correctional institution are held to a relatively high standard of performance because of the inherent danger to themselves and to the public should errors occur allowing an escape or major incident. Further standards are imposed externally by the courts, inspection agencies, and accreditation processes. As a result, regardless of the number of employees or the size of budget available, a prison staffing pattern must be stretched, compressed, extended, and creatively

managed to accomplish the basic responsibilities of a prison. This requirement is perhaps the greatest challenge in developing, evaluating, and managing a prison staffing pattern, and perhaps the greatest challenge of correctional administration in general.

## CHAPTER TWO DETERMINING AND EVALUATING STAFF REQUIREMENTS

### A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The most basic issue in developing a new staffing pattern, or in evaluating an existing one, is the determination of whether a post or position is needed at all. Coverage factors, shift cycles and patterns, and organizational structures all are important final determinants of the total level of staff required. However, the first and most important determinant is the level of need for a post or position in the first place.

The purpose of this chapter is to present some of the basic approaches to such an evaluation. The chapter is conceptual, establishing the methodological and theoretical foundations for the step-by-step approach presented in Chapter Five.

There are several important concepts which structure the process of determining basic needs: local variation, productivity, and diminishing returns. Each of these factors influences the ultimate determination of the appropriate level of employees for a given function.

Local variation: It is important to recognize that there are no simple and final answers. Each prison and prison system operates under procedures which vary greatly. As a result, institutions which appear to be similar can have markedly contrasting populations and functions. Terms which have apparent uniformity of definition, such as "medium security", "intake process", "cellhouse shakedown", or "classification hearing", generally describe processes which vary from system to system and prison to prison. For example, a shakedown, or search for contraband, in a cellhouse can include the inspection of all cells on a frequent basis, or a few cells on a random basis. The inspection itself can involve a brief examination of the cell by one officer, or an intensive item-by-item search, complicated by the presence of the prisoner exercising numerous procedural rights. Therefore, the determination of a proper staffing level of an institution generally has to respond at some point to the actual workload requirements of the institution, based upon the responsibilities and mission of the institution.

Productivity: This is a term which has been used frequently during recent years, but often is not used with precise definition. According to Webster's dictionary, it refers to "the quality or state of yielding or furnishing results". As a management concept, productivity refers to the relation between "inputs", or resources such as time, supplies, or money, and "outputs", such as products, or work tasks completed. Productivity improvement occurs when inputs into a work process are reduced, or the outputs of the process are increased.

Generally, productivity is measured by dividing outputs by inputs. A simple example from a correctional institution involves

automation of some gates which were previously operated manually. Prior to the consolidation, six gates might be operated by six officers at any one time. The productivity index would be six divided by six, or one. After consolidation and automation of the gates, the six gates could be operated by three officers. The new index would be six divided by three, or two. This is a 100% increase in productivity. There are many actual examples of productivity improvements throughout the field of corrections today. The following is a list of some common approaches to productivity improvement:

Introduction of computer technology to prison record systems;

Replacement of many small surveillance towers with one or two high, advanced design towers; or even the elimination of towers altogether;

Automation, substituting machines for labor, including sensing devices;

Negotiation of improved work practices through collective bargaining, eliminating inefficient procedures in return for employee benefits;

Relocation of employees and prisoners adjacent to one another through unit management and advanced prison design concepts, reducing wasted time moving prisoners from one location to another;

Training employees to accomplish work tasks with a lower level of error, so that the number of correctly completed tasks per employee is increased;

Review and evaluation of outdated forms and procedures to eliminate unnecessary or duplicative work tasks.

Generally, there are three types of approaches to productivity improvement. The first is to simply increase workload levels without hiring additional staff or increasing supply budgets. Up to a point, this can result in productivity improvements, especially if many inefficient or unnecessary practices exist prior to the workload increase. This occurred nationally when the massive population increases occurred in the latter half of the 1970's. The problem with this approach is that employees can become overworked and quit their jobs, or lose morale and do poor quality work. Thus, genuine productivity improvements do not always occur. Often, work standards are simply reduced, so that a classification interview, for example, becomes a brief and mechanical conversation, or the physical structure of a facility becomes overused.

A better type of productivity improvement is to evaluate or reorganize work tasks, so that employees can complete them more efficiently. As the goals, procedures, and tasks of an

institution change over time, methods must be continually evaluated to reduce duplicative or unnecessary tasks. In a prison which has operated in a stable and traditional manner for a relatively long time, many such procedures or traditions will exist. Institutions subject to rapid change in recent years will also have many such procedures, usually the result of new procedures duplicating older ones to some extent. Productivity improvements resulting from this type of streamlining process tend to improve the quality of work production and the morale of employees.

Another type of productivity improvement results from the introduction of new technology into work processes. Simple examples include the substitution of self-correcting electric typewriters for manual ones, or word processors for typewriters. More complex and expensive examples include the use of new devices such as computers in record processing, or the use of electronic movement sensing devices, or improved communication systems. Finally, many new facilities incorporate materials which increase visibility, reduce maintenance costs, require lower levels of staffing, or reduce energy consumption.

A final and important note about productivity is that it must not become an end in itself. The history of corrections is littered with examples of institutions or programs which were planned with the reduction of operating costs as the primary objective. Examples include the famous panopticon cellhouses at the Illinois State Penitentiary at Stateville, designed in a circular fashion to permit one officer to observe hundreds of cells at once, but without any capacity to respond to what he sees. Other examples include the original plans for many prison farms, characterized by unrealistically low staffing levels, and goals of self-sufficiency. Productivity involves doing what needs to be done, but doing it in an efficient manner. Productivity is not an excuse for not doing important and necessary tasks.

Diminishing returns: Many correctional administrators have come to realize that the addition of employees to solve a problem sometimes can create more problems than it solves. There are several reasons for this.

First, the addition of employees creates unanticipated increases in workloads throughout an institution and a system. Most of the increases occur in five categories: training, personnel management, fiscal management, supervision, and building maintenance and development. In a typical architectural firm, law firm, or consulting firm, for each day of direct service to a client by an employee, there are additional expenses generally equal to one or two days salary of the employee, associated with administrative overhead, provision of space, and other requirements. While a prison can operate more efficiently than this because of the relative stability of its workload, the process of simply adding employees can have substantial unanticipated effects.

Second, an increase in the number of employees working on a given problem, or in a defined area, increases the potential for interpersonal and communication problems geometrically. If five people work on a problem, there are thirteen separate one-to-one relationships which must be reasonably satisfactory. There has to be general agreement as to the role or jobs of each person, antagonisms must be smoothed over, and agreement has to be achieved sometimes when disputes arise. If that staff is increased to ten, and therefore doubled, the number of relationships is increased to over 40, which practically triples potential interpersonal problems. To the extent that an organization has internal staff infighting, and most organizations have some of this, increasing the staff will greatly increase the problems.

Third, if the nature of the work to be done is general, such as the supervision of a cellhouse, as opposed to piecemeal, such as sorting mail, an additional factor must be considered. A series of fixed increment additions to resources achieves successively lower levels of relative improvement in resource inputs, when improvement is measured as a percent of the resources of the previous period. Consider, for example, a cellhouse of 100 prisoners, and a day-shift staff of four officers. This is a ratio of one officer for every twenty-five prisoners. If the number of officers is increased by four, the ratio is reduced to 1:12.5. A 100% increase in staff yielded a 50% reduction in the ratio. Assume that this lead to a satisfactory improvement in staff and prisoner morale, and in basic conditions; so that the legislature decides to increase the staff by four again. This time, this is a 50% increase in staff even though the absolute increase in employees and related staff is the same as before. The reduction in the ratio of officers to prisoners is reduced by 34% rather than 50%. When one also considers that the potential for interpersonal conflict has been increased by almost about 1100% over two years (from 6 relationships to 66!), it is conceivable that the institutional staff may have begun to wonder why the 200% increase in staff has not yielded a 200% improvement in day to day operations of the cellhouse.

#### B. METHODS OF STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

The determination of appropriate staffing levels has been a central concern of managers since long before the development of the production line. There are several basic approaches which have been employed and tested for many years, most often in the private sector. These approaches have also been employed within the field of corrections, although not so universally. Each of these methods will be reviewed along with examples from correctional institutions.

##### 1. Task Analysis

Task analysis is a relatively simple and direct method to

determine the appropriate level of staff for any stable and repetitious work activity. It is commonly employed in civil service systems to identify the type and number of employees required for a given function in an agency or unit.

The process of task analysis begins with the identification and measurement of the work to be done. The task auditor analyses the job, breaking it down into its component parts. For example, a records clerk may have to retrieve files, file files, and place material in files. Each of these tasks occurs at a certain rate on a typical day, perhaps 200 retrievals, 200 filings, and 400 placements of materials into files. This defines a quantified manner the work to be done. Next, the task auditor conducts an observation of the performance of one or more tasks in the performance of this work. The auditor determines, through repeated measures of tasks, the typical amount of time required to complete each task, and also the amount of time devoted to other activities, such as rest, personal activities, conversations with supervisors or other employees, and other activities. Finally, the auditor multiplies the number of each type of task to be done by the typical time periods required to complete them, and adds an appropriate amount of time for other activities. In the above example, filings and retrievals might take two minutes each, and placements might take three minutes. Thus, the total time per day for direct tasks would be 2000 minutes, or 33.3 hours. The auditor might have found that a typical records clerk spent 40 minutes per hour on these tasks, and, based upon several recommendations, could spend 50 minutes per hour, a total of 40 employee-hours per day are required. On this basis, five file clerks would be needed. A more complex study would include an analysis of peak time periods, as well a supervision requirements and shift pattern alternatives.

A task analysis is a simple and logical approach to a workload which is stable and which consists of a series of repeated tasks. It has two basic flaws, however. First, it does not work well for more generalized tasks, a type which frequently occur in prisons. For example, a correctional officer in a tower could theoretically be able to observe a certain distance, and over a certain scope of area. The typical tower may not fully use this capacity, due to design features of an institution or other factors. A task analysis could not propose many practical solutions to this problem. Another example is a team of officers supervising a dining area. Certain tasks could be measured discretely, but the most important aspect of the job of those officers, deterring incidents and disturbances, cannot be measured in the same manner as filing a file. The irony is that, to the extent that the need for the officers can be measured, such as in the numbers of incidents, more officers are probably needed.

Nevertheless, task analysis can determine relative levels of post efficiency. Assume, for example, that a post must be open 16 hours per day. A post efficiency rating of 50% would mean that half of the time that the post was open the officer had a task to



complete which was described in the post orders. The other half of the time the officer was waiting, or simply observing areas in a general way. In such a circumstance, additional duties could be assigned to that post without requiring additional officers or reducing the availability of the post in emergencies.

The second problem with task analysis is that the methodology tends to underestimate the amount of staff required to do a job. It tends to assume that optimal levels of worker performance can be generalized, and this is not typically the case. Measures are sometimes optimistic because the worker, when audited, attempts to make a favorable impression on the auditor. Also, to the extent that the worker controls the pace of the work, optimistic proposals to reduce non-task activities tend to not succeed.

The following is an example of a task analysis conducted within a correctional agency. It illustrates some of the steps involved in the process. There is also another example in Chapter Five which uses forms designed for use by a correctional manager in a prison or jail setting.

The Oklahoma Department of Corrections conducted a task analysis based evaluation of the accounting and restitution units at the administrative offices. (Joanie Callison & Gary Parsons: Accounting and Restitution Evaluation (Oklahoma Department of Corrections, Oklahoma City, 1978). The accounting unit was responsible for pre-auditing all vouchers and claims from all units within the entire department prior to forwarding them to the State Budget Office and Treasury for payment. It was also responsible for the coordination of budget development, the conduct of internal audits within the Department, and the bookkeeping for the central administrative offices. The Restitution unit was responsible for the processing of restitution and probation fee payments from probationers across the state. Such payments are made by mail.

The methodology of the project included the following: 1) flow charting of the major work flows, 2) calculation of volumes of workload for major activities, 3) daily activity audits on employees within the unit, and 4) calculation of a job descriptive index for each employee, which includes measures of satisfaction with the work.

The task analysis of the Restitution unit provides an example of the process. The overall work of the unit was defined through flow charting, yielding a list of the tasks which, taken as a whole, constitute the workload of the unit. The frequency of these tasks was calculated over a representative time period, and the workload for a representative week was determined. Then, by conducting daily activity audits on the employees in the unit, and by timing the amount of time needed to complete tasks, an allowance of time per task was identified. The following is a summary of the workload of the unit.

TABLE II-1: RESTITUTION WORKLOAD SUMMARY

TASK	NUMBER	MINUTES	TOTAL
receipts	752	1	752
post ledgers	805	1	805
treasury deposits	11	60	660
payment checks	155	2	310
payment letters	5	5	25
default letters	37	1	37
new accounts	63	2	126
restitution accts	5	40	200
rest. defaults	165	5	825
phone calls	170	4	510
log checks	155	2	310
sorting & filing			1260
TOTAL			5820
TOTAL HOURS			97

In this unit, seven persons were employed to complete approximately 97 hours per week of work, and yet there was a substantial backlog of work in the unit and additional staff had been requested. In fact, within the last twelve months, several employees had been authorized to achieve the staff of seven, but production had not increased. Through the analysis of workflow and the job description indices, the project team identified supervision and task organization as the major reasons for the lack of production. Responsibility for tasks was not clearly assigned, and the work process was not organized efficiently. For example, there was little specialization of functions, so that high level employees were sorting mail, and clerk typists performed an amount of typing which was not greater than that performed by higher level employees.

The audit recommended that the staff in the unit be reduced by one, from seven to six, and that the remaining staff be organized into two teams of an account clerk and a typist, with both teams supervised by an accountant who would also supervise a typist clerk. The overall supervisor for both units was also replaced.

Once this reorganization was completed, the backlog within the unit was relieved, and the six employees absorbed a rapidly increasing workload thereafter.

This task analysis provides an example of the type of work situation for which task analysis is appropriate. Workload consists of a quantifiable and repetitive series of tasks, permitting the reasonably precise determination of staff needed. It should be noted, however, that even though the analysis showed that there were 97 hours of work to be done per week, which could presumably be accomplished by 2.5 employees, six employees were authorized. This was done for several reasons. First, vacations, sick leave, training, and other types of leave must be

considered. As will be illustrated in the next chapter, this generally results in a reduction in actual work production per employee by about 20 to 30 percent. Thus, 3.0 to 3.5 employees would actually be needed to generate 2.5 employees on duty on any given day. Second, as was discussed above, task analysis as a process tends to underestimate the time necessary to complete work, because of unpredictable factors. Third, a supervisor was required, and a span of control of five is appropriate for this type of work. Also, the workload was projected to increase rapidly because the program was popular with the judges and district attorneys.

In Chapter Five, a specific process will be illustrated which builds upon this example.

## 2. MOTION AND TIME STUDY

Motion and time study (M&TS) is a more refined version of task analysis. Some authors, in fact, consider task analysis to be a short and simplistic version of motion and time study. There are several good books on M&TS:

Marvin E. Mundel, Motion and Time Study: Improving Productivity, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1978)

Ralph M. Barnes, Motion and Time Study, (New York, Wiley, 1966).

Barnes defines MT&S as follows:

Motion and time study is the systematic study of work systems with the purposes of (1) developing the preferred system and method--usually the one with the lowest cost; (2) standardizing this system and method; (3) determining the time required by a qualified and properly trained person working at a normal pace to do a specific task or operation; and (4) assisting in training the worker in the preferred method. (Pg. 4)

MT&S evolved historically from the "Scientific Management" movement which existed around the turn of the century. The effort focused primarily on manufacturing processes, attempting to evolve the most efficient production methods for industries. In Barnes book, very detailed instructions are provided for developing efficient procedures, including the following:

Methods to arrange production lines and work areas so as to reduce movement to a minimum.

Methods to analyse human and machine operations so as to reduce inefficient effort, including an extensive analysis, as an example, of the proper method of using a floor mop.

Methods of studying motions, including filming of processes.

Principles for motion economy as related to the use of the human body, such as approaches to using both hands at once on a task.

Methods to timing processes, and for developing appropriate time allowances for the steps in a task.

Sources of predetermined time-motion data.

It should be apparent that MT&S is a highly developed technology. It requires trained personnel to conduct studies, and therefore can be time consuming and expensive. Such a highly refined effort is beneficial when a limited number of tasks are to be continually employed in a work process, especially when expensive machinery is to be developed and purchased. When tasks change often, or then a job consists of many different tasks, then the effort of MT&S may not pay off.

In corrections, there are few jobs which involve the repetitive completion of a few limited tasks. Generally, these can be found in two general areas: control stations which operate gates, communication systems, or observe surveillance equipment, or in support functions such as accounting offices or prison industries. As a rough guide, the administrator might look for jobs which are limited to about ten specific tasks which are completed each at least ten times per hour. Thus, an officer operating several gates might meet this guide, while an officer conducting a cellhouse inspection might not.

## 3. PRODUCTIVITY AUDITING

Productivity auditing is much like task analysis. It differs in two respects. First, the unit of analysis is the productivity index, which is a broader and more flexible measure of the resources required to complete a task including non-labor resources, allowing comparisons between alternative approaches, including automation. Second, it attempts to achieve improvements in productivity, whereas the methodology of task analysis must be "stretched" by a creative auditor to accomplish this.

A productivity audit of the record system used above as an example would start with the measurement and calculation of a number of indices, such as the numbers of various types of file transactions completed per day, perhaps translating the transactions into a time unit or point system. For example, the filings might be worth two points each, and the placements of records into files three points each. On a typical day, the unit would do 2000 points of work, or 400 points per employee. Non-task time would constitute 2.66 hours per day per employee, or the productivity audit would have covered much the same area.

The productivity audit would continue, however, by developing additional measures which would incorporate operating expenses and non-labor resources. Then, it would explore a variety of methods to improve productivity, including automation.



Thus, the main difference between the productivity audit (PA) and the task analysis (TA) is that the TA asks "How many employees are needed to get this job completed?", whereas the PA asks "How can this work be done more efficiently?".

PA and TA can be integrated into a single process. Any productivity improvement will be accomplished in one of three ways: 1) methods will be improved, reducing the time required to complete a task; or 2) an overall process will be redefined, eliminating or reducing the number of tasks to complete a job, or 3) a new task will be substituted for one or more old ones, streamlining a process. Each of these approaches can be expressed in a task analysis format as a number of tasks each requiring a certain amount of time to complete. A productivity audit would seek to show that one approach was more efficient than another, and that the cost of the equipment or new methods involved would be recouped by the greater efficiency of the revised method. This is illustrated more completely in Chapter Five.

#### 4. OUTCOME ANALYSIS

Outcome analysis infers the need for staff on the basis of results and other external measures. This approach would suggest, for example, that a prison with many incidents, much overtime, and poor staff morale, is more likely to need added staff than a prison which appears to be running smoothly. In the records system example, outcome analysis would look to complaints from employees within the unit, or from those who are served by the unit. If there were few complaints, then it would be assumed that it was staffed properly.

The deficiencies of this approach are very clear. Such an approach tends to reward incompetence, and directs resources at problems without clear evidence that a lack of resources is the precise problem which needs remedy. The problem may be in the management of the unit. Also, it offers no methodology to identify a unit which might have too much staff. Conceivably a unit which is running smoothly could be operated with a lower level of staffing without a sacrifice in performance.

There are distinct advantages, however. First, outcome analysis is a more efficient method than TA or PA in terms of the cost to implement the monitoring system. While TA and PA require an auditing team, outcome analysis is a generally passive methodology, which requires only waiting for problems to be articulated by others.

This is the most typical method of staff analysis in use today in corrections.

#### 5. PROCESS ANALYSIS

Process analysis attempts to compare staffing levels to prescriptive standards. Sometimes such standards are found in court orders. A simple example is a caseload ratio. One might

adopt a standard of 35 cases per counselor in an institution. The actual caseloads of counselors could be compared to this standard, and if the caseloads are larger than 35, then additional counselors may be needed. This approach is very simple, and also very efficient to apply because compliance can be ascertained easily and inexpensively. The key to the effectiveness of this method is the specificity and validity of the standard.

The problem with this approach is that such standards are difficult to draft in a manner which respects the differences between types of situations, programs, and institutions. As a result, very few quantified standards exist which attempt to define an adequate staffing pattern. In the Fourth Chapter, some of these will be reviewed and discussed.

The American Correctional Association Commission on Accreditation Standards deserve particular attention here. Generally, these standards describe levels of performance, but not levels of staffing other than in a few instances. A specific institution might apply these standards to itself and identify areas of staff deficiency. However, generally some other type of staff analysis process must be applied to translate the standard and the institutional situation into a quantified recommendation. This is very reasonable, as such standards cannot and should not attempt to address the universe of correctional institutions in specificity.

In 1980, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration published a report entitled "Correctional Policy and Standards: Implementation Costs in Five States". (Greiser et al., Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, U.S. Govt. Printing Office contract 1980-311-379/1368, Washington, D.C., 1980). The report attempts to estimate the cost of complete compliance with CAC accreditation standards in five states.

The analysis of standard number 4090 provides a good example of process analysis. Standard 4090 states that new employees of correctional institutions should receive at least 80 hours of initial orientation and training. Colorado estimated that an average of 120 employees per year would require such training. That number multiplied by 80 hours comes to a total of 9600 training hours per year generated by this standard. An analysis of all of the remaining training standards (2053, 3065, 4091, 2054, 3066, 4092, 4093, 4097, 4098, 4183, and 4271), a total of 146,800 hours of training was estimated. This is equivalent to approximately 80 full-time employees at any one time.

Based upon the types of training to be accomplished, Colorado identified \$261,000 in personnel costs for training staff, for approximately fifteen employees. In addition, fifty-two officers were requested to provide relief coverage for the officers in training. Non-correctional officers were not included in this estimate, as it was assumed that their responsibilities could be deferred while in training, or covered by other staff as

additional duties. The following is the percent of total training hours generated by various types of requirements:

TABLE II-2: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINING BY GOAL

New employee orientation.....	6.5%
Inservice training.....	27.2%
Management training.....	6.5%
Training for direct contact employees...	27.7%
Emergency training.....	5.4%
Other (first aid, weaponry, etc.).....	26.7%

In all of the states examined in the report, it is interesting to note that an average of 24% of all estimated costs to comply with training standards were "participation costs", or costs to provide relief staff for employees who are attending training. This illustrates the importance of including training requirements in the calculation of coverage factors, which will be illustrated in the next chapter.

As an example of process analysis, both the advantages and disadvantages of this method are illustrated in the report. The training standards certainly provide a benchmark for determining the size of training program needed. However, the process of estimating the cost to accomplish that training produced highly disparate results. A comparison of Connecticut and Colorado provides an example.

TABLE II-3: COMPARISON OF TRAINING COSTS

STATE	CONNECTICUT	COLORADO
1978 BUDGET	\$32,000,000	\$38,000,000
1979 POPULATION	2,000	2,300
1978 EMPLOYEES	1,564	978
TRAINING COST EST.	\$342,000	\$1,224,000
EST./EMPLOYEE	\$219	\$1,252

In any comparison, figures are not always completely comparable, and it is recognized that there could have been changes in certain statistics. However, the estimates are widely disparate, even though two relatively comparable states are attempting to comply the same standard, with the assistance of the same agencies, LEAA and its contractor.

The explanation for this disparity might be an example of another deficiency of process analysis. It could be that one state has a much higher turnover rate of employees, or that it proposes to provide a much better type of training, or that it shows more real costs in its estimates than the other state. A process standard rarely is so specific that reliable interpretations can be made of its implications.

Process standards relating to personnel requirements are generally more vague than standards relating to more concrete

topics, such as a fire code requirement, or a ratio of shower heads to prisoners, or a space standard for a single cell. The American Public Health Association's "Standards for Health Services in Correctional Institutions" (Washington, D.C., APHA, 1976) provides a classic example of an ambiguous personnel standard: "The health staff shall be of such a size as to be able to afford to any prisoner in the institution who needs it, quality health care that meets these standards." (pg. 111). It is readily apparent that this statement would not provide any specific guidance beyond the functional standards provided elsewhere in the book.

## 6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Comparative analysis infers the adequacy of a staffing pattern by comparing it to a comparable situation in another institution. The effectiveness of this approach is dependent upon the appropriateness of the institution selected for comparison.

The most frequently used comparative statistic is the staff-to-prisoner ratio. As of 1978, for example, the American Correctional Association reported, in the ACA Directory, numbers or prisoners and employees for a large number of states. Here is a selection of rates of employment per 100 prisoners based upon these statistics:

TABLE II-4: RATES OF EMPLOYMENT PER 100 PRISONERS, 1978

Alabama.....	39
California.....	43
Connecticut.....	50
Florida.....	53
Kansas.....	51
Kentucky.....	39
Massachusetts.....	114
Michigan.....	37
Mississippi.....	42
New York.....	58
Ohio.....	30
Oklahoma.....	49
Rhode Island.....	106
Texas.....	14
Utah.....	67

There are several reasons for using a "rate per 100 prisoners" rather than a traditional staff to prisoner ratio. First, it is a whole number, rather than a decimal. Second, the rate avoids the confusion of the higher ratio indicating less staff per prisoner, and the lower ratio indicating more staff per prisoner.

There are a number of major problems with the use of staff to prisoner rates or ratios:

While they do measure numbers of employees, they do not

measure the tasks which employees perform. Thus, two cellhouses might have the same staff-to-prisoner ratios, but in one unit the staff might actual do more supervisory activities, while in the other the staff might be assigned to posts which are not interactive with the population. As a result, the two similar ratios might produce markedly dissimilar results.

Most ratios or rates do not consider coverage factors. Thus, two institutions might have comparable numbers of correctional officers, but one might require more training days per year, and might provide more annual leave days. As a result, the actual numbers of officers on duty at any one time would differ.

Most ratios or rates do not consider the shifts when employees are on duty, so that the same rates might result from staffing patterns which deploy staff in markedly different ways.

Such ratios or rates do not fully consider facility design and mission which significantly influence the numbers of employees needed to complete a given task or general function.

Nevertheless, there are some important benefits of a comparison analysis approach as one of several methods to study a problem:

They are more accessible than most other measures. It is easier, for example, to compare rates of employment of accounting staff with those of another institution, than to conduct two task analyses of the units.

They are generally more objective because they are simpler. Two or three different persons could compare rates of employment for several functions, and each arrive at the same results as to the measures. The same persons might not arrive a similar results for a task analysis because of the greater complexity of the measures to be developed.

They are easier to communicate and understand as management devices, because of their simplicity.

Chapter Four of this report uses comparative measures extensively, providing rates of employment per hundred prisoners for many categories of positions in many institutions. The methodology which has been developed reflects some attempts to alleviate problems associated with comparative measures:

The measures for each institution are broken down by functional category, avoiding some of the problems which result from comparing institutions which have similar numbers of staff and prisoners, but which employ their staff for different types of functions.

Measures are provided which show the actual numbers of employees on duty for specific shifts, cutting through misimpressions created by differing leave or training policies.

The latter parts of this report serve as one example of the use of comparative measures in staff analysis. However, the following study is another example of such an approach.

In 1980, a state correctional agency conducted an internal study of such rates, following a report by a state budgeting agency which suggested that the number of employees in that state's prisons could be reduced. The project identified a number of factors which influence the rates. The study was based upon data from over 100 institutions in seven states. While reasonably reliable, the findings should be considered tentative until a more nationally-based study can confirm or dispute them. Today, however, this is some of the best data available. No names of states are provided because this was an assurance provided to the states which agreed to provide data to the state conducting the study.

Economies of scale accounted for some differences. The study reported that systems with more than two-thirds of their population in facilities with populations of over 1500 beds had an average rate of 13, whereas systems with less than two-thirds of the population in large facilities had an average rate of 29.

The length of the average program day also was associated with rates of employment. Systems with maximum security prisoners out of cells for more than eight hours per day had an average rate of 29, whereas those with an eight-hour policy had an average rate of 13.

Inmate idleness was associated with lower rates of correctional officer employment. This data is much less clear, but, if one excludes one highly disparate institution, the units with more than 10% idleness had a rate of 18, and those with less than 10% had 26.5. Including the disparate state, the rate for those above 10% is 23.

Assaults on staff occur less frequently when there are fewer employees. The institutions with over ten assaults per thousand employees had an average rate of 29 officers per 100 prisoners, whereas those with a rate of less than 10 assaults per 1000 prisoners, had an officer employment rate of 13.

Homocides within prisons tend to occur more frequently in prisons with low rates of employment. States with rates of more than one homicide per year per 5000 average daily prisoners had an average officer employment rate of 17, whereas states with rates of less than one per year per 10,000 ADP had an average employment rate of 30.

General assaults on prisoners tend to occur in prisons with lower rates of employment. Institutions with fewer than 20 assaults per year per 1000 prisoners had an average rate of officer employment of 29. Those with more than 20 assaults had an average rate of 19.

The conclusions presented in this project deserve evaluation in projects which are available for independent analysis. Until such projects have been completed, these findings can be only considered as tentative.

#### C. SUMMARY

The following are some suggestions as to the types of situations one might encounter in correctional institutions where various methods of work analysis might be appropriate.

#### TASK ANALYSIS, OR MOTION AND TIME STUDY

Use when the job to be evaluated consists of specific tasks, and when the tasks are uniform and repetitive. As a general guide, a job should consist of no more than ten tasks completed at least ten times each per hour.

Use task analysis most of the time, but use M&TS when the implications of error are substantial, such as when investing in major new equipment or when designing new facilities or major renovations.

#### PRODUCTIVITY AUDITING

Use when considering replacement of one method or approach with another, such as substituting a centralized records unit for several decentralized ones.

Use when considering the costs and benefits of automation.

#### OUTCOME ANALYSIS

Use for an overall, general analysis of all areas of the staffing of an institution, on an ongoing basis. General measures of performance can identify possible problem areas, but do not prove the need for added staff by themselves.

#### PROCESS ANALYSIS

Use when your goals or procedures are clearly defined, such as when you are attempting to meet a standard.

Use when attempting to implement a single standard at multiple locations, such as a new program or procedure.

#### COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS:

Use to develop an overall perspective on staffing levels -- global indications of strength or weakness.

Use to discover possible alternative approaches to functions, by identifying institutions which accomplish comparable tasks with markedly different levels of staff.

Use to justify staffing levels or recommendations to public officials. Other methods may also be useful, but officials will usually inquire as to what other institutions are doing with comparable functions.

The objective of this chapter has been to introduce correctional officials to possible approaches to determining the numbers of staff needed for functions within their institutions. The next chapter will review how to organize that level of staffing according to shifts.

## CHAPTER THREE

### ORGANIZATION OF CORRECTIONAL POSTS AND POSITIONS

#### A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will review methods of organizing the work of a correctional institution, so that it can be accomplished by a team of employees. There are two dimensions to the organization of a workforce:

**Hierarchical and functional organization:** The staff must be organized so that there is command, coordination, and supervision. Normally, this requires the establishment of a written chain of command as well as the organization of personnel into functional groups.

**Temporal organization:** The staff must be organized with respect to time. Normally, this requires the assignment of people to shifts, and the scheduling of employment so that the necessary numbers of employees are on duty at all times.

The remainder of this chapter will deal with these elements of staff organization.

#### B. HIERARCHICAL AND FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATION

In concept, there are three ways to organize the chain of command of a prison: the traditional model, the project model, and the matrix model. In reality, these models are expressed in several forms, such as the unit management concept, or the military concept.

The **TRADITIONAL MODEL** is based upon some concepts first articulated by Max Weber during the 19th century. Weber's concept of a bureaucracy had four basic elements:

The positions should be grouped according to specialized functions, to enable efficiency and supervision.

The positions should be arranged hierarchically, so that each employee except for the ultimate top administrator is supervised by another employee.

The responsibilities of positions should be defined by rules and procedures, so that each employee's duties are clearly defined.

Positions should be depersonalized, to facilitate the replacement of employees when this is necessary, and to permit the selection of employees based upon explicit qualifications, rather than subjective or personal factors.

Much has been written about the advantages and disadvantages of traditional organizations. Since this model is the prevailing



approach in corrections today, it is useful to examine these problems.

A major advantage for a prison system is that the traditional model clearly assigns responsibility to employees. This is, of course, critical to the management of any large and complex organization, but is especially important in the management of security.

Another advantage to the traditional model is that the depersonalization and merit selection of employees is very important to a correctional system which is attempting to move away from previous patterns of political involvement in institutions. Thus, a warden seeking to wean a local politition from an inclination to patronage can reinforce that effort by a traditionally organized prison.

A disadvantage is that the traditional organization is not very flexible. As a result, situations requiring the coordinated effort of employees who are in functionally and hierarchically distant units, such as a problem which has medical, environmental, and security dimensions, is difficult to organize without violating the principles of the traditional organization. Thus, while a procedural manual may call for certain specific patterns of command and communication, a supervisor often has to resort to informal arrangements which violate these patterns. While this may solve a problem or cope with an emergency, it makes for difficult relations with supervisors who might feel circumvented, and it results in situations where procedures do not fully describe actions. This can sometimes be difficult to explain in a courtroom.

Another disadvantage is that the communication patterns of a traditional organization are not always feasible. Theoretically, if a low level employee wishes to communicate to another low level employee through the chain of command, and if the two employees are in functionally and hierarchically distant units, then the message may have to go all the way up and down that organizational hierarchy before it can be delivered. To the extent that, as an alternative, the employees communicate directly, the accountability and supervisory advantages of the organization are reduced.

As a result of these problems, prisons often cope by stressing either hierarchy over rules and procedures, or the reverse. Thus, one can find institutions which are run strictly according to rules, and which as a result are very bureaucratic and inefficient; or institutions which are run according to highly delegated hierarchy, so that the institution appears to be a series of independent fiefdoms run by middle managers. Both of these approaches cope, to an extent, with the problems of traditional organizations, but not without a reduction in efficient and coordinated operation.

The most common example of the traditional model is the military model, where the prison is modeled after a military organization. Sometimes the names of positions are revised to reflect a more civilian approach, the the essential concept is intact.

A second approach is the PROJECT MODEL. While this can be a model for the overall structure of an organization, it is more generally applied as a temporary structure to cope with an immediate problem, or as a limited devise to enable the coordinated response to a specific problem. In general, the project model consists of the organization of personnel according to a task. Thus, an employee might be assigned to Group A for task A, and Group B for task B. In corrections, there are some common examples.

The warden might assign employees drawn from many areas of a prison to develop a new procedure for classification. While these employees work for there respective supervisors, for the purposes of developing the procedure, they work for the leader of the task force.

Employees might be permanently assigned to an institutional classification committee. Such a structure violates the literal principles of a traditional organization, but it does resolve problems of communication and coordination.

The project organization solves some problems of a traditional organization, but it does not represent a good way to organize an entire institution, precisely because it lacks accountability.

A third approach is the MATRIX MODEL. A matrix organization is called by that term because there are two or more organizational structures, one of which is generally presented vertically like a traditional organization, and one of which is presented horizontally, with the chain of command flowing from left to right, rather than from top to bottom. As a result, most employees have two or more supervisors rather than one. In an architectural firm, for example, an employee might report to a project coordinator for the particular project he or she is working on, as well as to a functional coordinator for the type of specialty the employee performs. Thus, a question of electrical engineering would be referred to that supervisor, while a question of project schedule would be referred to the project coordinator. When a conflict occurs, the employee would attempt to resolve it with the two supervisors. If that is unsuccessful, then the ultimate resolution occurs at a higher level, such as the supervisor of the two coordinators.

The general advantage to this model is that complex problems tend to get resolved at the level where an employee is most aware of all of the dimensions to the problem. This is especially useful when very different disciplines must be coordinated, such as medicine and classification or security. It is also useful



when the work of an organization changes frequently.

In corrections, there are some good examples of matrix organizational structures, although they are generally not described as such. Usually employees are assigned to one supervisor, with instructions to "coordinate" with another. This avoids the appearance of violation of unity of command. The following are examples of situations in corrections where a matrix organizational structure is appropriate.

Unit management involves the organization of much of an institution's staff into teams associated with housing units. The advantage is that this tends to make a large institution resemble a smaller one in aspects which relate to the daily lives of prisoners. Coordination problems can occur, however, in relating within-unit functions with external functions, such as security. This is especially acute when considered across shifts. Theoretically, during the night shifts, employees within units are still responsible to their team leaders who are not present, just as they would be if the cellhouse were a small independent institution, and the employee was a shift supervisor, or the only one on duty. In reality, the situation within units must be coordinated throughout the institution. As a result, the unit staff is generally either supervised by, or responsible to "coordinate with" the shift supervisor of the institution. This is the type of problem that a matrix organization is intended to resolve, because it allows the chain of command to be described the way it really is intended to work, without either violating the goals of unit management, or creating informal supervisory relationships which are not clearly articulated in institutional procedures.

Medical services presents another example. With respect to medical functions and decisions, the staff must respond to medical supervisors. However, basic logistical and security functions must also be coordinated, requiring coordination with non-medical staff such as shift supervisors. The traditional organizational structure cannot describe such a situation very well, and generally must subordinate one function to another. The matrix organizational model is clearly appropriate here.

In planning or evaluating the organizational structure of a prison, there are some basic ideas and recommendations to consider. These are not experimentally proven principles, but rather are the reflections of the author, based upon some notable successes and failures in dealing with these problems.

It is probably best to begin by developing the organizational structure along the lines of the traditional model, resorting to project and matrix structures when the traditional model does not adequately define the necessary relationship.

Attempt to limit the span of control, or number of people supervised by a supervisor, to between three and seven. In the staffing pattern descriptions at the end of the report, the span of control of each employee is measured. As is apparent, many institutions violate this principle, and it is the source of some of their problems. A large span of control is only appropriate when a high level of autonomy can be expected from each employee supervised, or when all of the employees are doing a simple repetitive task which requires very little supervision. Sometimes a large span of control reflects unresolved organizational conflict, where a large number of employees want to maintain the impression of accountability and access to a high level official. It rarely works well, however, to organize an agency in a manner which is not functionally practical. The result will be great lack of coordination, and a lot of staff infighting.

A manager may wish to distinguish between "line employees" and "staff employees". Line employees are those through whom passes the chain of command. These people have specific authority and generally supervise other people with specific authority. Staff employees help line employees, but do not have actual authority. Sometimes they act in the capacity of their supervisor, but the authority and responsibility rests with the supervisor.

When an organizational structure is developed, a major decision involves the hierarchical division of the employees, or the arrangement of the workforce into manageable groups. There are five approaches which this project has identified.

**FUNCTIONAL DECENTRALIZATION:** This approach avoids the appearance that one group has been favored over another. The staff is divided into many functional units according to similarity of job. Then a supervisor is selected for each group. The chart which results suggests many equal units with equal authority. Generally, the actual hierarchy is defined by the degree of access and attention the supervisor gives to each group. The result is that the supervisor often works excessively so as to avoid neglecting any one area, and the staff tend to compete and fight for access, or insulate their teams from the rest of the organization by creating little kingdoms. This approach makes everyone happy when the chart is drawn up, but creates ill feelings and poor coordination later on.

**FUNCTIONAL HIERARCHY:** Under this approach, one functional area, usually security, is designated as predominant, and all of the remaining areas are made subservient to it. The justification is that the one functional area is the most important. In reality, however, all of the functional areas have at least some essential purposes, and this approach places people who are not qualified to accomplish those essential purposes in a position where they are responsible for them. The result very often is

crisis management. High level administrative effort is devoted to the main function, while the subsidiary functions are attended to when a crisis makes a malfunction apparent.

**UNIT MANAGEMENT or LOCATIONAL DECENTRALIZATION:** Under this approach, the staff associated with housing units, and related program and support staff if their function is associated primarily with a given unit, are grouped by unit. The following are some general advantages of this approach:

Many aspects of life for the prisoner population are less like a large institution and more like a small institution. Prisoners associate with smaller groups of staff and inmates.

Decisions can be made at a lower level, with more participation by the prisoners, or at least a better level of awareness of the decision process.

Better jobs are created for employees. Mid-management opportunities open up because of the positions associated with unit team leadership. Also, each employee has a better sense of the significance of his or her specific job role in relation to the overall functioning of the unit.

There are also some disadvantages. Unit management will probably require somewhat more staff, and creates some potential coordination and communication problems between staff associated with unit and non-unit functions.

**TEAM MODEL:** For small institutions, it is sometimes possible to adopt more flexible and informal organizational structures, especially in less structured and secure units such as halfway houses or group homes. This may also be feasible as an organizational model for one or two unit teams under a unit management concept. Under this model, employees are expected to assume responsibility for the operation of the institution or unit, and are expected to cooperate in accomplishing that goal. The organization at any time is determined by the work to be done, with only very minimal guidance by the organizational supervisor. Clearly, a very large institution, or a functionally complex one such as a jail, could not reliably function under such a model.

**SHIFT MODEL:** In some institutions, the first division of the organizational structure is by shift, with perhaps one extra division for support functions. Thus, there might be a day division, an evening division, and a night division. The clear advantage to this approach is that the leadership for each division is routinely available when most of the workers are on duty. The disadvantages are that divisions tend to lack coordination with each other, so that the evening operations are not consistent with the night operations, and that important functional operations are not grouped together. However, at some point in the organizational structure, there does have to be a

mechanism for multi-shift operation and supervision. The organization of some of the staff, such as non-unit custody staff, for example, along the lines of this model, would provide for the multi-shift supervision of these personnel.

In summary, the hierarchical organization of staff is critically important to the successful operation of an institution. Even the most carefully designed staffing pattern can fail if it is not organized properly.

### C. SHIFT PATTERNS

The general objective of a shift pattern is to structure work hours to achieve the necessary coverage of posts and positions to accomplish the work to be done. The next section will review many approaches to structuring work, such as alternative shift cycles and patterns, as well as the concepts which underly them, and their relative utility.

#### 1. CONTINUITY: POSTS AND POSITIONS

Throughout this report, the term "post" refers to a job, generally the responsibility of a correctional officer, which is defined by its location, time, and duties; but which may be filled interchangeably by a number of officers. A control center, tower, or cellhouse assignment can be considered a post. A "position" refers to a job which is held by a specific person, such as the business manager, a secretary, or a plumber. As in any terminology used to describe a complex circumstance, sometimes the distinctions are blurred, but the general concept is important for reasons which will become apparent.

Continuity is a basic and important distinction between positions and posts. A post generally has tasks associated with it which cannot be deferred, they are either done or not done. For example, a post at the supply dock at a prison must be filled or supplies cannot be received. Many posts are associated with tasks which must be done twenty-four hours per day, every day, continuously. Many other posts must be filled more than eight hours per day, the length of a conventional shift. As a result of the requirement for continuous or semi-continuous accomplishment of the tasks, the determination of the number of persons to be employed to fill a post must include consideration of the total hours the post is open, plus a factor or contingency to cover for vacations, other leaves, employee turnover, training obligations, and other factors. The calculation of such a contingency or coverage factor will be reviewed later in this chapter.

A position, in contrast, is a much simpler concept. The job of "Business Manager", for example, is generally intended to be a thirty-five to forty hour job. (Business managers reading this chapter may laugh hysterically at this point.) If a business manager goes on vacation, his or her responsibilities are either deferred until he or she returns, or they are delegated to another employee who temporarily does two jobs. Thus, no coverage

factor must be calculated to fully staff a position. Generally, employees in positions work a standard shift pattern, such as "normal office hours", from approximately 8:00am to 5:00pm.

Use of a coverage factor may be necessary to determine the number of positions necessary to accomplish a function. Even though the job may not require continual duty, time for leave and training does reduce the time available for normal duties. If, for example, a given function required 80 hours per week of work to complete, two workers would never complete it if they worked 40 hours per week, but also took leave time and attended training. Thus, a coverage factor must be considered in determining the numbers of employees needed to get the work done. Chapter Five will illustrate this more precisely.

A generalization is that posts are filled by correctional officers, while positions are filled by non-correctional officers. This is generally, but not completely, true. Exceptions would include a correctional officer working as one of several mail clerks, or as a locksmith. These tasks would not necessarily require a coverage factor. A high-level supervisory correctional officer, such as the chief officer, would not be filling a continuous post. Non-correctional officer employees such as paramedical staff might fill continuous posts. In that example, one paramedic might have to be on duty at all times. The same might be true of a clerk at a reception desk.

The provision of continuous coverage can generate the need for a substantially larger contingent of employees than one might initially estimate. For example, to fill two positions would require two employees. For reasons which will be explained later in the chapter, to fill two twenty-four hour continuous posts such as two towers would require approximately ten to twelve employees. If a staffing pattern does not consider these factors, it may be insufficient to accomplish the work to be done.

## 2. CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTORS

A coverage factor is the ratio between the number of hours a post is open, and the number of hours of employee time which must be acquired to fill the post during the open hours. Since the post must be filled each hour it is open, extra employee time, or "relief time" must be acquired to cover for sick leave, vacation, holidays, training obligations, and other factors.

Theoretically, an employee working a shift consisting of five days per seven day week, would work 260 days per year, based upon a fifty-two week year. This is calculated by subtracting 104 days (52 weeks times 2 days), from the 365 days in a year. Precisely, the employee could work 260.89 days, based upon a 365.25 day year considering leap years.

From this total, one must deduct for days which are not actually worked, due to tradition, legal and contractual rights, and management objectives. Categories of such days are listed,

including some typical examples of days involved:

Holidays.....	16
Annual leave.....	10
Annual training....	5
Illness leave.....	5
Days in court.....	2
TOTAL.....	38

This total must be deducted from the total days theoretically available, leaving 223 days (261 minus 38). This results in a simple coverage factor of 1.17, (dividing 261 by 223). This means that for every hour a post is open, 1.17 employee hours must be acquired in order to staff the post and provide for leave, training, and other obligations. However, to be truly accurate, the coverage factor could be increased slightly to allow for rounding of positions which are not fully required in whole numbers. For example, a unit team might require 8.78 positions, but practicality would call for the employment of nine people. Such rounding can either be accomplished by rounding up as required as the pattern is specified, on a position-by-position or post-by-post basis, or by adding a small increment to the factor initially.

Several examples might make this more explicit. An institution is about to open a new multipurpose program facility, which was to be open from Monday to Friday, from 1:00pm to 9:00pm. Assume that five officers must be assigned to the facility when it is open. The facility is open a total of forty hours per week, and five officer posts are required, so a total of two hundred officer hours per week are required. If the officers work a forty-hour week, then one might conclude that five officers are required. However, this would not provide for leave, training, and the other factors illustrated above. Assuming that the institution has a coverage factor of 1.17 as illustrated above, then 234 (200 multiplied by 1.17) actual hours of officer time would have to be acquired, or just about six officers, rather than five.

A specific coverage factor for any institution must be calculated specifically for that institution. The following is a list of common time deduction factors:

- annual leave
- sick leave
- holidays
- military leave
- training periods
- authorized union activities
- unauthorized absence
- unanticipated time in court

Several of these categories must be calculated based upon the experience of the institution. These include sick leave or military leave, where the total amount of authorized time might

not be fully used by the employees. A routine pattern of unauthorized absence must also be recognized for as long as it is allowed to continue. Correctional officers are sometimes required to be in court when they are sued by prisoners. To the extent that this occurs to even a small number of officers relatively frequently, then this must be reflected in the coverage factor.

It may be desirable to calculate separate coverage factors for different types or ranks of officers. Supervisory officers may have a higher factor. Officers in their first year of employment may have a higher factor due to training requirements and adjustment to the job. The estimation of the staff for a new program employing new officers could actually require a higher factor than the average factor for all officers.

An extended coverage factor considers an additional problem when determining the number of employees required for a continuous post. A tower, for example, is often staffed around the clock, seven days per week. An extended coverage factor applies the basic coverage factor to the number of hours certain types of posts are typically open.

A tower open all of the time is open 168 hours per week, based upon 7 days multiplied by 24 hours. A total of 195.56 hours of employee time must be acquired to staff it, however, because of the basic coverage factor (1.17 X 168). Thus, about five officers would be required to staff a tower around the clock in this example (195.56 divided by 40 hours per officer per week).

The following is a table illustrating the total hours per week of certain common types of shifts. An extended coverage factor for those shifts would be calculated by multiplying the total hours by the basic coverage factor for your institution, and then dividing by the number of hours an employee works per week, not considering overtime.

24-hour, 7-day.....	168
16-hour, 7-day.....	112
8-hour, 7-day.....	56
16-hour, 5-day.....	80

Assuming the basic coverage factor illustrated above, which is 1.17, the following are the extended coverage factors which would result in our example:

24-hour, seven day:	4.914
16-hour, 7-day:	3.276
8-hour, 7-day:	1.638
16-hour, 5-day:	2.340

The following is a computation table which may be useful in making these calculations:

COVERAGE FACTOR CALCULATION SUMMARY

STEP	EXAMPLE
1. Regular days off per employee per year (usually 52 weeks per year x 2 days off per week).....	104
2. Remaining work days per year, which is 365 minus #1.....	261
3. Vacation days off per employee per year.	10
4. Holiday days off per employee per year..	16
5. Average number of sick days taken per employee per year.....	5
6. Average number of inservice training days per employee per year.....	3
7. Additional initial training days for each new employee beyond inservice training in #6 above.....	10
8. Percent of employees employed one year or less.....	20
9. Number of other days off per year, such as for union meetings, litigation, military leave, special assignments, funeral leave, injury, etc.....	2
10. Total days off per year equals #3+4+5+6 +9 to which is added #7 multiplied by #8.....	36+2
11. Number of actual work days per employee per year equals #2 minus #10.....	223
12. Coverage factor equals #2 divided by #11	1.17
13. Seven-day coverage ratio equals #13 multiplied by 1.4, which is 7/5.....	1.64
14. Continuous coverage ratio equals #13 multiplied by 168, and divided by the number of hours an employee works each week, not including overtime, which is usually 40.....	4.91



Some methods of calculation vary from that presented above, and the following are some alternative approaches and their rationales:

One method decreases the actual work days (#11) by multiplying it by a downtime factor of, for example, .9275, to allow for lunches and breaks. This report suggests that such factors be accounted for in the design of posts and positions, since coverage for lunches and breaks must be actually achieved through a routine assignment of an employee. It is the general philosophy in this report that routine jobs should be accounted for as duties of posts and positions, while non-routine and non-job factors such as vacations should be accounted for in a coverage factor. Unless this distinction is closely followed, double accounting will occur. For example, if breaks are provided for in the coverage factor, and if a post is created in the usual manner to cover for officers on break by rotating from post to post, the personnel for this post would have been provided twice -- once through authorization of the post, and again through the coverage factor on all posts. As a result, such a system would tend to result in an overestimate of staffing needs by five to six percent.

Some methods define the coverage factor in such a way as to provide for coverage around the week as is illustrated in #13 above. Actually, a coverage factor is an abstract ratio which is applicable to any unit of time, such as an hour, and day or a year. This author prefers to calculate the abstract ratio and then apply it to convenient units of time for the work to be done.

In some systems, employees work 35 hours per week, rather than forty. In developing a coverage factor in such cases, it is important to consider how the work schedule is managed. Usually, since it is inefficient to attempt to schedule continuous operations on the basis of anything other than a three-shift day, either employees are given overtime pay for the additional five hours per week, or they are given additional annual leave as compensatory time. In the overtime case, the coverage factor would be calculated on the basis of a 40-hour five day week, and the additional overtime would be managed as a salary bonus. Under the annual leave method, the shorter work week would be expressed in the coverage factor as a greater number of annual leave days.

Some methods include factors such as learning curves (the time required for an employee to learn to do a job up to standard). This author, for the reasons stated above, suggests that such factors be considered in the design of jobs and posts, but that they not be considered in the calculation of coverage factors. The number of positions needed to staff a post at a given time should take into consideration the difficulty of the work, and the typical

level of employee competence achieved. This results in a number of employees on duty adequate to accomplish the required workload.

Some methods include the time needed to fill vacancies into the coverage factor, although this report does not recommend it. The coverage factor should describe the number of employees needed to accomplish a given level of work. The inability of a given agency to produce that number of employees is an entirely separate, albeit very real, problem. The vacancy problem is best accounted for by the calculation of a separate ratio -- the total authorized positions divided by the average level of employment achieved. If one multiplies the authorized positions by this ratio, it yields a hypothetical number of positions which, if used as a basis for hiring decisions, would in time yield a number of actual employees close to the authorized level. The reason for calculation of a separate ratio is to avoid the wrong impression that the hypothetical number of positions -- the hiring goal -- is the actual number needed to do the work. An additional practical problem is that inclusion of the vacancy time in the coverage factor would probably result in the funding of positions during time periods when, according to the calculation method, the positions are vacant.

It is important to remember that use of coverage factors carry management responsibilities. If positions are authorized on the assumption that certain levels of training are to be achieved, for example, then a roster management system should be implemented to assure that this occurs. Roster management is not within the scope of this monograph, but it is an ability which should accompany the use of coverage factors.

### 3. SHIFT CYCLES

There are two basic types of shift cycles commonly used in correctional institutions. There are numerous other types of shift cycles and patterns which are not commonly used, but which could be used. These can be found in: Institute for Public Program Analysis: Work Schedule Design Handbook (U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., 1978). This publication is highly useful for any official who must regularly organize a workforce into shifts. The most typical is the seven day cycle, based upon a seven day week. This type of cycle is also typically used in private industry. In this type of cycle, shifts are repeated every seven days for most employees. Employees primarily working relief for other employees might work on a more random schedule.

The basic advantage of a seven day cycle is that it corresponds with the organization of the rest of our society. Schedules of other family members, day care help, and commercial activity can be synchronized with the schedule of the employee.

The alternative type of cycle is the six day cycle, sometimes referred to as "four and two scheduling". While on the seven day cycle the employee would typically work five days and get two off, on the six day cycle, the employee works four days and gets two off, but gets no holidays. The basic advantages of the six day cycle is that it provides coverage automatically on holidays, and that it rotates employee days off. The disadvantage is that it does not correspond with general practice in most of the rest of society, and generally it is inappropriate for professional and administrative employees who need to work in communication with other employees in other agencies who work a conventional 5&2 seven day week. In some institutions, the correctional officers work a 4&2 schedule, and the professional and administrative staff work a 5&2 schedule.

The two types of cycles roughly produce the same number of work days in a year, depending upon the number of holidays allowed. The seven day cycle occurs 52 times per year and generates 261 days per year for work, minus holidays. The six day cycle occurs 61 times per year, and generates 244 days for work, or 17 fewer days. Depending upon the number of holidays, there is a difference of five to ten days per year. This difference can be managed in several ways, including reduced leave, or the requirement of overtime, or the lengthening of shifts by one-half hour to provide for overlap between shifts, or by requiring attendance by employees at training programs on the off days once every month or so.

There is no definitive evidence that one cycle works better than the other. A generalization is that the seven day cycle coordinates better with the outside world and professional and administrative staff, while the six day cycle relates somewhat more conveniently to the actual problems of operating a correctional institution.

#### SHIFT PATTERNS

Employees typically work about forty hours per week. Shift patterns represent methods of structuring and dividing this time across a shift cycle. Conventionally, employees work for five days per week, for seven to eight hours per day.

This type of shift pattern, however, does not always correspond with the actual duration of work tasks, or with the leisure time preferences of employees, especially in a field such as corrections. For example, a certain post may be operational for ten hours per day, but may inefficiently consume two eight hour shifts to staff it, resulting in marginal utilization of an employee for six of the sixteen hours of the two shifts. These employees are working, but the tasks may not really require the six extra hours of effort. A workweek consisting of four ten-hour days could staff the ten-hour post on any day with one employee rather than two. Depending upon the number of days of the week the post is open, and the degree of need for the marginal six hours, the workhours, and the cost, of staffing the post could be

reduced by up to 37.5%. This is based upon a reduction from 112 hours per week (7 days times 16 hours), to 70 hours per week (7 days times ten hours).

Obviously, such a technique would only work in a limited number of circumstances. However, the example illustrates the importance a well designed shift cycle and pattern to the efficient operation of a correctional institution. A productive and efficient operation is generally the result of many small improvements taken together over time, rather than any one major change or basic original plan. If a manager could implement one successful productivity improvement project per month, saving 42 hours per week as illustrated above, over a year that manager would have created the equivalent of approximately twelve new employees, to be devoted to new operations, or to enable cost reductions without service cuts.

There are five approaches in industry and public administration to the management of work hours. The feasibility of these concepts should be examined in correctional institutions as well.

The first concept is the FOUR-TEN PLAN or compressed workweek, which is a simple label for the concept of establishing longer shifts for fewer workdays. In corrections, this concept is applicable to posts which are open for more than one conventional shift, but less than two. Typical examples are recreation areas which are open in the afternoon and evening, backup officers in housing areas during peak movement periods, or posts associated with activities which take eight hours, but which require an hour of set-up before and after. For example, if prison industries were to work prisoners for a strict eight hour day as has been suggested in some recent studies, an officer supervising such an area might need to work a ten hour shift to cover the post and to inspect the area before and after work hours. The alternative would be to pay overtime, or to use two officers for the post, one coming in early, and one staying late. Depending upon the precise requirements of the post, and the ability of the institution to productively use the marginal time of the second officer, an extended shift concept might be the best choice.

The second concept is called FLEXTIME. Under this approach, employees working a day shift in a records area, for example, would be required to be at work from 10:00am to 3:00pm, but could start work as early as 6:00am and leave as late as 7:00pm, provided that they work eight hours per workday, or forty hours per workweek. In some programs, each employee must plan his or her hours in advance with approval by the supervisor. Others simply require documentation of the hours worked. Flexitime has obvious advantages for employees, because it permits them to use their leisure time more efficiently. However, in certain instances it can also enable improvements in productivity. Assume for example that the records unit in the above example has a variable, but somewhat predictable workload. An eight-to-five fixed schedule would always provide the same number of employees,



regardless of workload. Flexitime would permit the supervisor to increase staffing prior to parole hearings or at other times of peak demand. In addition, work patterns could be restructured so that checking out of files could be done during high demand hours, and refiling of files, or original filing of new documents, could be done at off-peak hours. This would probably increase productivity because the work would flow in one direction, in or out, resulting in a more smooth flow of employee traffic in the work area. Another advantage is that the records unit would be open more hours per day at no added cost. This could conceivably help other units within the institution to become more productive.

The third concept is to evaluate SHIFT ASSIGNMENT VARIATIONS. This concept is not single-ended in its recommendations; there is no one best way to implement it. The basic idea is to critically evaluate the rationale for the assignment of particular employees or operations to particular shifts. Here are some factors to be considered in such an evaluation.

Psychological studies have indicated that worker capacities suffer when they work highly variable shift patterns, such as one day on the day shift, the next on the night shift, and the next on the evening shift. Thus, an attempt should be made to assign an employee to a particular shift, and only rotate it once every two or three months, if necessary. (See Koosoris, Max, Studies of the Effects of Long Working Hours Washington Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletins 791 and 971A (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944).)

Assignment to shifts by seniority or by some arbitrary method is equally undesirable, however, because it can increase employee turnover by placing new employees in the least desirable work circumstances, and because it limits management's ability to assign personnel on the basis of capacity to do a particular job well.

To a limited extent, shift assignment variations can be used by management as an incentive for improved productivity. It is especially useful in times of tight budgets, because it is a non-monetary, yet potent, incentive.

The assignment of certain functions to unusual shifts can sometimes improve productivity. In a congested area, or an overworked unit, breaking down the workforce into two shifts can sometimes relieve congestion, and improve each employee's ability to get a job done. This idea is especially useful in functions involving paper-processing. Such an approach can also sometimes avoid the need for a physical expansion of a physical plant devoted to such an operation.

Finally, some functions having special security or operational requirements, such as exercise or programming for a protective custody unit, often work better when operated during a

quiet shift, such as late at night. Prisoners can get access to resources and areas not usually available to them, without compromising security or classification objectives.

In each of the above approaches, special incentives may be needed to motivate employees to work special hours. Several approaches are discussed in the following article: Nanda and Browne, "Hours of Work, Job Satisfaction, and Productivity", in PUBLIC PRODUCTIVITY REVIEW, Volume II, No. 3, New York, Center for Productive Public Management, 445 W59th, New York, 10019).

The fourth method is an old one which might deserve reconsideration. That is the use of PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT. There are two reasons why this might be desirable. First, an employee working a shorter shift could be used during a period of peak demand in an operation, without the expense of employment during non-peak hours. A part-time employee might be substituted for a full-time one. Second, the employment of part-time personnel may give an institution access to a potential workforce at a time when pay rates or other incentives for fulltime employees are not sufficient to fill all authorized positions. This may become increasingly important when private salary and wages increase to cover inflation, but public salaries and wages do not.

At the Minnesota Correctional Facility at St. Cloud, students are hired as part time correctional officers. They are used to supervise a recreation program during the evenings for four hours. Two half-time employees can cover the program all days of the week, as well as provide for their leave time, because the one full time position, divided as two half time positions, provides a potential of ten four-hour periods per week. This is sufficient to cover the seven days as well as leave. If a fulltime position were used, the same level of coverage could not be achieved.

The fifth alternative shift pattern concept is the SPLIT SHIFT. The type of pattern is typically used in the restaurant industry, where work demand peaks at mealtime. Under such a system, an employee would work, for example, for three hours at lunchtime, and for five hours in the evening, with a three hour break between the two periods. This has clear advantages for the employer, because he or she pays for employees only for those hours where demand is greatest. The value of this pattern for the employee is less clear. For example, in the above illustration, the employee commits eleven hours per work day to work, unless he or she can productively use the three hours in between. This would probably depend upon whether the employee resides near to work, or whether the worksite is near to shopping or other areas where the employee might typically need to go to anyway.

In evaluating possible changes in work hour patterns at an institution, a manager should keep in mind the basic ways in which such changes could improve productivity.

First, alternative patterns of work hours can make the

number of employees on duty at any time correspond more closely to the actual work requirements at the time. Slack-time is reduced.

Second, longer periods of work can increase the ratio of productive time to preparation time. If, for example, an institution counts an employee as reporting for duty when he or she first enters the institution, the process of reporting for duty, shift briefings, and assuming posts could take up to an hour per day. On an eight hour day this would represent 12.5% of the shift time, while on a ten hour day this would represent 10% of the shift time. This relatively small differences can become expensive if they generate overtime, or if they create the need for two shifts of personnel to do work that could almost be accomplished by one.

Third, variations in work hour patterns can be used as non-monetary, no-cost incentives for employees to become productive in other areas. For example, employees in a clerical area showing the greatest productivity could be given the first opportunity to participate in a flextime program. At a time when budgets are tight, such incentives can be valuable tools.

Finally, variations in work hours can contribute to increased levels of employee satisfaction. Higher morale can cause greater productivity and lower attrition rates, enabling savings in employment and training costs of new employees, while retaining the advantages of an experienced workforce. Increased levels of employee satisfaction can occur as a result of the following factors.

Employees can tailor their work hours to allow accomplishment of personal goals. These may be leisure pursuits, personal activities such as shopping or banking, or family responsibilities such as picking up a child at a day care center. With the increased incidence of families where both spouses are employed, the ability to tailor work hours more flexibly will become increasingly important.

Alternative work hour patterns can have direct economic advantages for employees. For example, if an employee has to drive to work a significant distance, working four ten-hour days, rather than five eight-hour days, can result in a 20% savings in gasoline and vehicle wear and tear. Assuming that an employee drives 25 miles to and from work, which is not unusual in a rural area, and assuming that it costs about 20 cents per mile for the trip, eliminating a trip per week would save ten dollars per week or \$500 per year. After taxes, since savings are not taxed, this is equal to a \$600 to \$800 raise, which as a supplement to a regular raise in a lean-budget year, is worth considering.

Also, such variations may improve working conditions,

especially in crowded or congested areas, where a multiple shift operation reduces the number of people on duty at any time in the area.

Organizing a staffing pattern is an ongoing activity. A continuing process of reevaluation, and revision to respond to changing work operations, is necessary.

CHAPTER FOUR  
AN EXAMINATION OF SPECIFIC STAFFING ISSUES

A. INTRODUCTION

All decisions about staffing of prisons and jails can be divided into two types: those which are technical, dealing with the process of managing staff levels, or translating posts and positions into required numbers of employees, and those which are fundamental, dealing with the absolute question of whether to include a given post or position, at a given location and time, within a staffing pattern. Within this report, the chapter on management of posts and positions generally dealt with technical decisions, while the chapter on determining and evaluating staff requirements generally dealt with fundamental decisions.

This chapter attempts to focus on the fundamental questions again, by examining and comparing the staffing levels of various prisons and jails. The analysis should provide some ideas, and some general guidelines, for those who must evaluate existing levels of staff, or develop proposals for the operation of new facilities. The report and its recommendations are not a substitute for the task analysis processes discussed earlier, because correctional institutions are usually quite different from one another. However, application of some of the suggestions developed later in the report should assist the staff planner or evaluator in the following ways:

It should provide a relatively comprehensive list of the task areas to be considered, to provide for all of the potential functions of a given institution.

It should direct a planner or evaluator to areas of potential over- or understaffing, by enabling comparison to the general rates of employment per hundred prisoners in other institutions.

It should stimulate some new ideas, and suggest alternative approaches to the accomplishment of institutional goals.

It is important to note, however, that this project is not intended as a national survey of staffing patterns, or as a survey of the characteristics of staffing patterns associated with certain types of prisons. The institutional staffing patterns which are presented provide examples of approaches to staffing prisons and jails, and illustrate various levels of staff deployment. However, the staffing statistics presented in Volume I, and the specific and detailed descriptions in Volume II, are intended as illustrations of specific approaches, and not as proof of the utility of these approaches. Ultimately, decisions about specific staffing patterns have to be based upon a specific analysis of the goals and tasks of each institution, and the levels of work generated by those tasks, rather than by reference to general guidelines or average situations. As the application of concepts of public administration and management

are more generally applied and tested in the field of corrections, perhaps more specific rules may evolve; and perhaps this report may serve as a starting point for such an effort.

There are several interesting studies which are mentioned several times in this chapter. One is entitled "Staffing Guide for the Federal Prison System", which was published in late 1980 as a general guide to the staffing patterns of institutions within the Federal Prison System. It is an excellent example of the application of a comparative methodology to the analysis of staffing patterns. It establishes expected levels of staff for various functions based upon the prevailing levels of staff at existing institutions, and based upon the recommendations of key managers within the institutions as to their needs for a reasonable level of institutional operation, but not an ideal one.

Later in this chapter, these guidelines will be cited several times, to support or contrast the levels of staffing in the state and local institutions within this project. In such instances, the rates per 100 prisoners have been calculated according to the instructions in the manual for two hypothetical institutions, one with a capacity of 375, and one with a capacity of 950. There is an element of judgement involved due to differences in functional organization between federal, state, and local institutions, but the comparisons should be reasonably accurate. The manual observes that generally the federal institutions have fewer employees than many comparable state institutions.

Another project is entitled "Comparison of Staffing in Maryland Correctional Facilities Having Over 500 Population With Those of Other States". It was developed by the Maryland Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning in December, 1980. It is a survey of the total staffing levels of prisons with capacities of greater than 500 prisoners. The specific observations will be discussed later in the chapter when total levels of staffing are compared.

Two other studies are also cited. The first is American Prisons and Jails, Volume III, (Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980), authored by Joan Mullen and Bradford Smith. This survey focuses primarily upon prison and jail crowding, but also provides data on overall staffing levels of these facilities.

The Center for Public Productivity at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City, at the time of publication of this monograph, is completing a report entitled National Survey of Correctional Institution Employee Attrition Rates. Since the author of this monograph is also an author of the attrition project, data from that survey has been incorporated into this monograph at certain points. The data is based upon a survey of 200 state correctional institutions.

Institutions which have been included in this staffing monograph have been selected primarily so as to reflect a geographical and functional diversity. Generally, they are categorized in four ways: age, size, security, and jurisdiction.

Older facilities are those constructed prior to 1950. Most of the newer ones have been constructed since 1975, and several are still under construction at this time. In those instances, the staffing information is based upon plans. In that tables included in this chapter, newer facilities are identified by an asterisk, as follows: "\*".

Large sized facilities are those with over 1000 prisoners, and smaller ones are those with less than 1000 prisoners.

Security is divided into two categories: maximum-medium, and minimum. Maximum-medium security facilities are those which offer secure perimeters either by walls or fences, and which offer relatively secured internal conditions including cells or rooms in most instances. The minimum security units offer no physical perimeter security.

Jurisdiction is either state or local. The local facilities are so functionally different from the state facilities that they are categorized separately.

Generally, the staffing pattern statistics, and the detailed tables presented in Volume II, are developed based upon the operating documents of the institutions involved. However, there are several exceptions. The Federal institutions' patterns are based upon central office documents. The non-correctional officer positions are highly reliable and detailed. However, the officer posts are developed from documentation which was accurate, but somewhat less precise in description. Also, several facilities, including the Oak Park Heights unit and the new local facilities are based upon planned or recommended staffing patterns, not actual operational documents.

## B. REVIEW OF STAFFING LEVELS BY FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY

In Volume II, actual staffing patterns of the institutions discussed above are presented. The positions are divided into functional categories, so that positions associated with common tasks can be compared from institution to institution. This arrangement is also intended to provide a staff planner or evaluator with a systematic list of general and specific functions which can be used as a check in studying the adequacy of any given pattern of staff. This section will review each category of staff, and provide observations and guides specific to the types of tasks subsumed under each category.

### 1. ADMINISTRATION

The administration category includes two types of positions: Those associated with the general leadership of the institution,

such as the executive office of the warden, and positions which provide services of a high level and general nature which cut across the remaining categories. Such positions would include public information, legal services to the institutional staff, or administrative planning. Within all tables included in this chapter, the "\*" indicates an institution built since 1960.

TABLE IV-1: ADMINISTRATION

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	14.0	2.3	0.8	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	11.0	2.4	0.7	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	9.0	2.4	1.5	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	9.0	1.7	1.0	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 5.0	3.3	1.3	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 11.5	3.8	3.0	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 8.0	2.9	1.3	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 7.0	1.9	1.9	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 12.0	3.1	3.1	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 6.0	5.7	1.4	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	2.0	3.4	1.3	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	3.0	3.2	0.8	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 9.0	2.1	1.6	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 9.0	3.9	1.6	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACILITY	7.0	5.9	4.4	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	13.0	4.8	2.1	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	15.0	5.3	3.0	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 8.0	4.0	1.9	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 7.0	4.6	3.6	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 9.0	3.1	2.3	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	11.3	2.1	0.9	3
400-800 CAPACITY	9.6	3.9	1.8	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	7.1	3.6	2.4	9
OLDER FACILITIES	9.4	3.9	2.4	9
NEWER FACILITIES	8.2	3.1	1.6	11
ALL FACILITIES	8.7	3.5	1.9	20

This table illustrates the levels of staff associated with administration for the institutions in the project. The approximate range is one to three positions per 100 prisoners. In the Federal Prison System Guide (FPS Guide), 2.1 positions per hundred prisoners are recommended for a 375 bed institution, and 0.9 per hundred for a 950 bed prison. The higher end of the range within the state institution sample tends to occur under the following conditions:

Institutions which are not part of a larger system, and

which therefore provide for the functions of a general departmental administrative office, such as the Onandaga facility, tend to have higher needs.

Institutions which have complex functions, such as a jail or a maximum security prison tend to have more staff.

Smaller facilities tend to have higher rates, presumably because of the need for a minimal level of positions regardless of size.

The next table illustrates the clerical staff level associated with the institutions. In the presentations, all clerical positions are shown with the functional areas served. This table permits an examination of total levels.

TABLE IV-2 CLERICAL

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	37.0	6.0	2.2	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	20.0	4.4	1.3	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	17.0	4.5	2.8	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	27.0	5.1	3.0	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 8.0	5.2	2.0	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 20.5	6.8	5.4	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 11.0	4.0	1.8	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 12.0	3.3	3.3	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 16.0	4.1	4.2	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 1.0	1.0	0.2	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	4.0	6.9	2.7	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	5.0	5.3	1.3	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 30.0	7.1	5.2	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 19.0	8.3	3.4	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	8.0	6.8	5.0	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	6.0	2.2	1.0	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	4.0	1.4	0.8	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 9.4	4.7	2.3	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 9.0	6.0	4.7	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 5.0	1.7	1.3	400

The patterns suggest that a normal level of clerical staff is about five percent of the total staff. Lower levels suggest undercivilianization, where correctional officers perform clerical functions which can be completed more efficiently and at lower cost by clerical employees, or simply levels of clerical staff which appear to be too low.

## 2. BUSINESS MANAGEMENT



This category includes management support functions, as contrasted to operations support. Types of positions include business office staff such as accountants, personnel staff, and commissary employees. Functions such as mail processing are included here if the task is primarily logistical, but are included in correctional officer functions if the primary purpose is security.

TABLE IV-3: BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	29.0	4.7	1.7	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	34.0	7.4	2.3	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	16.0	4.2	2.7	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	21.0	4.0	2.3	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 5.0	3.3	1.3	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 17.0	5.7	4.5	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 15.0	5.4	2.5	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 8.0	2.2	2.2	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 14.0	3.6	3.7	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 1.0	1.0	0.2	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	6.0	10.3	4.0	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	11.0	11.6	2.9	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 19.0	4.5	3.3	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 21.0	9.2	3.7	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACILITY	3.0	2.5	1.9	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	1.0	0.4	0.2	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	9.0	3.2	1.8	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 16.0	8.1	3.8	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 3.0	2.0	1.6	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 6.0	2.1	1.5	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	28.0	5.4	2.1	3
400-800 CAPACITY	12.3	4.5	2.3	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	8.1	4.8	2.6	9
OLDER FACILITIES	11.9	3.6	2.2	9
NEWER FACILITIES	13.5	5.7	2.5	11
ALL FACILITIES	12.8	4.8	2.4	20

The table for business management indicates some very stable rates and percentages, of about five percent of the total staff, and two to three positions per hundred prisoners. An examination of the specific tables suggests that the majority of the positions are associated with the accounting and fiscal management function. In the FPS Guide, 4.8 positions per hundred are recommended for a 375 bed institution, and 2.5 per hundred prisoners for a 950 bed institution.

### 3. SUPPORT OPERATIONS

Support operations include logistical support functions such as food service, building and vehicle maintenance, and warehouse operation. The table suggests a range of levels of about ten percent of staff, and about four to seven positions per hundred prisoners. The FPS Guide suggests about 8.5 per hundred for a 375 bed institution, and 4.4 per hundred for a 950 bed institution, although several factors about a specific institution could modify this level.

TABLE IV-4: SUPPORT OPERATIONS

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	46.0	7.4	2.7	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	76.0	16.6	5.1	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	29.0	7.6	4.8	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	47.0	8.9	5.2	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 12.0	7.8	3.0	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 22.0	7.3	5.8	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 41.0	14.8	6.8	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 38.0	10.5	10.6	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 70.0	18.0	18.4	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 11.0	10.5	2.6	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	6.0	10.3	4.0	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	21.0	22.1	5.6	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 46.8	11.1	8.1	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 31.0	13.5	5.5	565
LOCAL FACILITIES				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	11.1	9.4	6.9	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	13.0	4.8	2.1	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	34.0	12.0	6.9	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 17.0	8.6	4.1	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 10.0	6.6	5.2	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 14.9	5.2	3.7	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	56.3	11.0	4.3	3
400-800 CAPACITY	27.9	10.4	5.1	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	22.8	10.8	7.0	9
OLDER FACILITIES	33.4	11.0	6.8	9
NEWER FACILITIES	26.9	10.4	5.1	11
ALL FACILITIES	29.8	10.7	5.9	20

The age of a facility does not appear to be associated with higher or lower levels, suggesting perhaps that while older facilities have more maintenance problems, newer facilities have more space per prisoner or employee to be maintained. The FPS



Guide confirms this observation by providing for additional staff over a baseline level if an institution is built before 1940, or if it has a high level of gross square footage. As a rough guide, an additional employee is allowed for every 50,000 square feet over 300,000, and comparable deductions are made for less gross footage. Thus an older institution might lose staff because it has less footage per prisoner than a newer one with a comparable capacity, but it would gain two positions because of its age. An examination of the actual staffing tables suggests that the institutions with very high rates have greater levels of functional separation of staff types, than those with lower rates, even though the numbers of staff may be comparable.

#### 4. PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Programs and services includes case management, education, work programs, recreation, and religion. This category varies markedly according to the function of the institution involved. There are generally six to eight employees per 100 prisoners, representing ten to fifteen percent of the total staff. The only clear distinction is that local institutions have very few employees in these functions.

TABLE IV-5 PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	83.0	13.4	4.9	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	114.0	25.0	7.6	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	93.0	24.5	15.5	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	64.0	12.1	7.1	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 20.0	13.0	5.0	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 32.5	10.9	8.6	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 28.0	10.1	4.7	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 20.0	5.5	5.6	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 58.0	14.9	15.2	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING' C.I.	* 16.0	15.3	3.8	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	6.0	10.3	4.0	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	27.0	28.4	7.2	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 105.1	24.9	18.1	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 51.0	22.2	9.0	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	11.0	9.3	6.9	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	1.0	0.4	0.2	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	12.0	4.2	2.4	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 25.7	13.0	6.2	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 12.0	8.0	6.3	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 12.0	4.2	3.0	400

#### SUMMARY

	# OF CASES			
CAPACITY OVER 800	87.0	16.8	6.5	3
400-800 CAPACITY	41.5	14.3	7.5	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	22.1	11.6	6.9	9
OLDER FACILITIES	42.0	13.2	7.9	9
NEWER FACILITIES	37.6	13.7	6.4	11
ALL FACILITIES	39.6	13.5	7.1	20

The FPS Guide suggests a level of 6.6 per hundred for the 375 bed institution, and 4.6 per hundred for the 950 bed institution, although it carefully observes that the actual levels for a specific institution would be determined by the specific activities of the prisoners and the mission of the institution. In addition, the FPS Guide includes counselors within the Unit Management function. For this project, the FPS figures were adjusted to show the movement of the counselors to the program category, so that the comparisons are more valid.

The following tables illustrate industry and program staffing levels separately.

TABLE IV-6: INDUSTRY

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
U.S.P. ATLANTA	88.0	19.3	5.9	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	18.0	4.7	3.0	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	19.0	3.6	2.1	900
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 14.0	4.7	3.7	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 3.0	1.1	0.5	600
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 2.0	0.5	0.5	381
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	12.0	12.6	3.2	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 4.0	0.9	0.7	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 8.0	3.5	1.4	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
MCC: NEW YORK	* 1.0	0.5	0.2	416

TABLE IV-7: EDUCATION/VOTEC

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	33.0	5.3	1.9	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	25.0	5.5	1.7	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	38.0	10.0	6.3	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	8.0	1.5	0.9	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 4.0	2.6	1.0	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 5.0	1.7	1.3	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 8.0	2.9	1.3	600
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 28.0	7.2	7.3	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 11.0	10.5	2.6	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	2.0	3.4	1.3	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	4.0	4.2	1.1	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 61.1	14.5	10.5	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 14.0	6.1	2.5	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	1.0	0.8	0.6	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	0.0	0.0	0.0	630
MCC: NEW YORK	* 1.0	0.5	0.2	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 1.0	0.7	0.5	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 2.0	0.7	0.5	400

An examination of the specific staffing pattern presentations suggests some basic issues which determine levels of program and activity staff.

Does the institution intend that each prisoner have a significant daily activity, or is a substantial portion of the population inactive?

Does the education program offer a high degree of specialization, so that teachers with very specific skills are employed, or is the program more limited to general education? To the extent that specialization exists, especially in vocational training, high levels of staff may be required. The table showing education/votec positions by institution illustrates this. Both the MCF St. Cloud and the Vienna Correctional Center have large, specialized programs, which require high levels of staff.

The industry table illustrates that where significant programs are operated, a range of three to six positions per hundred prisoners exists, translating to about six to twelve positions per hundred prisoners actually working in industries. Some institutions have lower levels because correctional officers assigned to industries supplement the industry workers' tasks, while other institutions have higher levels of industry workers and few correctional

officers.

## 5. MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

Medical and treatment positions include mental health, drug abuse treatment professions, psychologists, as well as the traditional medical positions. These data should be interpreted with special caution, because each institution employs personnel under contract to varying extents, and uses services provided by other agencies. Thus, several institutions which show practically no medical staff actually have very good programs provided by external agencies. It was not possible to identify the level of time expended by these agencies on correctional medicine, as opposed to other medical services.

TABLE IV-8: MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	16.5	2.7	1.0	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	32.0	7.0	2.1	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	15.3	4.0	2.6	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	20.0	3.8	2.2	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 19.6	12.7	4.9	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 34.0	11.4	8.9	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 6.0	2.2	1.0	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 19.3	5.3	5.3	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 13.0	3.3	3.4	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 4.0	3.8	1.0	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	0.0	0.0	0.0	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	6.0	6.3	1.6	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 14.5	3.4	2.5	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 23.0	10.0	4.1	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	1.0	0.8	0.6	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	0.0	0.0	0.0	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	0.0	0.0	0.0	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 16.0	8.1	3.8	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 1.0	0.7	0.5	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 3.0	1.0	0.8	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	22.8	4.5	1.8	3
400-800 CAPACITY	9.8	3.9	1.9	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	10.8	4.6	2.9	9
OLDER FACILITIES	11.7	3.6	2.2	9
NEWER FACILITIES	12.6	4.9	2.4	11
ALL FACILITIES	12.2	4.3	2.3	20

As a general guide, it appears that when an institution

provides medical services inhouse, or has been capable of showing external staff on the printouts in this report, a range of three to five positions per hundred prisoners exists. Special attention by medically competent individuals should be given to development of a medical staffing pattern. This is illustrated by the following tables:

TABLE IV-9: MEDICAL

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	11.0	1.8	0.6	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	21.0	4.6	1.4	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	6.0	1.6	1.0	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	14.0	2.7	1.6	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 17.6	11.4	4.4	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 12.5	4.2	3.3	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 2.0	0.7	0.3	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 12.8	3.5	3.5	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 9.0	2.3	2.4	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 1.0	1.0	0.2	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	2.0	2.1	0.5	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 10.5	2.5	1.8	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 15.0	6.5	2.7	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	0.0	0.0	0.0	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	0.0	0.0	0.0	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	0.0	0.0	0.0	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 11.0	5.5	2.6	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 0.0	0.0	0.0	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 0.0	0.0	0.0	400

TABLE IV-10: MENTAL HEALTH

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
U.S.P. ATLANTA	4.0	0.9	0.3	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	4.0	1.1	0.7	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	1.0	0.2	0.1	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 1.0	0.7	0.3	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 15.0	5.0	3.9	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 3.0	1.1	0.5	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 1.0	0.3	0.3	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 3.0	0.8	0.8	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 2.0	1.9	0.5	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	4.0	4.2	1.1	375
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 4.0	1.7	0.7	565

LOCAL FACILITIES....

ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	1.0	0.8	0.6	160
MCC: NEW YORK	* 2.0	1.0	0.5	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 1.0	0.7	0.5	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 3.0	1.0	0.8	400

There are several reasons why it is probable that a higher level of staff may be required for prisoners than for a comparable number of citizens in the general public:

Prisoners tend, as a group, to have more medical problems than average citizens. This is because many of them never took good care of their health prior to going to prison. Thus, the workload per medical employee will be higher for a prisoner population than for a comparably sized group of non-prisoners.

Working in prison can tend to be somewhat inefficient, because of the coordination of functional activities with security imperatives. As a result, medical staff may not be able to see patients as efficiently as on the outside, because of the need to escort prisoners brought to them, or the need for the medical staff to go to the units to see the prisoners.

Prisoners tend to fake illness, or show a great degree of interest and concern for relatively minor symptoms. As a result, a greater amount of time may be expended in diagnosing and screening cases than would be expended with a group of citizens.

The FPS Guide is generally consistent with the levels observed in the state institutions, suggesting about 3.5 medical employees per hundred prisoners. The Guide suggests, however, that several medically specialized institutions must be considered as separate cases. The Guide also assumes that some services are provided under external contracts. Thus, use of this Guide, or the guidelines from the state institutions should only be done in the context of a more detailed study by medically competent officials.

6. CONTROL POINTS

The following table illustrates observed staffing levels for correctional officer control stations and supervisory posts.

TABLE IV-11: CONTROL POINTS

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	77.2	12.5	4.5	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	37.9	8.3	2.5	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	44.9	11.8	7.5	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	31.9	6.0	3.5	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 15.7	10.2	3.9	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 24.1	8.0	6.3	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 37.7	13.6	6.3	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 45.7	12.6	12.7	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 37.5	9.6	9.8	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 21.3	20.3	5.1	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	8.7	15.0	5.8	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	10.9	11.5	2.9	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 44.0	10.4	7.6	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 19.5	8.5	3.5	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	12.1	10.2	7.6	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	65.0	24.1	10.3	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	36.2	12.8	7.3	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 27.7	14.0	6.7	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 16.8	11.2	8.8	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 36.7	12.7	9.2	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	49.0	8.9	3.5	3
400-800 CAPACITY	37.0	14.4	6.8	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	23.1	11.2	7.4	9
OLDER FACILITIES	32.9	12.9	7.1	9
NEWER FACILITIES	32.3	11.6	6.1	11
ALL FACILITIES	32.6	12.2	6.6	20

This category, and those which follow, are reserved for functions generally completed by correctional officers. The control points category includes general security leadership, and fixed posts supporting overall leadership such as a control center, and posts which primarily control or supervise movement within a facility. Generally, it appears that about twelve to fifteen percent of the staff is associated with such functions, or approximately seven officers per hundred prisoners. In larger institutions, the rates are somewhat lower.

#### 7. PERIMETER SECURITY

The following table illustrates observed levels of staffing to provide for perimeter security.

TABLE IV-12: PERIMETER SECURITY

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	46.5	7.5	2.7	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	43.0	9.4	2.9	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	17.6	4.6	2.9	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	36.2	6.9	4.0	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 10.4	6.8	2.6	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 8.4	2.8	2.2	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 37.1	13.4	6.2	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 26.4	7.3	7.3	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 53.7	13.8	14.1	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 24.8	23.7	5.9	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	0.0	0.0	0.0	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	0.0	0.0	0.0	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 9.9	2.3	1.7	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 9.2	4.0	1.6	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	3.4	2.9	2.1	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	0.0	0.0	0.0	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	6.9	2.4	1.4	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 12.6	6.4	3.0	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 5.1	3.4	2.6	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 5.5	1.9	1.4	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	41.9	7.9	3.2	3
400-800 CAPACITY	14.8	7.1	2.9	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	12.5	4.3	3.5	9
OLDER FACILITIES	20.6	8.0	4.2	9
NEWER FACILITIES	15.6	4.3	2.5	11
ALL FACILITIES	17.8	6.0	3.2	20

Perimeter security posts are towers, entrance posts for both public, prisoners, and materials, and roving patrol posts. Generally, unless a facility is minimum security, three to six positions per hundred prisoners are devoted to this function. Older facilities appear to devote greater levels of staff to this function, reflecting the trend in modern institutions away from towers, towards electronic surveillance with either single towers or roving patrols, or designs where the shell of the facility is the perimeter.

#### 8. UNIT SUPERVISION

Unit supervision includes posts associated with housing units, such as officers who work cellruns, or operate doors or gates to cells or rooms. This is a very important category of staffing because it constitutes one-fifth to one-third of all institutional staff. In general, between ten and twenty

positions per hundred prisoners are devoted to this function. There is great variation in levels, however, reflecting a diversity of operating concepts and standards for units. The FPS Guide suggests a unit staffing level of about 3.5 employees per hundred prisoners, or 4.5 if case managers within the housing units are included. The highest possible level, for a very specialized small unit, would be 7 per hundred prisoners.

TABLE IV-13: UNIT SUPERVISION

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	99.5	16.1	5.9	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	60.5	13.3	4.1	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	108.5	28.5	18.1	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	186.2	35.3	20.7	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 49.3	32.1	12.3	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 113.3	37.8	29.8	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 63.9	23.1	10.6	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 161.6	44.7	44.9	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 97.0	24.9	25.5	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 15.1	14.4	3.6	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	12.0	20.6	8.0	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	8.6	9.1	2.3	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 135.6	32.1	23.4	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 35.6	15.5	6.3	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	53.9	45.6	33.7	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	133.5	49.5	21.2	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	85.9	30.3	17.3	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 52.6	26.5	12.6	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 66.2	43.9	34.5	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 106.0	36.7	26.5	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	115.4	21.5	10.2	3
400-800 CAPACITY	78.8	27.5	14.1	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	74.2	32.8	24.2	9
OLDER FACILITIES	82.1	31.6	20.7	9
NEWER FACILITIES	82.3	26.9	15.9	11
ALL FACILITIES	82.2	29.0	18.1	20

This is the greatest area of contrast between the FPS recommendations and the observed conditions within the state institutions. A comparison between the federal and state institutions in the sample suggests that this guideline is reasonably accurate as it applies to federal operations. In those institutions taken together, 221 unit officers supervise 3449 prisoners, for a rate of 6.4 This is comparable to their Guide, but not comparable to the state operations. The following is a selection of concepts which the author has observed:

TABLE IV-14: UNIT SUPERVISION STAFFING MODELS

MODEL	NUMBER CONTROL	NUMBER ROVING	TYPICAL RATES
INTERMITTENT	0	LT-1	5
INTERNAL	0	1	8
EXTERNAL	1	LT-1	10
PAIR	1	1	15
DOUBLE BACKUP	1	2	20
TRIPLE BACKUP	1	3	25

The rates are estimated based upon a unit of about 30 prisoners. In a smaller unit of 15-20 prisoners, the rate would double, and in a larger unit of 50-100 prisoners, the rate would halve.

The unit staffing concepts presented above are based upon the following operating concepts and assumptions:

The INTERMITTENT model assumes that no staff is specifically assigned to the housing unit. An officer intermittently observes the housing unit, generally from outside of the unit, to ascertain whether any unusual incidents have occurred. This pattern is often found in jails and in minimum security institutions. While it does result in a very low number of employees devoted to unit supervision, it provides for a very poor level of supervision. It is practically impossible to provide for any control of prisoner behavior with this system. If the units are very large, then counts of prisoners are also difficult.

The INTERNAL model places an officer within the housing unit, without a backup officer capable of observing him or her from a secure location. This is a reasonably adequate level of staffing if the prisoners within the unit behave reliably, or if the prisoners are secure in cells or rooms while the unit is staffed this way. A form of backup can be provided with electronic communication systems, provided that the communication can be initiated by the officer, and does not rely on someone else to notice a problem such as would be the case with a close circuit television surveillance backup system. The problem with cctv in this instance is that there are behaviors which are dangerous to the officer which the cctv would not pick up, such as a threatened action as opposed to an actual one. Realistically, if the population within the unit is potentially dangerous, the intermittent model should not be used unless the prisoners are secured in their cells.

The EXTERNAL model calls for continuous observation from outside of the unit, with intermittent tours of inspection by an officer inside of the unit, while that officer is observed by the officer assigned to the outside. The external model is intended to be a safer situation for the



supervision of a more dangerous population while they are outside of their cells in day space areas. However, this author is of the opinion that it is generally preferable to use a system which places one or more officers inside of the unit at all times. The assignment of officers to routinely external unit posts creates an "us versus them" mentality between officers and prisoners, and does not enable a rapid response to any internal problems on the unit. It also tends to limit the role of the officer to inspection functions.

The PAIRED model assumes one officer outside in a secure location, and another inside the unit with the prisoners. This model provides for an officer within the unit to not only supervise, but also to interact with and lead the prisoners. Besides enabling a broader range of supervisory behaviors by the officer, the assignment of officers to posts within units may provide an atmosphere which would also encourage non-correctional officer staff to deal with prisoners within the units, because officer supervision is readily available within the unit. To the extent that case management meetings, medical screenings and other staff contacts can occur on the units, less officer time is expended escorting prisoners to and from off-unit meetings.

The DOUBLE-BACKUP model assumes two officers within the unit and one outside. Thus, each officer within the unit is backed up by two other officers, one inside and one outside. This allows for a broader and stronger response to any problems on the unit, but also results in a probable staff rate which is higher than the typical rates for institutions in this study. The feasibility of this model would depend upon the size of the unit to be supervised. If housing units are relatively large, with over 75 prisoners per unit, then the double back-up model would be economically practical for many prisons. It might also be desirable from a supervision standpoint for more difficult populations.

The TRIPLE BACKUP model is used in some more complex facilities. The basic goal of this model is to visually chain officers from the external control station to the end of the unit, with the number of officers within the unit determined by the number of officer locations needed to eliminate blind areas, or officers not visible to other officers. As a result, the average officer can see two other officers, and is also backed up by the control station. Thus, the term triple backup evolves.

#### 9. INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

This category includes the supervision of program and work areas, as well as the supervision of general areas such as a central yard. In general, this appears to require a range of about five to ten officers per hundred prisoners.

TABLE IV-15: INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	200.3	32.3	11.8	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	36.0	7.9	2.4	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	45.2	11.9	7.5	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	100.2	19.0	11.1	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 13.9	9.0	3.5	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 22.0	7.3	5.8	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 20.8	7.5	3.5	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 30.6	8.5	8.5	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 25.0	6.4	6.6	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.C.	* 4.3	4.1	1.0	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	15.7	27.0	10.5	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	6.6	7.0	1.8	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 36.9	8.7	6.4	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 22.3	9.7	4.0	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	14.7	12.5	9.2	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	42.2	15.6	6.7	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	80.9	28.5	16.3	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 8.0	4.0	1.9	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 26.2	17.4	13.6	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 94.1	32.6	23.5	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	112.2	19.7	8.4	3
400-800 CAPACITY	32.6	11.3	5.9	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	27.7	14.2	9.2	9
OLDER FACILITIES	25.3	9.7	6.1	9
NEWER FACILITIES	56.2	17.2	9.1	11
ALL FACILITIES	42.3	13.9	7.8	20

There are several factors which influence the numbers of officers required:

Some facilities, such as the MCC in New York, confine most prisoner activity to the housing unit. As a result, the levels of staffing for activity supervision are low, since programs and recreation are supervised by unit staff.

Minimum security units often use the non-officer staff for whatever supervision may be required. Thus, in a small factory, the forman may function both as a task leader as well as a supervisor from a security perspective.

#### 10. EXTERNAL AND OTHER

This category covers external functions such as movement to

other institutions or to court. The actual positions for each institution vary significantly so that no meaningful observations can be made about this category.

#### 11. TOTAL POSITIONS

The total numbers of positions vary from about 25 per hundred to over 100, which means that there are more staff, for all shifts taken together, than prisoners.

TABLE IV-16: TOTAL POSITIONS

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	619.2	100.0	36.4	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	456.7	100.0	30.6	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	380.2	100.0	63.4	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	527.2	100.0	58.6	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 153.8	100.0	38.4	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 299.3	100.0	78.8	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 276.8	100.0	46.1	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 361.5	100.0	100.4	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 388.8	100.0	102.0	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 104.7	100.0	24.9	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	58.2	100.0	38.8	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	95.1	100.0	25.4	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 422.9	100.0	72.9	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 229.5	100.0	40.6	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	118.1	100.0	73.8	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	269.9	100.0	42.8	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	283.8	100.0	57.3	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 198.2	100.0	47.7	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 150.7	100.0	78.5	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 288.5	100.0	72.1	400
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	534.4	100.0	41.9	3
400-800 CAPACITY	270.8	100.0	49.5	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	212.7	100.0	67.6	9
OLDER FACILITIES	276.4	100.0	61.2	9
NEWER FACILITIES	290.5	100.0	52.7	11
ALL FACILITIES	284.2	100.0	56.5	20

All facilities together had a rate of 56. Several factors were associated with levels of staff lower than 56:

Newer facilities used slightly fewer positions than older ones, although in the three instances where old and new institutions were presented from the same systems, the newer

facilities require higher levels of staff than the older facilities. There are some differences as to function of the newer facilities which account for increased staff levels in certain functional categories, but not to such an extent as to explain the overall differences.

Larger facilities, as one might expect, have lower rates, although the rates seem to be lower for all functions. Thus, rather than being more efficient with respect to "overhead functions", it appears that the larger facilities provide less supervision, programs, and services to their populations than the smaller ones. Thus, they are not inherently more efficient than smaller ones. Presumably the smaller ones could operate with the lower levels of staff if they also provided the lower levels of supervision and services.

The FPS Guide does not provide a general observation as to overall staffing levels, because the numbers of correctional officers are determined, in part, by facility characteristics. The Maryland survey of prisons with capacities of greater than 500 provided data to support several specific observations:

The average institution had 32 employees per hundred prisoners, which compares to the finding in this project of 33 for the institutions with over 800 prisoners.

There were 19.8 correctional officers per hundred prisoners, as compared to the finding in this project of 26.5 for the larger institutions, and 36.4 overall.

In the Maryland project, the lowest statewide staffing level was found in Texas, with 11 employees per hundred prisoners, and the highest in Massachusetts, with 59.

American Prisons and Jails (Mullen & Smith, 1980) reports the following median staffing rates according to region and jurisdiction (Mullen & Smith, p.99 & 102):

TABLE IV-17 TOTAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICER STAFFING BY REGION AND JURIDICTION

JURISDICTION	N. EAST	N. CENTRAL	SOUTH	WEST	TOTAL
LOCAL (CO'S ONLY)	33	22	18	15	20
STATE (CO'S ONLY)	29	24	20	20	24

The following is a summary of staffing rates for 162 institutions responding to the National Survey of Correctional Institution Employee Attrition Rates.

TABLE IV-18: A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF CATEGORICAL STAFFING RATES

STAFF TYPE	INSTITUTION TYPE				TOTAL ALL	
	PRERELEASE ALL	LOWER SECURITY SMALL----LARGE	HIGHER SECURITY SMALL-----LARGE			
ADMINISTRATION	2	5	3	4	2	3
SUPPORT	7	6	10	9	6	7
LINE OFFICERS	12	21	26	29	20	21
SUPERV. OFFICERS	3	5	3	6	3	4
PROGRAM	2	7	7	7	4	5
OTHER	1	1	1	2	2	2
TOTAL CASES	27 (36)	45 (18)	50 (17)	57 (44)	37 (47)	40 (162)

The total rate for correctional officers is consistent with that presented in American Prisons and Jails, as their finding of 24 is quite close to the finding in the attrition survey project of 21 for line officers and four for supervisory officers, for a comparable total of 25. It is also very close to the finding of 26.5 for the institutions presented specifically in this report.

The next table illustrates the deployment of correctional officers by type of post or function, for the institutions in the previous table:

TABLE VI-19: OFFICER DEPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF POST

POST TYPE	INSTITUTION TYPE				TOTAL ALL	
	PRERELEASE ALL	LOWER SECURITY SMALL----LARGE	HIGHER SECURITY SMALL-----LARGE			
COMBINED CO RATE	15	26	29	34	22	24
PERIMETER UNITS	2.9	0.5	4.0	6.5	3.7	3.8
PROGRAM SUPERVISION	6.0	11.2	6.7	15.6	8.6	9.1
CONTROL POINTS	1.2	2.6	10.3	6.1	4.6	5.3
EXTERNAL FUNCTIONS	1.8	5.2	3.5	1.7	1.8	2.1
OTHER	0.4	2.1	0.5	1.7	0.7	0.7
	2.7	4.4	4.0	2.4	2.7	3.0

There are several observations which can be made based upon the tables which presented data on combined staff rates.

Facility size does not appear to have a clear and consistent relationship with staffing intensity. For example, prerelease centers appeared to be authorized fewer staff than more conventional institutions, but economy of larger-scale operation appeared to operate only in the larger high security category of institution (table 14).

Institutional size appeared to achieve lower staff intensity in both security categories only for administrative staff and correctional supervisors (table 14).

C. APPENDIX TABLES

The final set of tables illustrates the staffing patterns by shift. This is a more realistic view of the staffing patterns as they would actually function, and also eliminates differences in levels of total staffing which are due to differences in coverage factors. Additional tables include a summary of the "External and Other" positions, and groupings of positions in broad categories.

This chapter has presented some specific observations about staffing levels of functional areas of institutional organizations. Most readers will find the tables which follow to be sufficiently detailed to meet their needs. However, if one is completing a specific study of a staffing pattern, it is suggested that Volume II be obtained, as it provides a position by position summary for each institution.

TABLE IV-20  
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....								
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	71	4	5	0	3	0	89	5
U.S.P. ATLANTA	106	7	5	0	1	0	121	8
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	54	9	10	2	6	1	54	9
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	64	7	4	0	1	0	77	9
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	22	6	0	0	0	0	22	6
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	46	12	5	1	1	0	51	13
U.S.P. MARION	52	9	5	1	1	0	64	11
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	35	10	6	2	1	0	53	15
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	73	19	7	2	2	1	96	25
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	17	4	1	0	0	0	18	4
MINIMUM SECURITY....								
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	12	8	1	1	0	0	14	9
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	28	8	2	1	1	0	35	9
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	60	10	4	1	3	1	75	13
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	51	9	3	1	1	0	61	11
LOCAL FACILITIES....								
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	17	11	1	1	1	1	21	13
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	22	3	2	0	0	0	27	4
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	37	8	6	1	2	0	58	12
MCC: NEW YORK	37	9	1	0	0	0	41	10
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	17	9	1	0	1	0	20	10
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	24	6	2	1	0	0	30	7

TABLE IV-21  
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....								
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	94	6	1	0	1	0	100	6
U.S.P. ATLANTA	136	9	2	0	2	0	146	10
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	96	16	18	3	2	0	108	18
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	79	9	1	0	0	0	84	9
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	30	8	3	1	0	0	40	10
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	41	11	15	4	3	1	67	18
U.S.P. MARION	34	6	0	0	0	0	34	6
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	27	7	4	1	2	1	39	11
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	62	16	3	1	1	0	71	19
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	20	5	0	0	0	0	20	5
MINIMUM SECURITY....								
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	6	4	0	0	0	0	6	4
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	30	8	1	0	1	0	33	9
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	93	16	22	4	1	0	120	21
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	68	12	2	0	2	0	74	13
LOCAL FACILITIES....								
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	12	8	0	0	0	0	12	8
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	10	2	1	0	0	0	12	2
MCC: NEW YORK	35	8	2	0	2	0	42	10
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	13	7	0	0	0	0	13	7
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	9	2	2	1	1	0	15	4

TABLE IV-22  
UNIT OFFICERS

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....								
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	21	1	18	1	16	1	99	6
U.S.P. ATLANTA	13	1	12	1	12	1	61	4
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	46	8	38	6	16	3	109	18
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	45	5	38	4	27	3	186	21
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	13	3	12	3	6	2	49	12
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	32	8	28	7	12	3	113	30
U.S.P. MARION	16	3	12	2	12	2	64	11
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	37	10	37	10	18	5	162	45
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	25	7	20	5	11	3	97	25
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	6	1	3	1	1	0	15	4
MINIMUM SECURITY....								
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	3	2	3	2	3	2	12	8
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	3	1	2	1	1	0	9	2
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	28	5	28	5	26	4	136	23
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	13	2	6	1	5	1	36	6
LOCAL FACILITIES....								
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	14	9	11	7	7	4	54	34
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	28	4	33	5	17	3	134	21
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	17	3	17	3	13	3	86	17
MCC: NEW YORK	15	4	10	2	8	2	53	13
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	23	12	18	9	7	4	66	34
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	26	7	21	5	11	3	106	26

TABLE IV-23  
OTHER OFFICERS

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....								
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	121	7	58	3	13	1	331	19
U.S.P. ATLANTA	43	3	24	2	16	1	129	9
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	38	6	29	5	7	1	109	18
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	64	7	38	4	12	1	180	20
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	18	5	14	4	9	2	43	11
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	16	4	22	6	4	1	69	18
U.S.P. MARION	39	7	24	4	12	2	115	19
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	42	12	13	4	12	3	108	30
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	38	10	23	6	13	4	125	33
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	18	4	8	2	6	1	52	12
MINIMUM SECURITY....								
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	14	9	3	2	1	1	26	17
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	8	2	2	1	2	1	19	5
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	43	7	19	3	8	1	93	16
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	30	5	9	2	2	0	59	10
LOCAL FACILITIES....								
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	15	9	6	4	3	2	31	20
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	33	5	24	4	10	2	108	17
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	41	8	34	7	9	2	128	26
MCC: NEW YORK	23	6	11	3	6	2	63	15
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	18	9	11	6	4	2	51	27
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	37	9	33	8	10	3	138	34



TABLE VI-24  
TOTAL STAFF

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....								
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	306	18	82	5	34	2	619	36
U.S.P. ATLANTA	299	20	44	3	32	2	457	31
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	234	39	94	16	31	5	380	63
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	252	28	81	9	40	4	527	59
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	83	21	29	7	15	4	154	38
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	135	36	70	18	21	5	299	79
U.S.P. MARION	141	23	41	7	25	4	277	46
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	141	39	61	17	33	9	362	**
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	197	52	53	14	28	7	389	**
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	61	14	12	3	7	2	105	25
MINIMUM SECURITY....								
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	35	23	7	5	4	3	58	39
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	69	18	7	2	5	1	95	25
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	224	39	73	13	38	7	423	73
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	162	29	20	4	10	2	229	41
LOCAL FACILITIES....								
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	58	36	18	11	11	7	118	74
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	84	13	59	9	27	4	270	43
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	105	21	58	12	24	5	284	57
MCC: NEW YORK	110	27	24	6	16	4	198	48
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	71	37	30	16	12	6	151	78
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	96	24	58	15	22	6	289	72

TABLE IV-20: EXTERNAL AND OTHER STAFF

INSTITUTION	POSITIONS	%	RATE	CAPACITY
MAXIMUM AND MEDIUM SECURITY....				
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILITY	7.2	1.2	0.4	1700
U.S.P. ATLANTA	12.3	2.7	0.8	1493
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD	1.7	0.4	0.3	600
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON	11.7	2.2	1.3	900
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.	* 3.0	2.0	0.8	400
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS	* 14.6	4.9	3.8	380
U.S.P. MARION	* 19.4	7.0	3.2	600
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.	* 5.0	1.4	1.4	360
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION	* 8.7	2.2	2.3	381
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.	* 1.3	1.2	0.3	420
MINIMUM SECURITY....				
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN	1.7	3.0	1.2	150
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD	1.0	1.1	0.3	375
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER	* 2.0	0.5	0.3	580
F.C.I. FORT WORTH	* 7.8	3.4	1.4	565
LOCAL FACILITIES....				
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACIL	1.0	0.8	0.6	160
NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTION	1.2	0.5	0.2	630
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION	3.9	1.4	0.8	495
MCC: NEW YORK	* 14.6	7.4	3.5	416
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY	* 3.4	2.2	1.8	192
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION	* 1.3	0.5	0.3	100
SUMMARY				# OF CASES
CAPACITY OVER 800	10.4	2.0	0.8	3
400-800 CAPACITY	6.5	2.7	1.3	8
CAPACITY UNDER 400	4.4	2.0	1.4	9
OLDER FACILITIES	7.1	2.4	1.5	9
NEWER FACILITIES	5.4	2.2	1.1	11
ALL FACILITIES	6.1	2.3	1.2	20

CHAPTER FIVE  
IMPLEMENTATION

A. INTRODUCTION

In this final chapter of the first volume, we return to a major original goal of this project: assisting managers in the planning and evaluation of staffing levels. The review of approaches provided in previous chapters illustrates a variety of methods to conduct such evaluations. However, in prisons and jails as they are, several of these approaches will be more immediately useful than the others. These are TASK ANALYSIS and COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. There are several reasons for this:

Jobs are so variable, and consist of so many different tasks that Motion and Time Study would be economically impractical. By the time a "best method" was precisely defined for a task, the task would be slightly changed, and the analysis would be invalidated.

Productivity auditing is more useful when non-labor resources, such as machines, are to be substituted for labor. This is not highly feasible in real institutions. Even such originally promising concepts as closed circuit television surveillance have generally only succeeded in displacing staff from prisoner contact areas to control stations, resulting in a diminished capacity to respond to incidents which are detected. The methodology presented later in this chapter will permit analysis of the substitution of equipment for labor, but not as a central feature of the method.

Outcome Analysis and Process Analysis are highly individualized methods, depending upon the situation to be evaluated or the standard to be applied. Thus, a general method for such approaches is difficult to specify.

Therefore, this chapter will focus primarily upon task analysis and comparative analysis, with some application of productivity auditing. These two methods are highly applicable to prisons and jails for several reasons. First, they apply easily to personnel resources, which constitute the majority of the resources expended in prisons and jails. Second, they are highly different methods, so that the results of one approach can be used as a check on the other.

After carefully reading this chapter, you should be able to conduct a simple, yet complete analysis of the staffing level of a program or function within an institution.

B. PLANNING AND EVALUATING STAFF LEVELS:  
A MULTIPLE METHODS APPROACH

The basic purpose of this report is to assist officials who must either develop staffing patterns for new institutions, or evaluate current staffing patterns for existing institutions. This section suggests and describes an approach to such projects.

Any problem solving method should occur at a scale which corresponds to the problem. Thus, the development of a complete staffing pattern for a new institution deserves a decisionmaking process which allows for participation by several levels of management, as well as outside parties, such as budgetary agencies, which will ultimately influence final decisions about funding and approval. However, more limited problems, such as whether to hire another employee for a certain unit, might not require such a complex and lengthy process. One or two officials with awareness of the problems, and authority to act could meet, decide, and implement a course of action.

The steps described here could, depending upon the size and complexity of the problem, be completed as a mental process by one person, or could be completed as a complex organizational planning method involving many officials inside and outside of an organization over a period of months. For many situations, the specific example, procedures, and forms presented below are appropriate and sufficient.

The following are six steps which should be followed in planning and evaluating a staffing pattern. Even if the steps are followed only as elements of a mental process, they should improve the accuracy of subsequent decisions.

The first step is to DEFINE ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS AND PRIORITIES. This might be as thorough and complex as an institutional mission statement or master plan, or as simple as a list of functions of a records unit. In developing a list of such goals, however, the following guidelines are suggested:

Goals should be stated behaviorally rather than conceptually. An example of a behavioral goal statement would be "to assure that all prisoners can read at a sixth grade level", as compared to "to provide adequate general educational services".

A large organization would generate many goal statements, while a small department or office within an organization might require only five to ten.

Priorities can be identified either as rankings of the goals, or as levels within each goal. An example of a level within a goal would be "as a minimum objective, to assure that prisoners read at the sixth grade level, and as a desirable objective, to read at the tenth grade level." If priority levels are the same for each goal, then it is

possible to identify the resource levels to meet all goals at a minimal level, and then to identify the levels necessary to meet higher priorities.

The second step is to IDENTIFY TASKS AND STANDARDS for each goal. Meeting a goal requires that specific tasks be completed, such as escorting a prisoner from one place to another, or filing a record. The level of detail in defining tasks would be determined by the specific method used for later analysis. A variety of methods are suggested and discussed in Chapter Two of this report. The purpose of identifying standards is to determine what level of task completion completes the goal.

It is important to emphasize here the importance of facility design and technology in the determination of the specific tasks to be accomplished. An analysis of this can be especially important when a facility is being designed.

The third step is to MEASURE THE TASKS, AND THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MEET THEM. A very specific example would be the following: There are 1000 records to be filed per day, and one person can file an average of 200 records per day. A more general example would be that there will be an average of 100 students for the education program on an average day, and one teacher should have a class size of between twenty and thirty.

The fourth step is to DETERMINE THE NUMBERS OF EMPLOYEES NEEDED, AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS. Based upon an assessment, for each goal, of the numbers of tasks to be completed and the employees needed to accomplish given numbers of tasks, the specific number of employees needed for each goal area can be defined. The material in the final chapters of this report should be a source of comparative information about many areas of institutional operation.

The fifth step is to ORGANIZE THE STAFF. Such organization would include both hierarchical structures such as a chain of command, as well as shift patterns. Chapter Three discusses methods to organize staff, and provides illustrations of organizational structures and shift patterns.

The final step is to DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM. It is unlikely that an initial staffing recommendation will be entirely correct. As proposals are implemented, processes to continue to measure tasks completed, as well as the ultimate result of the tasks completed, provide information allow subsequent readjustment of staffing levels.

The expression "multiple methods approach" has been selected as a label for this method because it should be more than a sequence of steps. There is a sequence of six steps to the approach -- from defining goals and priorities to implementing an evaluation strategy -- but the completion of each step should include use of more than one method of analysis. The use of several methods is supported by experience in social science

research. Webb et al., in Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research In The Social Sciences (Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966) have observed:

Once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more independent measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced. The most persuasive evidence comes through a triangulation of measurement processes. If a proposition can survive the onslaught of a series of imperfect measures, with all their irrelevant error, confidence should be placed in it. (p. 3)

To the extent that the field of management has developed methods of defining correct numbers of employees to conduct tasks, or appropriate organizational arrangements for their deployment and supervision, the level of accuracy is often directly associated with the level of cost and time required to get answers. As a result, staffing decisions have to be made on the basis of incomplete information. The use of several methods to estimate the solution to a problem can sometimes be the next best approach.

A selection of specific staff analysis methods are described in Chapter Two. An example of a multiple methods approach would involve using two methods at each step in the planning process described above. For example, a task analysis approach might be used first, and then a comparative approach might be used second. The second approach would serve as a check on the first. Using task analysis and comparative approaches together is especially effective because they are very different methods, and rely on different sources of information as a basis for conclusions.

The multiple methods should be used at each phase in the process. In defining goals and priorities, task analysis would call for specific statements based upon the intended purposes of the institution. Comparative analysis would call for goal statements of other institutions which seem to be comparable. In identifying tasks and standards, task analysis would call for the description of the specific tasks involved in the process of achieving the goals. Comparative analysis would call for information about the tasks completed by comparable institutions in meeting their goals. The end result is that conclusions are based both upon a specific analysis of the functions of the institution under study, but also upon a comparison to other institutions.

#### C. EXAMPLE

The following is an example of a multiple methods approach to staff analysis, examining the number of counselors needed for a hypothetical institution. This example was selected because it provides a relatively simple and clear illustration of the method. Forms are used which are included as blanks at the end of the chapter. This permits managers to copy the forms and use them in actual situations.

This will be a hypothetical situation, because no single actual situation clearly illustrates most of the points which need explanation. Our example is an institution with an average population of 400, and a staff of 200, of whom 8 are counselors. The counseling staff appears to be overworked, and is doing poor quality work, and not completing many tasks. In preparation for a budget request, an analysis is to be made to determine the added number of counselors, if any, which might be needed. The institution has a relatively short length of stay, of less than one year. An average of forty prisoners are received each month, and an equal number are discharged or transferred, with ten to fifteen prisoners seeing the Parole Board each month. The mission of the institution includes a responsibility to provide both classification and counseling services. The Warden would like to improve the counseling services which are minimal at this point.

As stated in the previous section, the first step is to DEFINE ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS AND PRIORITIES. In this example, there are four overall goals to the counseling program: 1) maintaining records, 2) answering questions, 3) assisting in prisoner classification, and 4) counseling prisoners. The priorities for achievement of these goals vary, and two alternative priority levels will be illustrated later.

The second step is to IDENTIFY TASKS AND STANDARDS. The following are the tasks for each goal:

To MAINTAIN RECORDS, counselors must develop intake summaries for each incoming prisoner, and develop a parole summary for each one considered for parole.

To ANSWER QUESTIONS, counselors must respond to mail inquiries about prisoners, and they must respond to questions by each prisoner.

To ASSIST IN PRISONER CLASSIFICATION, counselors must participate in classification interviews.

To COUNSEL PRISONERS, counselors must conduct monthly interview sessions with each prisoner, and they must conduct weekly counseling sessions with prisoners who need and request such sessions.

It should be noted that these are simplified sets of goals and tasks. In a real prison or jail, more goals and tasks might be identified, but the essential process would be the same.

The third step is to MEASURE THE TASKS. On the following pages, forms labeled "1 TIME ALLOWANCE ANALYSIS", and "2 TASK FREQUENCY ANALYSIS", are presented. These forms are used to measure the time required to complete the tasks which constitute a job, and to measure the number of times these tasks must be completed during an hour, day or week.





The first form lists each task, and shows the time, in minutes, to complete each task, in six separate measurements. The column on the far right shows the average amount of time required to complete each task, in minutes. The form could be completed measuring time in larger increments, such as five to ten minutes, or hours, although minutes are more accurate. On the example form, classification interviews took an average of eleven minutes each, and intake summaries took an average of eighty-eight minutes to complete.

A variation in the use of this form would be to conduct time measurements of several alternative methods of completing a task, so that the most efficient method could be used later in the process. This would be especially important if the substitution of equipment for labor is under consideration. In the example form, word processors and a computer terminal to the prisoner record system have been introduced and evaluated, and task completion times for intake summaries were reduced from 88 minutes to 30 minutes, responding to mail from 14 minutes to 6 minutes, etc. The use of these measurements will be illustrated later.

Another variation would be to compare the time to complete a task by trained and experienced employees, contrasted with inexperienced employees. This would enable the establishment of time standards which could be used in the promotion or extraordinary reward of employees, and might also permit the determination of the precise value of training and experience in job performance.

An important consideration in timing work is to define adequate performance of a task. Usually, the time required to redo a task to correct error is included in the original time to do it in the first instance. Thus, a job which took six minutes to do originally, and four more minutes to correct, would be considered to have taken ten minutes to complete. An alternative approach is to total the amount of time taken to do the tasks, but divide it (to determine the average time per task) by the number of tasks completed correctly. This method is appropriate if defective task completions are discarded, rather than corrected. In using this method, however, more than six samples of work completion should be completed. A rule of thumb would be to sample completions until five rejections have occurred. This assures that rejections are properly represented in the estimates. Another approach is to sample the time to complete the tasks correctly. Then count the number of correct completions and errors in fifty attempts. Then multiply the correct completion time by the number of correct completions and divide by fifty. This method will work unless errors take much longer than correct completions.

A final suggestion is to measure task completion times when the employee is working at a normal rate, not at a hurried

rate. The rate should be sufficiently relaxed that the employee could realistically keep it up for a full working day. A major source of error in these types of studies is to develop overoptimistic estimates of work rates.

The second form is a tally of the number of times each task was completed over three separate one-day measures. The form could be filled out over a period of a week or month, or could be filled out retroactively for a month or year in the past. Again, the column on the extreme right provides the average number of times each task was completed over the time period studied.

Both of these forms can be completed by the employee whose job is being studied. Sometimes this increases the acceptance of the results of the study. It also adds another task to the list -- filling out these forms -- however, this should not take too long, and tends to slightly bias the results in favor of the employee. This is useful to point out should employees complain about completion of the forms.

In the example, classification interviews averaged six per day per counselor. It should be noted that sometimes, more objective information about the frequency of tasks can be obtained from other sources. For example, the number of parole summaries to be completed could be determined by the number of prisoners to be considered for parole. This might be a more reliable method of estimation of the frequency of this task, especially if, for example, the management is aware of possible factors in the future which would increase or decrease that estimate. Thus, if the frequency of a task can be objectively ascertained by another method, then the completion of this form would be unnecessary.

The fourth step is to DETERMINE THE NUMBERS OF EMPLOYEES NEEDED. On the following two pages, two forms are provided labeled "3 JOB DEFINITION", and "4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS SUMMARY". These forms are used to determine the appropriate numbers of employees to complete the specified tasks.

Form 3 uses measures in either weeks or hours. Figures as to task duration from form 1 must be translated into hours from minutes. Thus thirty minutes becomes .5 hours. If form 2 was completed over anything but weeks, the task frequency data must be translated into weekly counts. Thus, if a task is completed once per day, it must be shown as five times per week. If it occurs forty times per month, it must be translated to 10 times per week. The reason for not calculating these figures in hours and weeks originally is that the task duration measures are more accurate if they are originally measured in minutes, and the task frequency measures are more representative of the total scope of a job if they are based on a relatively long time period.

# 3

## JOB DEFINITION

TASK	normal			optimal		
	frequency	rate	total	frequency	rate	total
Classification interviews	160	0.2	32	160	0.2	32
Intake summaries	40	1.5	60	40	1.0	40
Monthly interviews	120	0.5	60	120	0.5	60
Respond to mail	320	0.5	160	320	0.1	32
Parole summaries	13	1.1	14	13	0.5	7
Inquiries	280	0.2	56	280	0.1	28
Counseling sessions	40	0.9	36	80	0.9	72
<b>total direct time</b>			418			271
+ on-job allowances		.091	38		.091	25
+ relief factor		.24	109		.24	71
<b>total hours per week</b>			565			367
÷ workhours per week			40			40
<b>total positions required</b>			14			9

# 4

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS SUMMARY

institution	function	population	number	percent	rate
MILLHAVEN		381/387	6	1.5%	1.6
MANNING		420/105	4	3.8%	0.9
JOE HARP		400/154	9	5.8%	2.3
VIENNA		580/423	17	4.0%	2.9
FORT WORTH		565/230	11	4.8%	1.9
average of comparison institutions				4.0%	1.9
current actual positions		400/200	8	4.0%	2.0
normal proposal			14	7.0%	3.5
optimal proposal			9	4.5%	2.3
final recommendation			9	4.5%	2.3

### COMMENTS:

Requires purchase and operation of a word processor and computer record system terminal. Clerical time and effort may also increase.

The frequency figures can be based upon the expected performance of one employee, or of a group of employees. In this instance, the frequency figures are based upon the numbers of tasks for all of the counselors in a given week. The result is, therefore, an estimate of the total number of counselors needed.

The data on the form can best be explained by examination on one item in detail. First, the information on form 3 will be completed for a "normal" situation, under that category. The "optimal" category would be used for comparison purposes, to estimate the staff requirements under revised assumptions of the methods, time requirements, and frequency of some or all of the tasks. We will begin by completing the "normal" category on form 3.

It is estimated that forty intake summaries must be completed each week. This is consistent with the data on form 2, which showed one counselor completing an average of one summary per day. On that basis, eight counselors would complete forty summaries per week. Summaries each take an average of 88 minutes, or 1.5 hours to complete. Therefore, the total time required to complete 40 summaries is 60 hours.

Each task is calculated in the same manner, and the total time requirements are totaled at the line which is labeled "total direct time". In this example 418 hours of time are required to complete these tasks.

The next line is labeled "on-job allowances". The purpose of this line is to allow for non-task time which is permitted during a normal working day. In this case, during an eight-hour day, two 15 minute breaks are allowed, plus two five minute breaks. Thus, an eight hour day yields seven hours and twenty minutes of work, and forty minutes of break-time. Division of the break-time by the work-time yields a ratio which is used to calculate the extra time associated with a specific amount of work-time. In this case, the ratio is .091, which is the result of dividing 40 minutes of break per day, by 440 minutes of work (7 hours and twenty minutes). Thus, for 418 hours of work, an extra 38 hours of breaks will be required to fulfill obligations to the employees.

The next line is labeled "relief factor". The calculation of a relief factor is described in detail in Chapter Three. Basically, it represents the ratio of days on the job each year, to total working days. In this case, there are 261 working days per year, based upon 365 days in a year, and 104 regular days off because the counselors work a five day week. There are working days each year, however, where the counselors will not be doing their normal job duties: 15 days of annual leave, 10 holidays, 8 days of sick leave, 10 days of training, and 7 days of military and other leave. This leaves 211 actual days of work, out of the 261 days yielded by a 40 hour, five day week. The coverage factor is the total days divided by the actual days, or 261 divided by 211, or 1.24. Thus, 100 normal working days would require 124

days of employment.

In our example, 418 hours of actual work, plus 38 hours of breaks, would require 109 additional hours of leave, training, etc. This is calculated by multiplying 418 plus 38, or 456, by 0.24, which is 109.

Thus, the total number of hours required per week to complete these tasks would be 565, which includes direct effort, on-job allowances, and days on leave or training. This, divided by the 40 hour work week yields the total required number of employees, which is 14. Based upon this information, there are several observations which can be made. First, since there is 14 counselors worth of work to be done, and only eight to do it, the perception that these people are overworked and are probably not completing much of their work, and are probably not doing quality work, this perception would be accurate. Further, the analysis reveals that 52% of their work-time is expended answering mail and inquiries, and only 23% is expended counseling and interviewing prisoners.

On form 3, the "optimal" section of the form permits the restructuring of a job based upon different assumptions about the methods of work, time requirements, and frequency of tasks. In the example, changes have been made which attempt to resolve some of the problems illustrated above. For example, the time requirements for some of the tasks have been changed based upon time studies, on form 1, using word processing equipment and a computer terminal. The computer terminal, which is part of a record system, permits more rapid answers to inquiries regarding the present, past, and future status of prisoners. The word processing equipment searches the computer file for basic information on a prisoner, so that counselors only prepare those parts of parole summaries and other reports which are very recent or unique to the immediate problem. In the real world, such systems may or may not achieve such efficiencies, and may also require additional staff in other areas of an organization. However, for the purposes of this example, let us assume the validity of these figures.

On the basis of the more efficient methods, the total time required for some tasks has been greatly reduced. In addition, the number of counseling sessions has been doubled. Following the same methodology as under the "normal" analysis, a total of 271 hours of task-work is required, with a total of nine counselors needed. Under the optimal proposal, 49% of the time is expended in counseling and interviews and 22% on mail and inquiries. This is a substantial improvement.

This is a point at which productivity auditing can make a significant contribution to the analysis of this problem. These improvements probably increased clerical workloads, and required computer and wordprocessing equipment expenses. The following are some approaches to determining whether the costs of the extra personnel and equipment were efficient.

One way is to calculate the total cost of the normal and optimal approaches, and to subtract one from the other. Assume that the normal costs \$280,000 per year and the optimal costs \$180,000, in counselor salaries and support costs. On this basis, as long as the cost of clerical personnel and the annual lease or amortized purchase cost of the equipment is less than \$100,000, a savings has been achieved in the overall cost of the counseling program.

The problem with that approach is the the optimal approach not only is cheaper, but it also provides a more desirable mix of services. Productivity auditing would call for all of the "inputs" to the program to be translated into a single measure. In this case, dollars are a good measure, and we will assume a figure of \$300,000 for the normal and \$250,000 for the optimal. \$20,000 was added to the normal for clerical costs, and \$70,000 to the optimal for clerical and computer costs. A single measure of the outputs must also be created, which in this example will be "prisoner contact hours per week", which is the total number of hours per week, for the entire staff of counselors, in classification interviews, monthly interviews, and counseling sessions. The normal proposal yields 128 hours, and the optimal yields 164 hours. A productivity index is the ratio of outputs to inputs, or in this instance, the number of contact hours per \$100,000 of expenditure. The measures are 43 for the normal, and 66 for the optimal. Thus, the optimal proposal is 53% more productive than the normal proposal, in terms of contact hours per dollar spent.

In this way, productivity auditing allows the comparison of situations where equipment is being substituted for labor, or one kind of labor is being substituted for another.

Table 4 provides a final check on the analysis, before a decision is to be made. Comparable institutions are identified, either from volume 2 of this report, or from information available to the person doing the study. Two types of rates are calculated. The first is the number of employees as a percent of total staff, and the second is the number of employees per 100 prisoners. These are two simple "ballpark" measures which allow one to compare proposals to other institutions.

Differences may occur for several reasons. First, the institutions may not be as comparable as one might desire. In this case, the reasons for differences should be examined, to determine whether the comparison institution might have a better approach or method to a problem. Another reason for differences could be error in the comparison of one type of position to another. The actual duties on one "counselor" might not be comparable to those in another institution or system.

The most important type of difference would be based upon error on the part of the person doing the project, in defining

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 3**



the job under study. Comparison might lead to revision of time or frequency estimates, or the addition of new tasks to a job. People who work at a given job for a long time, or who study a job for a long time, can get distorted concepts and perceptions of work requirements. These distortions can arise because of needs for results to turn out in particular directions, or simply because of perceptions of work tasks which have been shaped by years of exposure to certain methods. Thus, the comparative approach can serve as a check on such a source of error.

The final recommendation is a judgement based upon analysis of all of the information developed on the forms. The comments might include statements about necessary conditions for the recommendation to work, such as, in the example, the purchase of certain equipment.

#### D. APPLICATION TO POSTS

One final consideration is the application of this methodology to correctional officer posts. The problem is that, while the tasks required in the post orders for a post might require a certain amount of time to be completed, the post may have to be open all the time. During a 24 hour period, there may be 14 hours worth of specific work to be done, and the remainder of the time might be spent in general observation of the unit, or waiting for an incident to arise. One school of thought is that task analysis methodologies cannot therefore be applied to posts which must be open for specific periods of time.

There are significant contributions which such a method can make to the management of posts. The TASK EFFICIENCY of a post can be increased. This is the percent of the total time that a post is open that is expended on specific tasks called for in the post orders. Specific tasks would be those which involve purposeful activity other than waiting and long periods of general observation. If a post is 80% efficient, then 80% of the time the post is open, the officer is doing tasks specified in the post orders, other than waiting. If a post were only 20% efficient, then added duties could be added to the post orders without adding more officer time to the post. If a cellhouse has ten officers within it, those positions are, on the average, 60% efficient, then the number of officers could be reduced to six without changing the overall responsibilities of the officers within the unit.

There are two reservations to this method. First, sometimes watching is a continuous responsibility of a post, and any other duty could distract the officer from this basic responsibility. An example of such a situation would be a tower at the perimeter of a prison. The problem here is essentially one of correctional management. Sometimes tasks can be added which do not interfere, such as monitoring an infrequently used radio frequency. However, this is a type of situation where task analysis has limited application.

The other reservation has to do with the maintenance of a basic response capability to a potential situation which should not arise. Thus, ten officers might be required in a cellhouse, not because of tasks to be completed, but because of possible incidents to be deterred or managed. Again, this ultimately becomes a correctional management judgement. However, in many such instances, these officers can perform other duties while waiting for an incident to arise. In determining the extent to which duties might be added, a post-efficiency measure might be useful.

#### E. FINAL OBSERVATIONS

The analysis of a staffing pattern can be a complex and time-consuming process. However, the benefits can be significant, especially at a time when budgets are tight.

The process of staffing analysis works best if it becomes an ongoing process, rather than a one-time event. The following are some suggestions in implementing a post and position analysis program at a jail or prison:

Middle management staff should be trained in these procedures, and should conduct analyses and audits as a routine part of management. One or two employees might be encouraged to develop a special expertise in this area, and they might review the work of the managers. This might be an appropriate role for staff from the personnel unit of the institution. But the responsibility for such projects should not be the sole responsibility of one or two employees

As a rule of thumb, every position should be evaluated no less than once every five years, and probably not more frequently than once every two years unless major changes are occurring in the position.

New position requests should be justified on this basis.

Even high-level positions should be audited, partly because it promotes acceptance of the practice by lower level employees, and partly because useful information can be developed. Perhaps the Warden really does need an administrative assistant after all.....

Correctional officer posts should also be evaluated, and the efficiency of each post should be determined. This will promote a reasonable distribution of responsibilities between posts.

Proposals for the staffing of new institutions should be justified, and re-evaluated within one or two years of the opening of the institution.

If responsibility for these functions are properly delegated to trained middle-management employees, the time and effort

required will not be substantial for each employee, and the overall benefits to the institution and employees will be significant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnes, Ralph M.: MOTION AND TIME STUDY: DESIGN AND MEASUREMENT OF WORK (New York, John Wiley, 1966).
- Benton, F. Warren, and Rosen, Ellen D.: NATIONAL SURVEY OF CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION EMPLOYEE ATTRITION RATES (New York, National Center for Public Productivity at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, to be published in early 1982)
- Callison, J., and Parsons, G., ACCOUNTING AND RESTITUTION EVALUATION (Unpublished report, Oklahoma Department of Corrections, 1978).
- Commission on Accreditation for Corrections: MANUALS OF STANDARDS FOR ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS, (Rockville MD, Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, 1977-)
- Federal Prison Service: STAFFING GUIDE FOR THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM (Washington, D.C., Federal Prison Service, 1980).
- Greiser et. al., Institute for Economic and Policy Studies: CORRECTIONAL POLICY AND STANDARDS: IMPLEMENTATION COSTS IN FIVE STATES (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980).
- Institute for Public Program Analysis: WORK SCHEDULE DESIGN HANDBOOK (Washington, D.C., U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, 1978).
- Koosoris, Max: STUDIES OF THE EFFECTS OF LONG WORKING HOURS, Washington Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletins 791 & 791A (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1944).
- Maryland Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning: COMPARISON OF STAFFING IN MARYLAND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES HAVING OVER 500 POPULATION WITH THOSE OF OTHER STATES (unpublished manuscript, 1980)
- Mullen, Joan, and Smith, Bradford: AMERICAN PRISONS AND JAILS, VOLUME III: CONDITIONS AND COSTS OF CONFINEMENT (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980)
- Mundel, Marvin E.: MOTION AND TIME STUDY: IMPROVING PRODUCTIVITY (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1978).
- Nanda & Browne: "Hours of Work, Job Satisfaction, and Productivity", in PUBLIC PRODUCTIVITY REVIEW, VOL. II, NO. 3 (New York, Center for Productive Public Management, 445 W59th, NYC, 10019).
- Webb et. al.: UNOBTRUSIVE MEASURES: NONREACTIVE RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, (Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966).

# 1 TIME ALLOWANCE ANALYSIS

TASK	1	2	3	4	5	6	average time



# 4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS SUMMARY

institution	function	population	number	percent	rate
average of comparison institutions					
current actual positions					
normal proposal					
optimal proposal					
final recommendation					

COMMENTS:

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS ADVISORY BOARD

John R. Armore  
Vice President  
The National Alliance of  
Business  
Washington, D.C.

Benjamin F. Baer  
Acting Chairman  
U.S. Parole Commission  
Bethesda, Maryland

Norman Carlson  
Director  
Bureau of Prisons  
Washington, D.C.

Bennett J. Cooper  
Director  
Division of Administration  
of Justice  
Columbus, Ohio

Robert F. Diegelman  
Acting Administrator  
Law Enforcement Assistance  
Administration  
Washington, D.C.

Shirley Gray  
Director  
Foothill Area Office  
County of Los Angeles  
Probation Department  
Pasadena, California

Dorcas Hardy  
Assistant Secretary for  
Development  
Department of Health and  
Human Services  
Washington, D.C.

Stephen Horn  
President  
California State University  
at Long Beach  
Long Beach, California

Robert J. Kutak  
Attorney  
Omaha, Nebraska

Charles Laurer  
Acting Administrator  
Office of Juvenile Justice  
and Delinquency Prevention  
Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Levin  
Director  
Federal Judicial Center  
Washington, D.C.

William Lucas  
Sheriff, Wayne County  
Detroit, Michigan

W. Walter Menninger  
Director  
Division of Law Psychiatry  
Menninger Foundation  
Topeka, Kansas

Norval Morris  
Professor  
University of Chicago  
Law School  
Chicago, Illinois

Vincent O'Leary  
President  
State University of  
New York  
Albany, New York



U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections

# Planning and Evaluating Prison and Jail Staffing

Volume 2

94721

PLANNING AND EVALUATING  
PRISON AND JAIL STAFFING

VOLUME II

F. WARREN BENTON, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
DIRECTOR, OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, 1975-1979

OCTOBER 1981

This project was supported by Grant Number CB-3 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

#### ABSTRACT

Planning and Evaluating Prison and Jail Staffing consists of two volumes, of which this is the second. The overall report (both volumes) has three major purposes. The first is to identify methods of analysis and evaluation of staffing levels. These include task analysis, motion and time study, productivity auditing, outcome analysis, process analysis, and comparative analysis. A specific method is presented, called the Multiple Methods Approach because several staff evaluation techniques are independently applied. The report provides instructions and necessary forms so that an institutional manager may apply this approach. The second purpose is to describe alternative methods of organizational structure and shift or roster management for prisons and jails. Concepts presented include traditional, project, and matrix organizational structures, unit management, as well as specific approaches to staffing housing units. The third purpose is to document current staff levels of twenty institutions representing jails and prisons which are both new and old, and large and small. The staffing patterns are presented and compared within the following categories: administration, business management, support operations, programs and services, medical and treatment, control points, perimeter security, unit supervision, internal activity and yard, and external positions. In addition, summary tables are presented illustrating rates of employment per hundred prisoners from several other studies, including a survey of 162 prisons. The monograph is divided into two volumes. The first contains all of the material except for the specific staffing patterns themselves. These have been placed in the second volume, including an introductory explanation.

SECTION ONE  
INTRODUCTORY EXPLANATION

A. INTRODUCTION

This volume includes detailed descriptions of the staffing patterns of twenty institutions, as of Summer, 1980. The descriptions have been developed from institutional source documents, systematically entered into a microcomputer data base, and processed so as to provide standard descriptions with reference measures.

The volume is intended as a resource in planning and evaluating prison staffing pattern, as the institutions have been selected so as to illustrate a variety of approaches to institutional operation, varying in terms of institutional size, institutional design, staffing intensity, civilianization, program objectives, and prisoner characteristics.

The collection of staffing descriptions may serve as a specific source of reference institutions in the application of the Multiple Methods Approach to staff evaluation described in Volume One. However, it should be understood that this is not the only source of such data, and that often a more realistic analysis can be conducted through the identification of one or more "live" reference institutions sharing similar relevant characteristics with the subject institution. Use of this volume is usually less expensive and faster, but not necessarily better.

B. SUMMARY OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT CONTENTS

For each of the twenty institutions, a specific report is presented. Because the reports are complex, some explanation of terms and approaches is necessary. This will be accomplished through a narrative review of the first institutional report, which describes the staffing of the Auburn Correctional Facility, of the New York State Department of Correctional Services.

The first page shows the calculation of the coverage factor, based upon data which is specific to each institution. For a more detailed discussion of such calculations, see pages 30-34 of Volume I.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTORY EXPLANATION	1
A. INTRODUCTION	1
B. SUMMARY OF INSTITUTIONAL REPORT CONTENTS	2
II. INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS	
<u>OLDER SECURE FACILITIES</u>	
AUBURN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, NEW YORK	5
UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, ATLANTA	13
MINNESOTA CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, ST. CLOUD	21
IOWA STATE PENITENTIARY, FORT MADISON	29
 <u>NEWER SECURE FACILITIES</u>	
JOE HARP CORRECTIONAL CENTER, OKLAHOMA	36
MINN. CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, OAK PARK HEIGHTS	41
UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, MARION, ILLINOIS	48
MECHLENBURG CORRECTIONAL CENTER, VIRGINIA	54
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION, CANADA	59
MANNING CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, S. CAROLINA	66
 <u>OLDER LOW SECURITY FACILITIES</u>	
CAMP GEORGETOWN, NEW YORK	71
FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, ALLENWOOD, VIRGINIA	76
 <u>NEWER LOW SECURITY FACILITIES</u>	
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER, ILLINOIS	82
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, FORT WORTH	89
 <u>LOCAL FACILITIES</u>	
PENITENTIARY, ONANDAGA COUNTY, NEW YORK	96
CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y.	101
BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION, NEW YORK CITY	106
METROPOLITAN CORRECTIONAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY	112
REPLACEMENT FACILITY, ONANDAGA COUNTY, N.Y.	118
MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION, NEW YORK CITY	123

The bottom half of the first page begins a summary of the specific posts and positions which make up the overall staffing pattern. The functional categories were described in Chapter Four of Volume I, but the following is a list of those categories:

- Administration
- Business management
- Support operations
- Programs and activities
- Medical and treatment
- Control points
- Perimeter security
- Unit supervision
- Internal activity and yard
- External and other

Thus, the bottom of the first page provides a summary of administrative positions at the Auburn facility, and subsequent sections provide summaries of other categories of posts and positions, in the order identified in the above list.

For each position, seven pieces of information are provided, as follows:

The name of the position is the first element, such as "warden", "secretary", or "doctor".

The location of the position is the next element, defining the general area of the institution where the position is assigned. For correctional officer posts, this may define the position more specifically than the name.

The shift, such as "office hours", or "continuous", identifies the general time period when the post is open or the position is on duty.

The next element, labeled "factor", indicates whether or not the position or post must be continuously covered when open. If this is the case, then the coverage factor is applied. There are three possible answers which appear in the column for each position. "Y" means that the position is factored, "N" means that it is not factored, and "\*" means that the position is reverse-factored. This would occur when four positions, for example, are assigned for a post which is supposed to be staffed continuously, such as four boiler operators. Reverse-factoring causes the number of available positions (in this instance 4) to be assumed as a given, and the number of persons on duty is then an estimate of the average level of staffing of the post. For instance, in Administration for the Auburn facility, five telephone operators is insufficient to provide the 5.43 needed for 24 hour coverage. As a result, the post is shown as staffed at a level of 0.9, which means that about 90% of the time the position would be staffed, unless overtime is incurred.

The next category, labeled "#", indicates the intended level of staffing of the position. For example, the Superintendent is identified as a "1", meaning that there is only one person in this job. On the next page, under "Business Management", six Account Clerks are identified.

The next column is labeled "Span of Control", identifying the number of employees directly supervised by the described position. In the Auburn example, the Superintendent is shown as having a span of control of four employees, which are the three deputies and a secretary. Span of control is discussed in more detail on page 27 of Volume I.

The final figure in each column represents the total positions needed to provide the described level of staffing for the indicated shift(s).

Each position for the entire institution is described in this manner, following the list of categories identified above.

The last two pages of each descriptive report provide a detailed analysis of the staffing pattern presented. First, a table is presented which summarizes the total number of positions by category. Thus, in the Auburn example, all 619 positions are accounted for. The next column, labeled "%", indicates the percent of all positions represented by each category. The column labeled "Rate per 100 Prisoners" provides the number of positions, by category, per hundred prisoners in the institution. The "Standard Cost per 100 Prisoners" should be interpreted relative to other institutions in the data base, and not as an absolute cost. However, it describes the cost per hundred prisoners of a given function, organized as it is in this institution.

The next table, "Staff Summary by Shift", illustrates the numbers of employees, and the rates per hundred prisoners, for each shift, and for various category groupings. In the Auburn example, the table illustrates that there are 619 total employees, constituting 36 per hundred prisoners. However, only 34 of these are on duty at any given time on the night shift, providing an effective ratio of 2 per hundred prisoners. Of these, only 16 are correctional officers in housing units.

At the bottom of this page, the Average Span of Supervisory Control is presented, which is the average span for all employees supervising other employees. Under that is an analysis of correctional officer positions. It determines whether the total number of authorized correctional officers, plus the average number of officers generated through overtime, is sufficient to cover the number of posts and positions identified. "Congruence" is the ratio of needed officers divided by available officers. It should be somewhere between 0.95 and 0.99. If it exceeds 1.00, then there is a shortage of officers for posts, requiring either more officers, or fewer posts. Note that the "Authorized CO's" does not include those whose posts are usually filled by

civilians, and whose post or position descriptions are described in the first five categories (Administration through Medical/Treatment). These positions are deleted from both the needed officers and the available officers in calculating the ratio.

The "Key Function Positions" table illustrates total positions are rates for specific categories of positions. Medical and mental health position totals should be interpreted with caution since much of these services are provided through contractual relationships.

On the last page, some of the measures from the previous page are illustrated in graphic format. With some experience, these charts can be interpreted to provide rapid insights into staffing pattern characteristics, and cues as to areas for further analysis.

The final table indicates the number of days per month, or per year, which should be accumulated in order to fulfill responsibilities to employees such as annual leave, training, etc. Unless these numbers of days are accrued each month, the institution will get behind, and have to suffer shortages of available employees at the end of the fiscal year to fulfill the obligations.

The overall purpose of the descriptions is to enable an insightful analysis and review of the staffing patterns of twenty very different institutions. These may serve as models for the planning or evaluation of other institutional staffing patterns.

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILTIY  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	25
HOLIDAYS:	11
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	11
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	5
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	6
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	202
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.29
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.43
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.81

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 9

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
SUPERINTENDENT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
DEPUTY SUPT.	ADMIN. SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	8	1.00
DEPUTY SUPT.	PROGRAM SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	11	1.00
DEPUTY SUPT.	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SECRETARY	SUPERINTENDENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	DPTY: ADMIN SVCS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SECRETARY	DPTY: PGRM SVCS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TELEPHONE OPERATORS	SWITCHBOARD	CONTINUOUS	*	0.9	0	5.00
SECRETARY	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	INMATE GRIEVANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.00



POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
PRINCIPAL CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
STEWARD	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
HEAD ACCT CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
BUDGET ANALYST	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SENIOR ACCT CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	3	2.00
ACCOUNT CLERKS	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	6.0	0	6.00
STENO/TYPISTS	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
PAYROLL CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK SUPERV	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
CLERKS	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
STENOGRAPHER	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SENIOR CLERK	CORRESPONDENCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CLERKS	CORRESPONDENCE	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						29.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

ASST. COOK	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
JANITOR	ADMINISTRATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
STORES CLERK	INVENTORY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
STORES CLERK	INVENTORY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOOD SERVICE MANAGER	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. MANAGER	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
HEAD COOK	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.4	0	5.00
MEAT CUTTER	KITCHEN	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
LAUNDRY SUPERV	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLANT SUPT.	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	12	1.00
SUPERVISOR	STAT. ENGINEERS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
STATIONARY ENGINEERS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.1	0	6.00
ASST. STAT. ENGINEERS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.3	0	7.00
MECHANIC	PLANT OPERATIONS	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
MECHANIC	REFRIGERATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMEN	BLDG MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	5.0	1	5.00
ASSISTANTS	BLDG MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	5.0	0	5.00
VEHICLE MECHANIC	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
VEHICLE OPERATORS	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						46.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
SENIOR COUNSELOR	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	15	1.00
COUNSELORS	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	13.0	1	13.00
COUNSELORS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	1	2.00
CLERK/TYPISTS	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	9.0	0	9.00
CLERK/TYPISTS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CHAPLAINS	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
DIRECTOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
TYPIST/STENO	EDUCATION DIR.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHER SUPERVISOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	18	1.00
TEACHERS	ACADEMIC EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	10.0	0	10.00
TEACHER SUPERVISOR	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	18	1.00
TEACHERS	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	17.0	0	17.00
TYPIST	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	PHYSICAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHERS	PHYSICAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
TEACHER	MUSIC EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
LIBRARIAN	INMATE LIBRARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	VOLUNTEER SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
STENO/TYPIST	VOLUNTEER SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHER	SPECIAL HOUSING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COUNSELOR	SPECIAL HOUSING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
STENO/TYPIST	SPECIAL HOUSING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
HEAD CLERK	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CLERKS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	3	2.00
TYPISTS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	6.0	0	6.00
INTERVIEWER	TEMPORARY RELEASE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TYPIST	TEMPORARY RELEASE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						83.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PHYSICIANS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	2	2.00
DENTISTS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.5	0	2.50
NURSE ADMINISTRATOR	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
PHARMACIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
NURSES	MEDICAL	CONTINUOUS	*	1.3	0	7.00
RADIOLOGY TECH	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SENIOR CLERK	MEDICAL RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TYPIST/STENO	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						16.50

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
ASST. DEPUTY SUPERINT	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CAPTAIN	SECURITY	DAY, M-F	Y	4.0	1	5.17
WATCH COMMANDER	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	4	5.43
ASST. WATCH COMMANDER	SECURITY	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
SERGEANT	WALL, YARD, ACTIVITIES	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	44	3.62
ENTRANCE	NORTH YARD/ADM. BLDG	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	FRONT DOOR	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.43
OFFICER	VISITING LOBBY	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	VISIT FRISK	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	LOWER CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.43
OFFICER	UPPER LOBBY	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	UPPER CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.43
OFFICER	UPPER CONTROL ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	ARSENAL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.43
OFFICER	DEPTY SUPT OFFICE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
ENTRANCE	C&D BLOCK	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
TRAFFIC CONTROL	MAIN YARD	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
GUN NEST	MAIN YARD	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
GUN NEST	MAIN YARD	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
CONTROL CENTER	YARD AREA	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	SHOP GATE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
N DINING GAS BOOTH	1:00-9:00	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
S DINING GAS BOOTH	1:00-9:00	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	NORTH CONTROL CTR	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	COMMISSARY GATE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	FIRE & SAFETY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						77.20

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

TOWERS	#1,3,7,10,12	CONTINUOUS	Y	5.0	0	27.13
TOWERS	#2,4,9	DAY, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.43
TOWERS	#5,11	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	7.24
TOWER	#9	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
GATE	WALL STREET	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	WIRE GATE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						46.51

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
SERGEANT	UNITS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	13	7.24
OFFICER	HOSPITAL	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICER	SPECIAL HOUSING	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICER	SPECIAL HOUSING	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	MENTAL HYGIENE SAT	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICER	MENTAL HYGIENE SAT	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	A BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICERS	B BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICERS	C BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICERS	D BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
OFFICERS	E BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.85
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						99.49

\*\*\*\*\* INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON-TROL	TOTL
SERGEANT	AREAS	DAY, ALL	Y	4.0	14	7.24
SERGEANT	AREAS	DAY&EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	14	2.58
ESCORT	TRUCK	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	VISITING ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	VISIT SNACK ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	DIAL HOME PGRM	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	CLINIC	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
ESCORT OFFICERS	CLINIC	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
SECURITY	LOWER HALL	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
PORTERS	ADM BLDG	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	PAROLE CLOTHING	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICERS	PACKAGE ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
PROCESSING	RECEPTION & RELEASE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	CORRESPONDENCE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	IDENTIFICATION OFFICE	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	LAW LIBRARY	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	ORIENTATION	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	MAIN YARD	EVENING, ALL	Y	5.0	0	9.04
OFFICERS	SOUTH YARD	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	5.0	0	18.09
OFFICERS	SOUTH YARD	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	RECREATION	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	YARD PATROL	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	SHOP PATROL	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	KITCHEN	DAY, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.43
OFFICER	NORTH DINING	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
BASEMENT & RECR	KITCHEN	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	BAKERY	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	EMPLOYEE DINING	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	STOREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
EVENING RECREATION	SOUTH DINING	EVENING, ALL	Y	4.0	0	7.24
OFFICER	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	BATHHOUSE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	CLOTHING ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	TAILORING CLASS	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	MAINTENANCE GANG	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	ELECTRIC SHOP	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICERS	MAINTENANCE GANGS	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.58
OFFICERS	OUTSIDE UTILITY GANGS	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.58
OFFICER	INCINERATOR GANG	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	TRASH GANG #1	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	TRASH GANG #2	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	LOCK REPAIRS	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICERS	INDUSTRY SHOPS	DAY, ALL	Y	20.0	0	36.18
OFFICERS	SCHOOL	DAY, ALL	Y	4.0	0	7.24
ESCORT	SCHOOL	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.29
OFFICER	BARBER SHOP & YARD	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICERS	SCHOOL & MOVIES	EVENING, ALL	Y	5.0	0	9.04
OFFICER	LIBRARY/HOBBY SHOP	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	CHAPEL AREA	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.62
OFFICER	GYMNASIUM	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	LOCKER ROOM	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICER	ACTIVITY ROOM	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.81
OFFICERS	MAIN YARD	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.62
OFFICERS	SOUTH YARD	EVENING, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.43

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON-TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	----------	---	------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* EXTERNAL AND OTHER

LIEUTENANT	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
BUS OFFICERS	TRANSPORTATION	DAY, M-F	Y	4.0	0	5.17
RELIEF OFFICERS	SUPPORT SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						7.17

TOTAL STAFF COUNT: 619.16

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILTIY

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	14.0	2.3	0.8	\$ 16,882
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	29.0	4.7	1.7	\$ 29,853
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	46.0	7.4	2.7	\$ 47,353
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	83.0	13.4	4.9	\$ 85,441
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	16.5	2.7	1.0	\$ 21,838
CONTROL POINTS	77.2	12.5	4.5	\$ 63,575
PERIMETER SECURITY	46.5	7.5	2.7	\$ 38,306
UNIT SUPERVISION	99.5	16.1	5.9	\$ 81,933
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	200.3	32.3	11.8	\$ 164,931
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	7.2	1.2	0.4	\$ 5,903
TOTAL	619.2	100.0	36.4	\$ 556,017

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	71	4	5	0	3	0	89	5
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	94	6	1	0	1	0	100	6
UNIT OFFICERS	21	1	18	1	16	1	99	6
OTHER OFFICERS	121	7	58	3	13	1	331	19
TOTAL	306	18	82	5	34	2	619	36

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 5.44 KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS # R

AUTHORIZED CO'S:	434.00	MEDICAL:	11	1
OVERTIME CO FTE:	30.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	0	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	464.00	INDUSTRY:	0	0
TOTAL POST REQ.:	430.65	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	33	2
DIFFERENCE:	33.36	CLERICAL:	37	2
CONGRUENCE:	0.93			

SUMMARY CHART  
NEW YORK: AUBURN CORR. FACILTIY

POPULATION LEVEL 1700 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 29 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 18 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 5 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 2 ##  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 36 #####  
 CONGRUENCE 0  
 SPAN OF CTRL 5 #####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 5 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 6 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 6 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 19 #####  
 MEDICAL 1 #  
 MENTAL HEALTH 0  
 INDUSTRY 0  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 2 ##  
 CLERICAL 2 ##  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 1 #

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	897	10766	393	4713
HOLIDAYS	395	4737	173	2074
ILLNESS LEAVE	395	4737	173	2074
TRAINING DAYS	179	2153	79	943
MILITARY LEAVE	36	431	16	189
OTHER LEAVE	215	2584	94	1131
CO OVERTIME	505	6060	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
U.S.P. ATLANTA  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR: 365  
 REGULAR DAYS OFF: 104  
 TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR: 261  
 VACATION DAYS: 15  
 HOLIDAYS: 10  
 AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN: 6  
 CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS: 5  
 AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE: 221  
  
 COVERAGE FACTOR: 1.18  
 CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR: 4.96  
 SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE: 1.65

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 2

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
EXEC. ASST.	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	CONTROLS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
SUPERINTENDENT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SECRETARY	AW OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	AW CONTROLS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ADM ASST	AW PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
SECRETARY	AW PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
PERSONNEL OFFICER	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. PERSONNEL OFFIC	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
TRAINING COORD	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PERSONNEL SPEC	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	1	2.00
CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. BUSINESS MANAGE	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
PURCHASING AGENT	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. PURCHASING AGEN	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SUPERVISOR	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
ASST. SUPERVISOR	COMMISSARY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
COMMISSARY TRAINEE	COMMISSARY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	4	1.00
CLERKS	TRUST FUND	DAY, M-F	N	4.0	0	4.00
CASHIER	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASST. ADMINISTRATOR	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
ADM. ASST	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	3	2.00
ACCOUNTANTS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
PURCHASING AGENTS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ORDER CLERK	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						34.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** SUPPORT OPERATIONS						
CHIEF: MECHANICAL SER	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	FOOD SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SUPERVISOR	CLOTHING SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SUPERVISOR	SUPPLIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
LAUNDRYMAN	CLOTHING SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
EXCHANGE OFFICERS	CLOTHING SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
STOREKEEPER	RECEIVING	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
STOREKEEPERS	WAREHOUSES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
ASSISTANT ADMINISTRAT	FOOD SERVICE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	4	1.00
COOK FOREMEN	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	4.2	0	14.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASST	CHIEF: MECH SERV	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	CONSTRUCTION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHIEF OF UTILITIES	UTILITIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
GENERAL FOREMAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	19	1.00
FOREMAN	MASONRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	CARPENTRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMEN	PAINTING	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOREMAN	ELECTRONICS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	MACHINE SHOP	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	ELECTRICAL	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOREMAN	PLUMBING	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOREMAN	SHEET METAL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	AUTO REPAIR	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOREMAN	LANDSCAPE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMEN	GENERAL MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	5.0	0	5.00
FOREMAN	AIRCONDITIONING	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. TO CHIEF	UTILITIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
UTILITIY OPERATORS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.2	0	6.00
FOREMAN	PIPEFITTING	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SAFETY OFFICERS	ALL AREAS	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
CHIEF WAREHOUSEMAN	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
WAREHOUSE FOREMEN	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	5.0	2	5.00
FOREMAN SUPERVISOR	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	10	1.00
MAINTENANCE FOREMEN	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	10.0	0	10.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						76.00



POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
CHIEF CLASS & PAROLE COORDINATOR	CLASS & PAROLE CASEMANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ASST. SUPERVISOR	PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
CASEWORKERS	PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CLERKS	PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	7.0	0	7.00
ASST. MANAGER TRAINEE	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR	CLASSIFICATION RECORDS CONTROL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ASSISTANT	RECORDS CONTROL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FILE CLERKS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
ADM. CLERK	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DATA ANALYST	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASST. PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	23	1.00
CLERK	PRINCIPAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TRAINERS	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	7.0	0	7.00
SUPERVISOR	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SPECIALISTS	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
TEACHERS	REMEDIAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
TEACHERS	ACADEMIC EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	11.0	0	11.00
TREATMENT SPECIALIST	DRUG ABUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	8	1.00
FACTORY MANAGERS	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	5.0	7	5.00
PRODUCTION CONTROLLER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEXTILE SPECIALIST	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
FOREMAN	QUALITY CONTROL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
INDUSTRIAL COUNSELORS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
MANAGER	TEXTILE DIVISION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
COST ANALYST	TEXTILE DIVISION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MARKETING SPECIALIST	TEXTILES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
MARKETING ASST.	TEXTILES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
INDUSTRIAL ENGINEER	TEXTILES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SUPERVISOR, QUALITY C	TEXTILES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ENGINEER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASSISTANT MANAGER	TEXTILE MILL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	9	1.00
MANAGEMENT TRAINEES	TEXTILE MILL	DAY, M-F	N	4.0	0	4.00
FOREMEN	TEXTILE MILLS	DAY, M-F	N	28.0	0	28.00
FOREMEN	CANVAS FACTORY	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOREMEN	BASKET FACTORY	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOREMEN	MATTRESS FACTORY	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						114.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT						
CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	DRUG ABUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SOCIAL SERVICE ASST.	DRUG ABUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
PSYCH TECH	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHYSICIANS	MEDICAL SPECIALTIES	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATO	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. ADMINISTRATOR	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
RECORDS TECH	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DENTISTS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
PURCHASING AGENT	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TECHNICIAN	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
PHYSICIAN'S ASST.	MEDICAL	CONTINUOUS	*	2.4	0	12.00
PHARMACIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						32.00
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CHIEF SUPERVISOR	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SUPERVISORY OFFICERS	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	*	3.0	11	15.00
OFFICERS	CORRIDORS	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	9.92
OFFICERS	CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
OFFICERS	CONTROL ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
CLERKS	CUSTODY	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
OFFICERS	ENTRANCE	DAY&EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	2.36
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						37.90
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
OFFICERS	TOWERS	CONTINUOUS	Y	7.0	0	34.72
OFFICERS	TOWERS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.31
OFFICERS	PATROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						42.99

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
PROGRAM MANAGER	DRUG ABUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
OFFICERS	CELLHOUSES	CONTINUOUS	Y	12.0	0	59.52
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						60.52
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
CORRECTIONAL COUNSELO	DRUG ABUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
OFFICER	RECEIVING & DISCHARGE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
OFFICER	VISITING	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
OFFICERS	RECEPTION	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
OFFICERS	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.61
OFFICER	RECREATION	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
OFFICERS	YARD	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	3.0	0	9.92
OFFICERS	PATROL	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
OFFICER	TOOL ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	RECREATION	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	SHOPS	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	RECEIVING & DISCHARGE	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						36.01
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OFFICERS	OTHER POSTS	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	9.92
OFFICER	BUS	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.36
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.28
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						456.70

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
U.S.P. ATLANTA

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	11.0	2.4	0.7	\$ 15,104
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	34.0	7.4	2.3	\$ 39,853
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	76.0	16.6	5.1	\$ 89,082
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	114.0	25.0	7.6	\$ 133,624
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	32.0	7.0	2.1	\$ 48,225
CONTROL POINTS	37.9	8.3	2.5	\$ 35,536
PERIMETER SECURITY	43.0	9.4	2.9	\$ 40,311
UNIT SUPERVISION	60.5	13.3	4.1	\$ 56,752
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	36.0	7.9	2.4	\$ 33,770
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	12.3	2.7	0.8	\$ 11,517
TOTAL	456.7	100.0	30.6	\$ 503,773

## STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	106	7	5	0	1	0	121	8
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	136	9	2	0	2	0	146	10
UNIT OFFICERS	13	1	12	1	12	1	61	4
OTHER OFFICERS	43	3	24	2	16	1	129	9
TOTAL	299	20	44	3	32	2	457	31

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 4.38

## KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS

	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	232	00
OVERTIME CO FTE:	10	00
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	242	00
TOTAL POST REQ.:	189	70
DIFFERENCE:	52	30
CONGRUENCE:	0	78
MEDICAL:	21	1
MENTAL HEALTH:	4	0
INDUSTRY:	88	6
EDUCATION/VOTEC:	25	2
CLERICAL:	20	1

SUMMARY CHART  
U.S.P. ATLANTA

POPULATION LEVEL 1490 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 18 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 20 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 3 ###  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 2 ##  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 31 #####  
 CONGRUENCE 0  
 SPAN OF CTRL 4 ####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 8 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 10 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 4 ####  
 OTHER CO'S 9 #####  
 MEDICAL 1 #  
 MENTAL HEALTH 0 #  
 INDUSTRY 6 #####  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 2 ##  
 CLERICAL 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 1 #

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	237	2846	334	4005
HOLIDAYS	158	1897	223	2670
ILLNESS LEAVE	95	1138	134	1602
TRAINING DAYS	79	949	111	1335
MILITARY LEAVE	32	379	45	534
OTHER LEAVE	32	379	45	534
CO OVERTIME	184	2210	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR: 365  
 REGULAR DAYS OFF: 104  
 TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR: 261  
 VACATION DAYS: 18  
 HOLIDAYS: 10  
 AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN: 8  
 CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS: 3  
 AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE: 218

COVERAGE FACTOR: 1.20  
 CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR: 5.03  
 SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE: 1.68

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 10

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
SUPERINTENDENT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
ASSOC. SUPT.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
GEN. MANAGER	LIVING UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
CLERK STENO	GLU	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	1	2.00
SECRETARY	SUPT.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ASST.UPT.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIRECTOR	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TRAINER	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
BUSINESS MANAGER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	11	1.00
PERSONNEL DIR.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
PERSONNEL AIDE	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SWITCHBOARD OPERATOR	SWITCHBOARD	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	WELFARE FUND	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
MANAGER	CANTEEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ACCOUNTING	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
ACCOUNT CLERK	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						16.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

FOOD MANAGER	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CHIEF COOK	KITCHEN	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	4	1.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	N	4.0	0	4.00
PLANT DIRECTOR	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
INVENTORY SUPERV.	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN, B. MAINT.	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
B. MAINT STAFF	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
CHIEF ENGINEER	BOILER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	11	1.00
ENGINEERS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	N	6.0	0	6.00
ENGINEER STAFF	MECHANICAL	DAY, M-F	N	5.0	0	5.00
EXECUTIVE	WAREHOUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
VAN DRIVER	WAREHOUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MACHINIST	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						29.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
PROGRAM COORD.	LIVING UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
INDUSTRIES SUPT.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CHAPLAINS	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CASEWORKERS	PLANNING UNIT	DAY&EVE, ALL	N	5.0	0	5.00
RECR. DIR.	RECR. AREAS	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
CASEWORKERS	UNIT A	EVENING, ALL	N	2.0	0	2.00
CASEWORKERS	UNIT C	EVENING, ALL	N	2.0	0	2.00
CASEWORKER	UNIT D	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASEWORKERS	UNIT E	EVENING, ALL	N	3.0	0	3.00
CASEWORKER	RESHAPE	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
HEARING OFFICER	INVESTIGATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
HRNG. INVESTIGATOR	INVESTIGATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
STENOGRAPHER	INVESTIGATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIRECTOR	SUPPORT SVES.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
RECDS. SUPERV	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
RECDS. CLERKS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
RELEASE CLERKS	RELEASE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
DATA ENTRY CLERKS	DATA ROOM	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
PLACEMENT OFFICER	PLACEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIRECTOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
SUPERVISOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	15	1.00
ACAD. TEACHERS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	14.0	0	14.00
LIBRARIAN	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
AIDES	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
SUPERVISOR	HIGHER EDUC.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
COUNSELORS	HIGHER EDUC.	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	VOCATIONAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
VOTEC TEACHERS	VOCATIONAL	OFFICE HRS	N	7.0	0	7.00
CLERK	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SALESMAN	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLANT MANAGERS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	10	2.00
FOREMEN	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	10.0	0	10.00
TEACHERS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	7.0	0	7.00
VAN DRIVER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	VOC-REHAB	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
COUNSELORS	VOC-REHAB	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
SECRETARIES	VOC-REHAB	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
WORK EVALUATOR	VOC-REHAB	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						93.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

CHIEF PSYCHOLOGIST	PSYCH DEPT.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	PSYCH. DEPT.	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
MEDICAL TECH	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
NURSES	INFIRMARY	DAY&EVE, ALL	N	3.0	0	3.00
PARAMEDICS	INFIRMARY	NIGHT, ALL	N	2.0	0	2.00
DENTIST	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
DENTIST	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	0.8	0	0.75
DENTAL TECHS	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	2.3	0	2.25
PHARMICIST	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHARM. TECH.	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	0.3	0	0.30
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						15.30

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CAPTAINS	CUSTODY	DAY&EVE,ALL	N	2.0	10	2.00
LIEUTENANTS	CUSTODY	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	6	10.06
LIEUTENANTS	CUSTODY	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	2.0	2	6.70
LIEUTENANTS	CUSTODY	EVENING,ALL	Y	1.0	9	1.68
LIEUTENANT	ASSIGNMENTS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECURITY	CAGES 1&2	EVENING,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
SECURITY	CAGES 1&2	NIGHT,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
SECURITY	CAGE 1	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
SECURITY	CORRIDOR	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
CORRIDOR	FOOD SERVICE	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
GATE	EDUCATION	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
INFORMATION	DESK	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
COMMUNICATION	SWITCHBOARD	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
TURNKEY	TURNKEY	DAY,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.35
COUNT CONTROL	COUNT	DAY,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.35
SECURITY	HEARING BOARD	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						44.90

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

PATROL	OUTSIDE	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.03
PATROL	OUTSIDE	EVENING,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
TOWERS 1-5	TOWERS	DAY,ALL	Y	5.0	0	8.38
TOWERS 1-5	HALF-TIME	EVENING,ALL	Y	0.5	0	0.84
TRUCK GATE	TRUCK GATE	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						17.60

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
DIRECTOR	PLANNING UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASST. DIR.	PLANNING UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISORS	PLANNING UNIT	DAY&EVE,ALL	*	1.2	1	4.00
CCII	PLANNING UNIT	DAY,ALL	*	1.2	0	2.00
CCII	PLANNING UNIT	EVENING,ALL	*	1.8	0	3.00
DIRECTOR	UNIT A	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. DIR.	UNIT A	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	UNIT A	DAY&EVE,ALL	*	1.2	1	4.00
CCII	UNIT A	DAY,ALL	*	1.2	0	2.00
CCII	UNIT A	EVENING,ALL	*	3.0	0	5.00
DIRECTOR	UNIT C	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. DIR.	UNIT C	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	UNIT C	DAY&EVE,ALL	*	1.2	1	4.00
CCII	UNIT C	DAY,ALL	*	1.2	0	2.00
CCII	UNIT C	EVENING,ALL	*	3.0	0	5.00
DIRECTOR	UNIT D	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. DIR.	UNIT D	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
CCIII:PROGRAMS	UNIT D	EVE,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	UNIT D	DAY&EVE,ALL	*	1.2	1	4.00
CCII	UNIT D	DAY,ALL	*	1.2	0	2.00
CCII	UNIT D	EVENING,ALL	*	3.0	0	5.00
DIRECTOR	UNIT E	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. DIR.	UNIT E	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	UNIT E	DAY&EVE,ALL	*	1.2	1	4.00
CCII	UNIT E	DAY,ALL	*	1.2	0	2.00
CCII	UNIT E	EVENING,ALL	*	3.0	0	5.00
DIRECTOR	ICU	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. DIR.	ICU	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	ICU	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	1	5.00
CCII	ICU	DAY,ALL	*	4.2	0	7.00
CCII	ICU	EVENING,ALL	*	1.8	0	3.00
CCII	ICU	NIGHT,ALL	*	1.2	0	2.00
DIRECTOR	RESHAPE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. DIR.	RESHAPE	EVE,M-F	N	1.0	4	1.00
INT. PGM. COORD.	RESHAPE	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	6	1.00
CCII	RESHAPE	CONTINUOUS	N	6.0	0	6.00
HEAD CCII	RSHPE OUTSIDE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
CCII	RSHPE OUTSIDE	CONTINUOUS	N	4.0	0	4.00
HEAD CCII	RSHPE TRANS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CCII	RSHPE TRANS.	DAY&EVE,M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
DIRECTOR	ATC	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CCII	ATC	EVENING,ALL	N	1.5	0	1.50
SUPERVISOR	UNIT SECURITY	NIGHT,ALL	N	1.0	5	1.00
SECURITY	UNITS	NIGHT,ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.03
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						108.53



POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
CCII	RECR. AREAS	EVENING, ALL	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECURITY	WAREHOUSE	DAY&EVE, ALL	N	3.0	0	3.00
SECURITY	CANTEEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SECURITY	PATROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.06
SECURITY	PATROL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
SECURITY	FOOD SERVICE	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.03
SECURITY	SCHOOL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
ACTIVITY	GYMNASIUM	EVENING, ALL	Y	6.0	0	10.06
SECURITY	VISITING	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
SECURITY	HEALTH SERVICE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
SECURITY	INDUSTRIES	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						45.23
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
TRANSPORT	TRANSPORT	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.68
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						380.23

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	9.0	2.4	1.5	\$ 30,750
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	16.0	4.2	2.7	\$ 46,667
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	29.0	7.6	4.8	\$ 84,583
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	93.0	24.5	15.5	\$ 271,250
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	15.3	4.0	2.6	\$ 57,375
CONTROL POINTS	44.9	11.8	7.5	\$ 104,776
PERIMETER SECURITY	17.6	4.6	2.9	\$ 41,066
UNIT SUPERVISION	108.5	28.5	18.1	\$ 253,232
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	45.2	11.9	7.5	\$ 105,531
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.7	0.4	0.3	\$ 3,911
TOTAL	380.2	100.0	63.4	\$ 999,142

## STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	54	9	10	2	6	1	54	9
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	96	16	18	3	2	0	108	18
UNIT OFFICERS	46	8	38	6	16	3	109	18
OTHER OFFICERS	38	6	29	5	7	1	109	18
TOTAL	234	39	94	16	31	5	380	63

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 3.78

AUTHORIZED CO'S: 205.00  
OVERTIME CO FTE: 10.00  
TOTAL FTE CO'S: 215.00  
TOTAL POST REQT.: 217.94  
DIFFERENCE: 2.94  
CONGRUENCE: 1.01

## KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS

MEDICAL: 6 1  
MENTAL HEALTH: 4 1  
INDUSTRY: 18 3  
EDUCATION/VOTEC: 38 6  
CLERICAL: 17 3

SUMMARY CHART  
MINNESOTA C.F. : ST. CLOUD

POPULATION LEVEL 600 XXXXXX  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 19 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 39 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 16 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 5 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 63 XXXXXX  
 CONGRUENCE 1 #  
 SPAN OF CTRL 4 ####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 9 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 18 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 18 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 18 #####  
 MEDICAL 1 #  
 MENTAL HEALTH 1 #  
 INDUSTRY 3 ###  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 6 #####  
 CLERICAL 3 ###  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 8 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 6 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 3 ###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	327	3923	243	2921
HOLIDAYS	182	2179	135	1623
ILLNESS LEAVE	145	1743	108	1298
TRAINING DAYS	54	654	41	487
MILITARY LEAVE	36	436	27	325
OTHER LEAVE	36	436	27	325
CO OVERTIME	182	2180	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	15
HOLIDAYS:	9
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	13
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	9
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	2
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	212
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.23
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.17
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.72

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 15

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	AMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ADM. ASSISTANT	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
INVESTIGATOR	DIV CRIM INVEST	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
LAW R	ATTY GEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADM ASST	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COUNSELOR	GRIEVANCES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RECEPTIONIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	DEPUTY WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
BUSINESS MANAGER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	15	1.00
PERSONNEL SPEC	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
ADM. OFFICER	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	13	1.00
TRAINING OFFICER	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TECHNICIAN	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERKS	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERKS	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	BUSINESS MANAGER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MAIL CLERKS	MAIL ROOM	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
TYPIST	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						21.00

***** SUPPORT OPERATIONS						
MANAGER	PLANT OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TECHNICIAN	ELECTRONICS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
SUPERVISOR	BLDGS & GRNDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
POWER TYPIST	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIETITIAN	FOOD SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
COORDINATORS	FOOD SERVICES	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	3.5	0	12.00
SUPERVISOR	IND. WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
WAREHOUSEMEN	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
STOREKEEPER	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	BUILDING SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
REPAIR LEADERS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	8.0	0	8.00
REPAIR LEADERS	ELECTRICIAN	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
REPAIR LEADERS	PLUMBING	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
REPAIR ASSTS.	ELECTRICIAN	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
MANAGER	PLANT OPERATIONS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
SUPERVISOR	PLANT ENGINEERS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
ENGINEERS	POWER PLANT	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
TECHNICIAN	ELECTRONICS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPISTS	SUPPORT	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						47.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
DIRECTOR OF TMT	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
DIRECTOR	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
TREATMENT DIRECTOR	PENITENTIARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
PRINCIPAL	SCHOOL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHERS	VOC. SCHOOL	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
TREATMENT DIRECTOR	AUG. & MONT.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
TREATMENT DIRECTOR	BENNETT UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
COUNSELORS	BENNETT UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
COUNSELORS	AUG. & MONT.	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CHAPLAINS	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ASST. DIRECTOR	TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASST. MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	15	1.00
INDUSTRY TECH	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	10.0	0	10.00
TYPISTS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
DRIVERS	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
INDUSTRY TECH	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	OUTSIDE UNITS	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
COUNSELORS	COUNSELORS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	12	1.00
SUPERVISOR	PENITENTIARY	OFFICE HRS	N	12.0	0	12.00
TYPISTS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
CLERK TYPIST	INMATE RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	9.0	0	9.00
TEACHER	DORM RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHER	BENNETT UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	BENNETT UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						64.00

***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT						
HOSPITAL ADM	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
PHYSICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
PHYSICIAN'S ASST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	NURSING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
PHARMACIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
DENTIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASSISTANTS	PHARMACY	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
MEDICAL TECH	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
NURSES	HOSPITAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
NURSES	HOSPITAL	DAY, ALL	*	4.1	0	7.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						20.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
DIRECTOR	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASST. SECURITY DIR	CUSTODY	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	7	2.00
CLERK & PASS OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	13	5.17
YARD LIEUTENANT	YARD	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	1	3.45
OFFICER	INVESTIGATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	PASSES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CONTROL	TURNKEY	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.17
SHAKEDOWN	TURNKEY	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
SURVEILLANCE	TELEVISION	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.17
SURVEILLANCE	TELEVISION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						31.85
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
TOWERS	#3, 5, 14, 15, 10	CONTINUOUS	Y	5.0	0	25.85
TOWERS	#2, 4, 7	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	3.0	0	10.34
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						36.20
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
SUPERVISOR	UNIT #18	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.17
OFFICERS	UNIT #18	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.17
OFFICERS	UNIT #18	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
CAGE	UNIT #18	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
SUPERVISOR	UNIT #19	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.17
CAGE	UNIT #19	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.17
OFFICERS	UNIT #19	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.17
OFFICERS	UNIT #19	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.89
OFFICERS	UNIT #19	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.46
GENERAL SUPERVISOR	UNIT #20	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	UNIT #20	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	9	5.17
SUPERVISOR	UNIT #20	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.72
OFFICERS	UNIT #20	CONTINUOUS	Y	4.0	0	20.68
OFFICERS	UNIT #20	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	5.0	0	17.24
OFFICERS	UNIT #20	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.72
SUPERVISOR	HOUSING UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	19	1.00
SUPERVISOR	UNIT #17	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.17
OFFICERS	UNIT #17	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.17
OFFICERS	UNIT #17	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
SUPERVISOR	UNIT #17: PC	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
OFFICERS	UNIT #17: PC	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.17
OFFICERS	BUILDING #97	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.17
SUPERVISOR	HOSPITAL UNIT	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	4	1.23
DESK OFFICER	HOSPITAL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.17
WARD OFFICERS	HOSPITAL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.17
SUPERVISOR	J BENNETT UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	7	5.17
OFFICERS	J BENNETT UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	6.0	0	31.02
SUPERVISOR	AUGUSTA&MONTROSE	DAY, ALL	*	1.2	10	2.00
OFFICERS	AUGUSTA	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.34
OFFICERS	MONTROSE	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.34
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						186.23

32

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
STOCKADE	STOCKADE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CAPTAIN	YARD	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	16	3.45
SECURITY	DRESSING OUT	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.72
VISITING ROOM	NE & SE	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.45
OFFICERS	YARD & RELIEF	DAY, ALL	Y	10.0	0	17.24
OFFICERS	YARD & RELIEF	EVENING, ALL	Y	13.0	0	22.41
OFFICERS	YARD & RELIEF	NIGHT, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.45
DINING HALL	DINING HALL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
OFFICER	CHAPEL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECURITY	VOCATIONAL SCHOOL	DAY, M-F	Y	3.0	0	3.69
OFFICER	CONSTRUCTION	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.46
YARD	OUTSIDE	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.23
SECURITY	ACADEMIC SCHOOL	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.23
SECURITY	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.46
SECURITY	LIBRARY	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.23
OFFICER	DRUG ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.45
OFFICER	DRUG ROOM	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.72
OFFICERS	ORIENT. & PROP.	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.46
LIEUTENANT	GYMNASIUM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	6	1.23
OFFICERS	GYMNASIUM	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.89
OFFICER	HOBBY CRAFT	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.23
OFFICERS	J BENNETT UNIT	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.89
OFFICERS	AUGUSTA	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
OFFICERS	MONTROSE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.45
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						100.24
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
ESCORT	IOWA CITY	DAY, M-F	Y	3.0	0	3.69
OFFICERS	UNIVERSITY HOSP	CONTINUOUS	*	1.5	0	8.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.69
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						527.21

33

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	9.0	1.7	1.0	\$ 20,500
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	21.0	4.0	2.3	\$ 40,833
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	47.0	8.9	5.2	\$ 91,389
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	64.0	12.1	7.1	\$ 124,444
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	20.0	3.8	2.2	\$ 50,000
CONTROL POINTS	31.9	6.0	3.5	\$ 49,550
PERIMETER SECURITY	36.2	6.9	4.0	\$ 56,304
UNIT SUPERVISION	186.2	35.3	20.7	\$ 289,682
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	100.2	19.0	11.1	\$ 155,935
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	11.7	2.2	1.3	\$ 18,190
TOTAL	527.2	100.0	58.6	\$ 896,827

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	64	7	4	0	1	0	77	9
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	79	9	1	0	0	0	84	9
UNIT OFFICERS	45	5	38	4	27	3	186	21
OTHER OFFICERS	64	7	38	4	12	1	180	20
TOTAL	252	28	81	9	40	4	527	59

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	5.00	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	324.00	MEDICAL:	14	2
OVERTIME CO FTE:	17.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	1	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	341.00	INDUSTRY:	19	2
TOTAL POST REQ.:	366.21	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	8	1
DIFFERENCE:	25.21	CLERICAL:	27	3
CONGRUENCE:	1.07			

SUMMARY CHART  
IOWA S. P. FORT MADISON

POPULATION LEVEL	900	XXXXXXXXXX
COVERAGE FACTOR	23	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	28	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	9	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	4	####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	59	XXXXX
CONGRUENCE	7	#####
SPAN OF CTRL	5	#####
ADM/SPT STAFF	9	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	9	#####
UNIT CO'S	21	#####
OTHER CO'S	20	#####
MEDICAL	2	#
MENTAL HEALTH	0	#
INDUSTRY	2	#
EDUCATION/VOTEC	1	#
CLERICAL	3	###
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	5	#####
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	4	####
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	3	###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	458	5493	201	2415
HOLIDAYS	275	3296	121	1449
ILLNESS LEAVE	397	4761	174	2093
TRAINING DAYS	275	3296	121	1449
MILITARY LEAVE	31	366	13	161
OTHER LEAVE	61	732	27	322
CO OVERTIME	300	3604	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	15
HOLIDAYS:	10
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	8
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	10
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	3
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	4
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	211
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.24
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.20
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.73

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 18

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
**** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
PROGRAM MANAGER	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
WARDEN'S SECRETARY	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						5.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

BUSINESS MANAGER	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERK	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	1	2.00
SECRETARY	FRONT OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						5.00

\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR	GARAGE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
MAINTENANCE REPAIRMAN	GARAGE	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
ELECTRICIAN	GARAGE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLUMBER	GARAGE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOOD SUPERVISOR	KITCHEN	DAY, ALL	N	4.0	0	4.00
FOOD MANAGER	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
WAREHOUSEMAN	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	4	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.00

\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

RECORDS CLERK	RECORDS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	RECORDS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGERS	UNITS A, B, C, D	OFFICE HRS	N	8.0	0	8.00
CASE MANAGER SUPERVISOR	PROGRAM CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	14	1.00
TEACHER	UNIT CLASSROOMS	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	PROGRAM CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
UNIT CLERKS	UNIT OFFICES	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						20.00

\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PHYSICIAN	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	18	1.00
MEDICAL SPECIALIST	INFIRMARY	DAY, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.20
PSYCH. AIDES	SPECIAL PROGRAM UNIT	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	3.0	0	10.39
DENTIST	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	SPECIAL PROGRAM UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						19.59



POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* CONTROL POINTS

CHIEF OF SECURITY	CONTROL CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
SHIFT LIEUTENANTS	CONTROL CENTER	CONTINUOUS	N	6.0	8	6.00
CONTROL CENTER	CONTROL CENTER	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
REAR ENTRANCE	REAR CONTROL CENTER	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						15.66

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

TOWER	TOWER	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
PERIMETER ROVER	PERIMETER	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						10.39

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT SUPERVISION

UNIT MANAGERS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	2	3.00
UNIT LIEUTENANTS	UNITS	EVE, M-F	N	3.0	11	3.00
UNIT CONTROL CENTERS	UNIT CONTROL CENTERS	CONTINUOUS	Y	4.0	0	20.78
UNIT BACKUPS	UNIT CENTERS A & B	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.93
SPECIAL PGRMS. BACKUP	SPECIAL PROGRAM UNIT	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
SPECIAL PROGRAMS ROVE	SPECIAL PROGRAM UNIT	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
DISCIPLINARY UNIT	DISCIPLINARY UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.39
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						49.29

\*\*\*\*\* INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

KITCHEN OFFICERS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
YARD SUPERVISORS	YARD	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.93
GYMNASIUM	GYMNASIUM	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						13.85

\*\*\*\*\* EXTERNAL AND OTHER

TRANSPORT OFFICERS	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.00

TOTAL STAFF COUNT: 153.79

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	5.0	3.3	1.3	\$ 25,625
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	5.0	3.3	1.3	\$ 21,875
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	12.0	7.8	3.0	\$ 52,500
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	20.0	13.0	5.0	\$ 87,500
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	19.6	12.7	4.9	\$ 110,170
CONTROL POINTS	15.7	10.2	3.9	\$ 54,806
PERIMETER SECURITY	10.4	6.8	2.6	\$ 36,367
UNIT SUPERVISION	49.3	32.1	12.3	\$ 172,529
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	13.9	9.0	3.5	\$ 48,489
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	3.0	2.0	0.8	\$ 10,500
TOTAL	153.8	100.0	38.4	\$ 620,361

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	22	6	0	0	0	0	22	6
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	30	8	3	1	0	0	40	10
UNIT OFFICERS	13	3	12	3	6	2	49	12
OTHER OFFICERS	18	5	14	4	9	2	43	11
TOTAL	83	21	29	7	15	4	154	38

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	6.02	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	90.00	MEDICAL:	18	4
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	1	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	90.00	INDUSTRY:	0	0
TOTAL POST REQ.:	92.20	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	4	1
DIFFERENCE:	2.20	CLERICAL:	8	2
CONGRUENCE:	1.02			

SUMMARY CHART  
OKLAHOMA: JOE HARP C.C.

POPULATION LEVEL 400 #####  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 23 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 21 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 7 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 4 ####  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 38 #####  
 CONGRUENCE 2 ##  
 SPAN OF CTRL 6 #####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 6 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 10 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 12 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 11 #####  
 MEDICAL 4 ####  
 MENTAL HEALTH 0 #  
 INDUSTRY 0 #  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 1 #  
 CLERICAL 2 ##  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 3 ###  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 3 ###  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 2 ##

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	115	1383	77	924
HOLIDAYS	77	922	51	616
ILLNESS LEAVE	61	738	41	493
TRAINING DAYS	77	922	51	616
MILITARY LEAVE	23	277	15	185
OTHER LEAVE	31	369	21	246
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	18
HOLIDAYS:	10
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	8
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	3
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	2
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	2
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	218
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.20
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.03
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.68

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 4

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
SECRETARY: SUPT	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
SECRETARY: A.S.	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY: A.S.	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	0.5	0	0.50
DIR. OF PROGRAMS	UNITS 1-4	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
EXECUTIVE ASST.	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIR. OF PROGRAMS	UNITS 5-7	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
INVESTIGATOR	INTERNAL AFFAIRS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TRAIN.DIR	TRAINING:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SCTRY:TRAIN	TRAINING:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.50

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
CLERKS/TYPISTS	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
FINANCE DIRECTOR	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
SECRETARY: FINANCE	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERKS	MAIL & RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
COMMISSARY MANAGER	COMM: 3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
CLERKS	COMMISSARY: 3	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
PERSONNEL SPECIALIST	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						17.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

DIRECTOR	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	3	1.00
LOCKSMITH	ARMORY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMEN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	6	2.00
SECRETARY	DIR. MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DRIVER	COMMISSARY: 3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PAINTER	MAINT: 3	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
MAINT. GENERALIST	MAINT: 3	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLUMBER	MAINT: 3	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
ENGINEERS & JANITORS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
ELECTRICIAN	MAINT: 3	DAY&EVE, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
ELECTRONICS	MAINT: 3	DAY&EVE, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FIRE & SAFETY	MAINT: 3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
GROUNDKEEPER	MAINT: 3	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
LAUNDRY	LAUNDRY: 2	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						22.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
DIRECTOR	DATA & INFORMATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
CLERKS/TYPISTS	LEVEL 4	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 1	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 2	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 3	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 4	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	DISC:5	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 7	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 6	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
LEGAL TECH	DISC UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIRECTOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
TEACHERS	EDUCATION	EVE, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
VOTEC TEACHER	EDUCATION:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	0.5	0	0.50
SUPERINTENDENT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CLERKS	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
FACTORY MANAGERS	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	2	2.00
FOREMEN SUPERVISORS	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	4.0	2	4.00
FOREMEN	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	6.0	0	6.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						32.50

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

ADMINISTRATOR	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
CHIEF NURSE	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
NURSES/PARAMEDICS	INFIRMARY	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PSYCHOLOGISTS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
SUPERVISOR	BEHAV. AIDES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
BEHAVIORAL AIDES	MENTAL HEALTH	CONTINUOUS	*	2.0	0	10.00
PSYCH NURSES	MENTAL HEALTH	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.0	0	3.50
SCTRY:MDIR	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DENTIST	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
DENT. TECH.	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHARMACIST	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	0.5	0	0.50
LAB. TECH	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RECORDS TECH	MEDICAL:3	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERKS	MENTAL HEALTH	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.6	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						34.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CAPTAIN	PM	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	12	1.00
CAPTAIN	AM	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	10	1.00
SHIFT OFFICER IN CHAR	LEVEL 4	CONTINUOUS	*	1.2	2	6.00
ASST. SHIFT OIC	LEVEL 4	CONTINUOUS	*	0.2	15	1.00
ASST SHIFT OIC	LEVEL 4	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	5	3.35
CONTROL	LEVEL 3	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
CONTROL CENTER	LEVEL 2	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
OFFICER	ID & COUNT	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
OFFICER	CONTROL 5	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						24.09
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
OFFICER	ROOF SECURITY	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.35
OFFICER	PERIMETER	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.03
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.38
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
SQUAD ROVERS	LEVEL 2	NIGHT, ALL	*	8.4	0	14.00
UNIT MANAGER	COMPLEX 1&2	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	20	1.00
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 1	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 1	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.48
OFFICERS	COMPLEX 1	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 2	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 2	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.48
OFFICERS	COMPLEX 2	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
UNIT MANAGER	COMPLEX 3&4	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	22	1.00
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 3	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
OFFICERS	COMPLEX 3	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 4	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
OFFICERS	COMPLEX 4	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
UNIT MANAGERS	DISC & SEG	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	9	2.00
C.CONTROL	DISC:5	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.03
OFFICERS	DISC:5	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
OFFICERS	DISC & SEG	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.03
UNIT MANAGER	COMPLEX 6&7	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	21	1.00
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 6	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
OFFICERS	COMPLEX 6	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.70
DAY OFFICER	COMPLEX 6	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.20
CASE MANAGER	COMPLEX 6	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
C.CONTROL	COMPLEX 7	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
OFFICERS	COMPLEX 7	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	4.0	0	13.50
CONTROL	MEDICAL: 2&3	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.03
C.MANAGER	MEDICAL: 2&3	OFFICE HRS	N	0.5	22	0.50
OFFICERS	MEDICAL UNIT	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
OFFICERS	MEDICAL UNIT	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.35
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						113.26

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICERS	VISITING	EVENING, ALL	*	4.8	0	8.00
SQUAD	LEVEL 2	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	3.9	0	13.00
ACTIVITIES COORD	RECREATION	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						22.00
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
TRANSPORT OFFICERS	OUTSIDE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.35
UTILITY OFFICERS	ALL AREAS	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.06
UTILITY OFFICERS	ALL AREAS	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.20
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.61
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						299.33

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	11.5	3.8	3.0	\$ 62,039
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	17.0	5.7	4.5	\$ 78,289
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	22.0	7.3	5.8	\$ 101,316
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	32.5	10.9	8.6	\$ 149,671
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	34.0	11.4	8.9	\$ 201,316
CONTROL POINTS	24.1	8.0	6.3	\$ 88,736
PERIMETER SECURITY	8.4	2.8	2.2	\$ 30,876
UNIT SUPERVISION	113.3	37.8	29.8	\$ 417,262
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	22.0	7.3	5.8	\$ 81,053
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	14.6	4.9	3.8	\$ 53,813
TOTAL	299.3	100.0	78.8	\$1,264,371

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	46	12	5	1	1	0	51	13
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	41	11	15	4	3	1	67	18
UNIT OFFICERS	32	8	28	7	12	3	113	30
OTHER OFFICERS	16	4	22	6	4	1	69	18
TOTAL	135	36	70	18	21	5	299	79

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	7.12	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	181.00	MEDICAL:	13	3
OVERTIME CO FTE:	7.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	15	4
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	188.00	INDUSTRY:	14	4
TOTAL POST REQ'T.:	182.33	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	5	1
DIFFERENCE:	5.67	CLERICAL:	21	5
CONGRUENCE:	0.97			

SUMMARY CHART  
MINNESOTA C.F.: OAK PARK HEIGHTS

POPULATION LEVEL	380	#####
COVERAGE FACTOR	19	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	36	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	18	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	5	#####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	79	XXXXXXX
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	7	#####
ADM/SPT STAFF	13	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	18	#####
UNIT CO'S	30	#####
OTHER CO'S	18	#####
MEDICAL	3	###
MENTAL HEALTH	4	###
INDUSTRY	4	###
EDUCATION/VOTEC	1	#
CLERICAL	5	#####
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	8	#####
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	7	#####
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	3	###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	273	3282	176	2106
HOLIDAYS	152	1823	98	1170
ILLNESS LEAVE	122	1459	78	936
TRAINING DAYS	46	547	29	351
MILITARY LEAVE	30	365	20	234
OTHER LEAVE	30	365	20	234
CO OVERTIME	127	1526	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 U.S.P. MARION  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	15
HOLIDAYS:	10
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	6
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	5
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	2
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	2
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	221
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.18
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	4.96
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.65

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 8

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
ASSOC. WARDEN	OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
SECRETARY	ASSOC WARDENS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DATA ANALYST	AW-P	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	CAMP	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	CAMP	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
PERSONNEL OFFICER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
CLERK	MAIL ROOM	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
CLERKS	TRUST FUND	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
PURCHASING AGENTS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ACCOUNTING SUPERV	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CASHIERS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	RELIEF	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MANAGERS	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
TRAINERS	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						15.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

CHIEF MECH. SERV.	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
FOOD SERVICE ADM	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
GENERAL FOREMAN	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	13	1.00
MAINTENANCE STAFF	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	13.0	0	13.00
SUPERVISOR	UTILITIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	3	1.00
UTILITIES OPERATORS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.2	0	6.00
UTILITY REPAIRMEN	UTILITIES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
STAFF	CLOTHING SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPPLY CLERKS	STORES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ASST. MANAGER	FOOD SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	3	1.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	3.3	0	11.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						41.00



POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
SUPERINTENDENT	INDUSTRY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CHIEF, C&P	CLASS.&PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
ADM. ASST.	CLASS&PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
FACTORY MANAGER	FURNITURE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERINTENDENT	PRINT PLANT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SENIOR CASE MANAGER	CLASS&PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SENIOR CASE MANAGER	CLASS&PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CASE MANAGERS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK	CLASS&PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	CLASS&PAROLE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
COORDINATOR	GROUP ACTIVITIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RECREATION SPECS	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
TEACHERS	VOCATIONAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
TEACHERS	ACADEMIC	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
TEACHER	RESOURCE CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHAPLAINS	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
RECORDS CLERKS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						28.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

MEDICAL OFFICER	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	HOSPITAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHIEF PSYCHOLOGIST	PSYCHOLOGY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
PSYCHOLOGISTS	PSYCHOLOGY	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK	PSYCHOLOGY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* CONTROL POINTS

CHIEF CORR. SUPERV	CUSTODY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	13	1.00
CLERK	CHIEF CORR SUPERV	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CORR SUPERV	CORR.SERVICES	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	19	4.96
SECURITY OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CORR SUPERV	CORR SERVICES	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	5	3.31
OFFCIERS	CORRIDORS	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
OFFICERS	CORRIDORS	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
CONTROL	CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	9	4.96
CONTROL	RECEPTION	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
INFORMATION DESK	LOBBY	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
CORR SUPERV	CORR SERVICES	DAY&EVE,M-F	Y	2.0	1	4.72
CORR SUPERV	CORR SERVICES	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	5	1.18
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.36
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						37.72

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

TOWERS	TOWERS	CONTINUOUS	Y	7.0	0	34.72
OFFICER	ENTRANCE	DAY&EVE,M-F	Y	1.0	0	2.36
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						37.08

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT SUPERVISION

UNIT MANAGER	SUBSTANCE PGM	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MANAGER	CONTROL PGM	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
UNIT OFFICERS	UNITS	CONTINUOUS	Y	12.0	0	59.52
UNITS	TWO-DAY POSTS	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.36
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						63.88

\*\*\*\*\* INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

RECEIV & DISCHARGE	RECEPTION	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
ACTIVITY	REC AREAS	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	4.0	0	13.23
OFFICER	TOOL ROOM	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	RECREATION	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	VISITING	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.36
RECREATION	TWO-DAY POSTS	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						20.79

\*\*\*\*\* EXTERNAL AND OTHER

OTHER	NOT DEFINED	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
OTHER	NOT DEFINED	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	4.0	0	13.23
OTHER	NOT DEFINED	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						19.37

TOTAL STAFF COUNT:

276.84

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
U.S.P. MARION

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	8.0	2.9	1.3	\$ 27,333
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	15.0	5.4	2.5	\$ 43,750
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	41.0	14.8	6.8	\$ 119,583
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	28.0	10.1	4.7	\$ 81,667
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	6.0	2.2	1.0	\$ 22,500
CONTROL POINTS	37.7	13.6	6.3	\$ 88,017
PERIMETER SECURITY	37.1	13.4	6.2	\$ 86,528
UNIT SUPERVISION	63.9	23.1	10.6	\$ 149,064
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	20.8	7.5	3.5	\$ 48,500
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	19.4	7.0	3.2	\$ 45,193
TOTAL	276.8	100.0	46.1	\$ 712,134

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	52	9	5	1	1	0	64	11
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	34	6	0	0	0	0	34	6
UNIT OFFICERS	16	3	12	2	12	2	64	11
OTHER OFFICERS	39	7	24	4	12	2	115	19
TOTAL	141	23	41	7	25	4	277	46

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	4.90	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	161.00	MEDICAL:	2	0
OVERTIME CO.FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	3	1
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	161.00	INDUSTRY:	3	1
TOTAL POST REQ.:	178.84	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	8	1
DIFFERENCE:	17.84	CLERICAL:	11	2
CONGRUENCE:	1.11			

SUMMARY CHART  
U.S.P. MARION

POPULATION LEVEL	600	XXXXXX
COVERAGE FACTOR	18	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	23	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	7	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	4	####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	46	#####
CONGRUENCE	11	#####
SPAN OF CTRL	5	#####
ADM/SPT STAFF	11	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	6	#####
UNIT CO'S	11	#####
OTHER CO'S	19	#####
MEDICAL	0	#
MENTAL HEALTH	1	#
INDUSTRY	1	#
EDUCATION/VOTEC	1	#
CLERICAL	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	3	###
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	2	##

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	224	2683	123	1470
HOLIDAYS	149	1788	82	980
ILLNESS LEAVE	89	1073	49	588
TRAINING DAYS	75	894	41	490
MILITARY LEAVE	30	358	16	196
OTHER LEAVE	30	358	16	196
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	14
HOLIDAYS:	13
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	7
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	17
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	1
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	208
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.25
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.27
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.76

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 20

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
SUPERINTENDENT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ASST. SUPT.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK/STENO	SUPERINTENDENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. SUPT.	SECURITY/OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CLERK/STENO	ASST. SUPT. SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. SUPT.	TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK/STENO	ASST. SUPT. TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	15	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						7.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

ACCOUNTANT	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
SUPERVISOR	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK/TYPISTS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

SUPERINTENDENT	BUILDING & GROUNDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	11	1.00
SUPERVISORS	BUILDING & GROUNDS	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
OPERATOR	WATER TREATMENT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLUMBERS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
ELECTRICIANS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CARPENTER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CUSTODIAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
MANAGERS	FOOD OPERATIONS	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.6	2	2.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	4.3	0	15.00
SUPERINTENDENT	POWER PLANT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISORS	POWER PLANT	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.6	0	2.00
FIREMEN	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	0.9	0	5.00
STOREKEEPER	INVENTORY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						38.00

\*\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

COUNSELORS	TREATMENT	DAY, M-F	N	11.0	0	11.00
TYPISTS	TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CUSTODIAN	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK/TYPIST	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISORS	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.4	0	5.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						20.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PSYCHOLOGIST	TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
NURSE RN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
PHYSICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	0.8	0	0.75
DENTIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	0.5	0	0.50
NURSE	MEDICAL	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
NURSE TECHNICIANS	MEDICAL	CONTINUOUS	*	1.9	0	10.00
X-RAY & LAB TECHNICIA	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK/TYPIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						19.25

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* CONTROL POINTS

CHIEF SECURITY OFFICE	SECURITY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
SHIFT COMMANDER	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	5	5.27
LIEUTENANT	MASTER CONTROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.27
UNIT CONTROL ROOMS	BUILDINGS 1-5 + MEDIC	CONTINUOUS	Y	6.0	3	31.62
OFFICERS	SALLY PORT	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.51
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						45.67

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

SUPERVISOR	PERIMETER SECURITY	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	15	1.76
OFFICERS	TOWERS 1-4	CONTINUOUS	Y	4.0	0	21.08
OFFICER	MAIN GATE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.76
OFFICER	TOWER 5	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.76
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						26.36

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT SUPERVISION

SUPERVISORS	BUILDINGS 1-5	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	5.0	2	17.57
OFFICERS	BLGD 1-5, CTRL A-C	CONTINUOUS	Y	15.0	1	79.05
OFFICERS	SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UN	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.27
OFFICERS	B1, UC: DEATH ROW	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.54
OFFICERS	B1, A+B POD	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	7.03
OFFICERS	B2-5, A-C PODS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	12.0	0	42.16
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						161.62

\*\*\*\*\* INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

CORPORAL	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	COMPOUND	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	16	1.76
OFFICER	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.51
OFFICER	MAILROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.76
OFFICERS	UTILITY	DAY, ALL	Y	5.0	0	8.78
OFFICERS	ACTIVITY	DAY, M-F	Y	5.0	0	6.27
OFFICERS	CMSY, PROP CTRL, SPLY	DAY, M-F	Y	3.0	0	3.76
OFFICER	LAW LIBRARY	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
OFFICERS	GROUNDS CREW	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.51
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						30.61

\*\*\*\*\* EXTERNAL AND OTHER

OFFICERS	TRANSPORTATION	DAY, M-F	Y	4.0	0	5.02
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						5.02

TOTAL STAFF COUNT: 361.53

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	7.0	1.9	1.9	\$ 39,861
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	8.0	2.2	2.2	\$ 38,889
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	38.0	10.5	10.6	\$ 184,723
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	20.0	5.5	5.6	\$ 97,222
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	19.3	5.3	5.3	\$ 120,312
CONTROL POINTS	45.7	12.6	12.7	\$ 177,610
PERIMETER SECURITY	26.4	7.3	7.3	\$ 102,476
UNIT SUPERVISION	161.6	44.7	44.9	\$ 628,522
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	30.6	8.5	8.5	\$ 119,053
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	5.0	1.4	1.4	\$ 19,519
TOTAL	361.5	100.0	100.4	\$1,528,190

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	35	10	6	2	1	0	53	15
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	27	7	4	1	2	1	39	11
UNIT OFFICERS	37	10	37	10	18	5	162	45
OTHER OFFICERS	42	12	13	4	12	3	108	30
TOTAL	141	39	61	17	33	9	362	**

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 5.10

AUTHORIZED CO'S:	231.00
OVERTIME CO FTE:	26.00
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	257.00
TOTAL POST REQ.:	269.28
DIFFERENCE:	12.28
CONGRUENCE:	1.05

KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS

	#	R
MEDICAL:	13	4
MENTAL HEALTH:	1	0
INDUSTRY:	0	0
EDUCATION/VOTEC:	0	0
CLERICAL:	12	3

SUMMARY CHART  
 VIRGINIA: MECKLENBURG C.C.

POPULATION LEVEL 360 #####  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 25 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 39 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 17 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 9 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 100 XXXXXXXXXX  
 CONGRUENCE 5 #####  
 SPAN OF CTRL 5 #####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 15 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 11 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 45 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 30 #####  
 MEDICAL 4 ####  
 MENTAL HEALTH 0 #  
 INDUSTRY 0  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 0  
 CLERICAL 3 ###  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 10 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 10 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 5 #####

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	314	3770	108	1292
HOLIDAYS	292	3501	100	1199
ILLNESS LEAVE	157	1885	54	646
TRAINING DAYS	381	4578	131	1568
MILITARY LEAVE	22	269	8	92
OTHER LEAVE	22	269	8	92
CO OVERTIME	451	5408	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR: 365  
 REGULAR DAYS OFF: 104  
 TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR: 261  
 VACATION DAYS: 14  
 HOLIDAYS: 17  
 AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN: 10  
 CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS: 5  
 AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE: 211  
 COVERAGE FACTOR: 1.24  
 CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR: 5.20  
 SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE: 1.73

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 12

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- #	SPAN	TOTL
			TOR	OF	CON-
				TROL	
***** ADMINISTRATION					
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 11	1.00
EXEC ASST	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 0	1.00
SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 0	1.00
ASSOC WARDEN	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 3	1.00
COORDINATOR	GRIEVANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 0	1.00
MANAGER	OFFICE SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 5	1.00
OPERATOR	SWITCHBOARD	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 0	1.00
SECRETARY	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 0	1.00
CLERK	OFFICE SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0 0	1.00
CLERK TYPISTS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0 0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:					12.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

ADMINISTRATOR	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASSOC WARDEN	FINANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
V&C SUPERVISOR	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
V&C STAFF	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
INSTRUCTOR	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNTANT	FINANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
CLERKS	FINANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
MESSENGER	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	PREVENTIVE SECURITY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

ASSOC WARDEN	TECHNICAL SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
STORES OFFICER	WAREHOUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
STOREMEN	WAREHOUSE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	E&W	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
COORDINATOR	PREVENTIVE MAINT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SUPERVISOR	WORKS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	11	1.00
SUPERVISOR	ENGINEERING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	8	1.00
SUPERVISOR	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
PAINTER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CARPENTER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
METAL WORKERS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
DRIVERS	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	4.0	0	4.00
MASON	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
GROUNDKEEPER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	LABORERS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	RELIEF	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
TECHNICIAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLUMBERS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
ELECTRICIANS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
SHIFT ENGINEERS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
ASST. SHIFT ENG	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
SUPERVISOR	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASST SUPERVISOR	FOOD SERVICE	DAY, ALL	*	1.7	2	3.00
COOKS	FOOD SERVICE	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	5.2	0	18.00
HELPERS	KITCHEN	DAY, ALL	*	1.7	0	3.00
SUPERVISOR	INMATE SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
CLERK	INMATE SERVICES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	CLOTHING	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLEANERS	CLOTHING	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						70.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

ASSOC WARDEN	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ASSOC WARDEN	SOCIALIZATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
ASSOC WARDEN	OPER & ADMIN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
ASSOC WARDEN	EDUC & TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CLERK	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	IND PRODUCTION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	16	1.00
FOREMEN	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	16.0	0	16.00
CLERK	SOCIALIZATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHAPLAINS	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	CLASSIFICATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
CLERK	CLASSIFICATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CL. OFFICERS	CLASSIFICATION	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
HEAD	SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
CLERK	SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
INSTRUCTOR	ARTS & CRAFTS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
STAFF	SOCIAL & CULT DEV	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
LIBRARIAN	LIBRARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
STAFF	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.4	0	5.00
COORDINATOR	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	SENTENCES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	ADMISSIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
INSTRUCTORS	INMATE TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	7.0	0	7.00
SUPERVISOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TEACHER	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						58.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PHYSICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SENIOR OFFICER	HEALTH CARE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CLERK	HEALTH CARE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
HEALTH CARE OFFICERS	HEALTH CARE	CONTINUOUS	*	1.3	0	7.00
PSYCHOLOGISTS	SOCIALIZATION	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						13.00



POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CLERK	AW SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	AW SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISORS	DUTIES	CONTINUOUS	*	0.4	68	2.00
SUPERVISORS	DUTIES	DAY&EVE,ALL	*	0.6	23	2.00
SUPERVISORS	DUTIES	DAY,ALL	*	1.2	15	2.00
OFFICER	PREVENTIVE SECURITY	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CONTROL	U	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
CONTROL	N&T	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.39
CONTROL	S	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	J CONTROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
OFFICERS	J CONTROL	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	U CORRIDOR	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.47
OFFICER	CAGE	EVENING,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						37.45

***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
CONTROL TOWER	E	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
TOWERS	#1-4	CONTINUOUS	Y	4.0	0	20.78
OFFICER	MOBILE PATROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
OFFICER	A OUTPOST	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
OFFICERS	OUTPOSTS BCD	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	15.59
ROVER	PER. SECURITY	EVENING,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
FOOT PATROL	PERIMETER	EVENING,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
FOOT PATROL	PERIMETER	NIGHT,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						53.68

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
HOSPITAL	#1	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
GALLERY	U	DAY,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	E LIVING UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.39
OFFICERS	E.C.A.	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
OFFICERS	E CONTROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.39
OFFICERS	E.C.A.	DAY,ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.20
OFFICERS	E LIVING UNIT	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	5.0	0	17.32
OFFICERS	J LIVING UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.39
OFFICERS	J LIVING UNIT	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	A LIVING UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.39
OFFICERS	A LIVING UNIT	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	A CONTROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
OFFICERS	A CONTROL	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	HOSPITAL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.20
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						96.98

***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICER	I.D.BUILDING	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
OFFICERS	N AREA	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.46
OFFICERS	N AREA	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.47
OFFICERS	CONSTRUCTION	DAY,ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.20
OFFICERS	TRAINING	DAY,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.46
OFFICER	V&C	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
OFFICER	RECREATION	EVENING,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.46
OFFICER	N AREA	EVENING,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.46
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						24.99

***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
ESCORT	OUTSIDE	DAY,ALL	Y	4.0	0	6.93
OFFICER	PICKUP	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.73
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.66
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						388.77

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	12.0	3.1	3.1	\$ 64,567
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	14.0	3.6	3.7	\$ 64,304
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	70.0	18.0	18.4	\$ 321,522
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	58.0	14.9	15.2	\$ 266,404
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	13.0	3.3	3.4	\$ 76,772
CONTROL POINTS	37.5	9.6	9.8	\$ 137,613
PERIMETER SECURITY	53.7	13.8	14.1	\$ 197,267
UNIT SUPERVISION	97.0	24.9	25.5	\$ 356,350
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	25.0	6.4	6.6	\$ 91,815
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	8.7	2.2	2.3	\$ 31,817
TOTAL	388.8	100.0	102.0	\$1,608,431

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	73	19	7	2	2	1	96	25
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	62	16	3	1	1	0	71	19
UNIT OFFICERS	25	7	20	5	11	3	97	25
OTHER OFFICERS	38	10	23	6	13	4	125	33
TOTAL	197	52	53	14	28	7	389	**

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	7.05	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	223.00	MEDICAL:	9	2
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	3	1
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	223.00	INDUSTRY:	2	1
TOTAL POST REQT.:	221.76	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	28	7
DIFFERENCE:	1.24	CLERICAL:	16	4
CONGRUENCE:	0.99			

SUMMARY CHART  
MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION

POPULATION LEVEL	380	#####
COVERAGE FACTOR	23	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	52	XXXXX
STAFF RATE/ EVE	14	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	7	#####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	102	XXXXXXXXXX
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	7	#####
ADM/SPT STAFF	25	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	19	#####
UNIT CO'S	25	#####
OTHER CO'S	33	#####
MEDICAL	2	##
MENTAL HEALTH	1	#
INDUSTRY	1	#
EDUCATION/VOTEC	7	#####
CLERICAL	4	####
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	7	#####
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	5	#####
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	3	###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	259	3105	195	2338
HOLIDAYS	314	3770	237	2839
ILLNESS LEAVE	185	2218	139	1670
TRAINING DAYS	92	1109	70	835
MILITARY LEAVE	37	444	28	334
OTHER LEAVE	37	444	28	334
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	14
HOLIDAYS:	13
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	7
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	17
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	1
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	208
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.25
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.27
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.76

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 3

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ADMIN. ASST.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
STAFF ASST.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK/STENO	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
DIRECTOR	SOCIAL SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

CLERK	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

DIRECTOR	LAUNDRY SERVICE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
MANAGER	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	4	1.00
OPERATORS	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	N	4.0	0	4.00
SUPERVISORS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
DIRECTOR	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SUPERVISORS	FOOD SERVICE	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.6	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.00

\*\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

CASE MANAGERS	CLASSIFICATION	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
TEACHERS	VOCATIONAL SCHOOL	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
TEACHERS	ACADEMIC EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	6.0	0	6.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
COORDINATOR	RECREATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						16.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

SOCIAL WORKER	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SPECIALIST	MENTAL HEALTH	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
NURSE PRACTITIONER	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TECHNICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						4.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CHIEF CORR. OFFICER	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SHIFT SUPERVISOR	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	*	1.1	0	6.00
OFFICER ON DUTY	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	*	0.9	9	5.00
DESK OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	7.03
TRAINING OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	CLOCK MAN	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						21.28
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
OFFICER	TOWER #1	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
OFFICER	TOWER #2	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
OFFICER	TOWER #3	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.27
OFFICER	TOWER #4	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.27
OFFICER	TOWER #5	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.27
OFFICER	TOWER #6	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.27
OFFICER	FRONT GATE	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						24.85
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
TUNNEL OFFICERS	UNITS & DINING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.27
TUNNEL OFFICERS	UNITS & DINING	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	7.03
TUNNEL OFFICERS	UNITS & DINING	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.76
TUNNEL OFFICERS	UNITS & DINING	WKND, DAYS	Y	2.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						15.06
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICER	LINE SUSPENSION	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.76
OFFICER	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
OFFICER	VISITING ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						4.27
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OFFICER	TRANSPORTATION	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.25
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.25
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						104.71

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	6.0	5.7	1.4	\$ 29,286
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	1.0	1.0	0.2	\$ 4,167
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	11.0	10.5	2.6	\$ 45,833
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	16.0	15.3	3.8	\$ 66,667
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	4.0	3.8	1.0	\$ 21,429
CONTROL POINTS	21.3	20.3	5.1	\$ 70,939
PERIMETER SECURITY	24.8	23.7	5.9	\$ 82,817
UNIT SUPERVISION	15.1	14.4	3.6	\$ 50,192
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	4.3	4.1	1.0	\$ 14,221
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.3	1.2	0.3	\$ 4,183
TOTAL	104.7	100.0	24.9	\$ 389,733

## STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	17	4	1	0	0	0	18	4
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	20	5	0	0	0	0	20	5
UNIT OFFICERS	6	1	3	1	1	0	15	4
OTHER OFFICERS	18	4	8	2	6	1	52	12
TOTAL	61	14	12	3	7	2	105	25

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 3.74

AUTHORIZED CO'S:	58.00
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	58.00
TOTAL POST REQ.:	66.71
DIFFERENCE:	8.71
CONGRUENCE:	1.15

## KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS

	#	R
MEDICAL:	1	0
MENTAL HEALTH:	2	0
INDUSTRY:	0	0
EDUCATION/VOTEC:	11	3
CLERICAL:	1	0

SUMMARY CHART  
S. CAROLINA: MANNING C.I.

```

POPULATION LEVEL 420 #####
COVERAGE FACTOR 25 #####
STAFF RATE/ DAY 14 #####
STAFF RATE/ EVE 3 ###
STAFF RATE/ NITE 2 ##
STAFF RATE/ TOTL 25 #####
CONGRUENCE 15 #####
SPAN OF CTRL 4 ####
ADM/SPT STAFF 4 ####
MED/PGRM/CASE 5 #####
UNIT CO'S 4 ####
OTHER CO'S 12 #####
MEDICAL 0 #
MENTAL HEALTH 0 #
INDUSTRY 0
EDUCATION/VOTEC 3 ###
CLERICAL 0 #
UNIT CO'S/ DAY 1 #
UNIT CO'S/ EVE 1 #
UNIT CO'S/ NITE 0 #
  
```

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	78	934	44	532
HOLIDAYS	72	867	41	494
ILLNESS LEAVE	39	467	22	266
TRAINING DAYS	95	1134	54	646
MILITARY LEAVE	6	67	3	38
OTHER LEAVE	6	67	3	38
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

```

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR: 365
REGULAR DAYS OFF: 104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR: 261
VACATION DAYS: 25
HOLIDAYS: 11
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN: 11
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS: 3
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN: 1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN: 1
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE: 209

COVERAGE FACTOR: 1.25
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR: 5.24
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE: 1.75
  
```

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING

6

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	RAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
SUPERINTENDENT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
SECRETARY	SUPERINTENDENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						2.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
HEAD ACCOUNT CLERK	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERKS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
TYPIST	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00
***** SUPPORT OPERATIONS						
HEAD COOK	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.9	0	3.00
GEN. MECHANIC	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
MAINTENANCE ASST.	GARAGE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
SENIOR COUNSELOR	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
COUNSELOR AIDE	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHER	ACADEMIC EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHER	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00
***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT						
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						0.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
LIEUTENANT	CUSTODY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SERGEANTS & CAPTAIN	CUSTODY	CONTINUOUS	*	1.1	5	6.00
OFFICERS	CONTROL CENTER	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.75
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.75
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						0.00
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
OFFICERS	DORMITORY	NIGHT, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.24
OFFICERS	DORMITORY	EVENING, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.24
OFFICER	DORMITORY	WKND, DAYS	Y	3.0	0	1.50
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.99
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICERS	RECREATION/PROGRAMS	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.50
OFFICERS	WORK CREWS	DAY, M-F	Y	6.0	0	7.49
OFFICERS	COMMUNITY PROJECTS	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.50
OFFICERS	GROUPS/HOUSEKEEPING	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.75
OFFICER	VISITING	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.50
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						15.73
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OFFICER	TRANSPORTATION	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.75
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.75
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						58.22



SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	2.0	3.4	1.3	\$ 27,333
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	6.0	10.3	4.0	\$ 70,000
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	6.0	10.3	4.0	\$ 70,000
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	6.0	10.3	4.0	\$ 70,000
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ 0
CONTROL POINTS	8.7	15.0	5.8	\$ 81,651
PERIMETER SECURITY	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ 0
UNIT SUPERVISION	12.0	20.6	8.0	\$ 111,893
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	15.7	27.0	10.5	\$ 146,859
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.7	3.0	1.2	\$ 16,318
TOTAL	58.2	100.0	38.8	\$ 594,053

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	12	8	1	1	0	0	14	9
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	6	4	0	0	0	0	6	4
UNIT OFFICERS	3	2	3	2	3	2	12	8
OTHER OFFICERS	14	9	3	2	1	1	26	17
TOTAL	35	23	7	5	4	3	58	39

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	3.46	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	38.00	MEDICAL:	0	0
OVERTIME CO FTE:	4.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	0	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	42.00	INDUSTRY:	0	0
TOTAL POST REQ.:	38.22	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	2	1
DIFFERENCE:	3.78	CLERICAL:	4	3
CONGRUENCE:	0.91			

SUMMARY CHART  
N.Y.: CAMP GEORGETOWN

POPULATION LEVEL	150	#####
COVERAGE FACTOR	24	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	23	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	5	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	3	###
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	39	#####
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	3	###
ADM/SPT STAFF	9	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	4	####
UNIT CO'S	8	#####
OTHER CO'S	17	#####
MEDICAL	0	
MENTAL HEALTH	0	
INDUSTRY	0	
EDUCATION/VOTEC	1	#
CLERICAL	3	###
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	2	##

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	80	955	42	500
HOLIDAYS	35	420	18	220
ILLNESS LEAVE	35	420	18	220
TRAINING DAYS	10	115	5	60
MILITARY LEAVE	3	38	2	20
OTHER LEAVE	3	38	2	20
CO OVERTIME	70	836	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 F.P.C. ALLENWOOD  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	15
HOLIDAYS:	10
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	6
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	5
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	2
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	2
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	221
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.18
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	4.96
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.65

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 7

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* ADMINISTRATION

SUPERINTENDENT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ASST. SUPT.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	16	1.00
SECRETARY	SUPERINTENDENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

PERSONNEL OFFICER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
ACCOUNTANT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNTANT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	TRUST FUND	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASHIER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
AGENT	PURCHASING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	FISCAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASSISTANT	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

FOOD ADMINISTRATOR	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CHIEF OF MECH. SERVIC	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
SAFETY SPEC	SAFETY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
COOK FOREMEN	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.2	0	4.00
MECHANIC	AUTOMOTIVE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	ELECTRIC	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
ENGINEERS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
FOREMAN	GROUND	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
FOREMAN	PLUMBING	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMEN	CONSTRUCTION	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
MANAGER	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						21.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
SUPERINTENDENT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
RECORDS OFFICER	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CHAPLAINS	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	ASST SUPT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
INSPECTOR	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	WOOD SHOP	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
FOREMAN	WOOD MACHINE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	CARPENTRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	UPHOLSTERY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
FOREMAN	WOODCRAFT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	PAINT SHOP	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
FOREMAN	UPHOLSTERY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASEWORKERS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	2	4.00
CLERKS	CLASSIFICATION	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
RECORDS SPEC	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
DATA COORDINATOR	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHER	ACADEMIC	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RECREATION SPEC	GYM & YARD	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
COUNSELOR	VOCATIONAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TEACHER	VOCATIONAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						27.00
***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT						
MEDICAL ADMINISTRATOR	INFIRMARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
PHYSICIANS ASST	MEDICAL	CONTINUOUS	*	0.8	0	4.00
CLERK	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CHIEF CORR SUPERV	CUSTODY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
SUPERVISORS	CORRECTIONS	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	4.96
OFFICERS	CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						10.92
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						0.00
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
UNIT MANAGERS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	1	2.00
CORR COUNSELORS	UNITS	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
OFFICERS	UNITS	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.61
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICERS	REC & DISCHARGE	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
OFFICERS	VISITING	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.61
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OTHER POSTS	UNSPECIFIED	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						95.15

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	3.0	3.2	0.8	\$ 16,400
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	11.0	11.6	2.9	\$ 51,333
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	21.0	22.1	5.6	\$ 98,000
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	27.0	28.4	7.2	\$ 126,000
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	6.0	6.3	1.6	\$ 36,000
CONTROL POINTS	10.9	11.5	2.9	\$ 40,769
PERIMETER SECURITY	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ 0
UNIT SUPERVISION	8.6	9.1	2.3	\$ 32,157
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	6.6	7.0	1.8	\$ 24,691
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.0	1.1	0.3	\$ 3,733
TOTAL	95.1	100.0	25.4	\$ 429,084

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	28	8	2	1	1	0	35	9
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	30	8	1	0	1	0	33	9
UNIT OFFICERS	3	1	2	1	1	0	9	2
OTHER OFFICERS	8	2	2	1	2	1	19	5
TOTAL	69	18	7	2	5	1	95	25

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	3.24	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	28.00	MEDICAL:	2	1
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	4	1
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	28.00	INDUSTRY:	12	3
TOTAL POST REQT.:	27.15	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	4	1
DIFFERENCE:	0.85	CLERICAL:	5	1
CONGRUENCE:	0.97			

**CONTINUED**

**2 OF 3**

SUMMARY CHART  
F.P.C. ALLENWOOD

POPULATION LEVEL 370 #####  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 18 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 18 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 2 ##  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 1 #  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 25 #####  
 CONGRUENCE 0  
 SPAN OF CTRL 3 ###  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 9 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 9 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 2 ##  
 OTHER CO'S 5 #####  
 MEDICAL 1 #  
 MENTAL HEALTH 1 #  
 INDUSTRY 3 ###  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 1 #  
 CLERICAL 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 1 #  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 0 #

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	34	407	85	1020
HOLIDAYS	23	271	57	680
ILLNESS LEAVE	14	163	34	408
TRAINING DAYS	11	136	28	340
MILITARY LEAVE	5	54	11	136
OTHER LEAVE	5	54	11	136
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD



#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	15
HOLIDAYS:	10
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	8
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	3
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	2
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	2
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	221
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.18
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	4.96
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.65

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 11

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
SUPERINTENDENT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
ADM. ASST.	SUPT.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK STENO	ADM ASST	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. SUPT.	OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	8	1.00
SECRETARY	A.S. OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
INVESTIGATOR	A.S. OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	INVESTIGATOR	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST. SUPT.	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	12	1.00
SECRETARY	A.S. PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

SECRETARY	SUPT.	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PERSONNEL REP.	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
CLERK	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CLERKS	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ACCOUNTANT	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERKS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ACCOUNT CLERK	TRUST FUND	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	TRUST FUND	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASHIER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SUPPLY STAFF	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK	SERVICE CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	SERVICE CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						19.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

SUPPLY SUPERV.	STORES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SUPPLY STAFF	STORES	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
SUPERVISOR	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
CLERK	SUPERVISOR	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISORS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	8.0	1	8.00
ASSISTANTS	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	6.0	0	6.00
SUPERVISOR	UTILITIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ENGINEER	BOILERS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	2	3.31
ENGINEERS	BOILERS	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
ENGINEER	WATER & SEWER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
OPERATORS	WATER & SEWER	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
MANAGER	FOOD SERVICE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	12	1.00
COOKS	EARLY AM	NIGHT, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
COOKS	A.M.	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
COOKS	LATE AM	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
COOKS	EVENING	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
MANAGER	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
VEHICLE REPAIR	AGRICULTURE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						46.84

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
SUPERVISOR	CLINICAL SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
CLERKS	CLINICAL SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
SUPERVISOR	CASEWORK	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
COUNSELORS	CASEWORK	OFFICE HRS	N	9.0	0	9.00
SUPERVISOR	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
CLERKS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
COORDINATOR	VOLUNTEERS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COUNSELOR	RELEASE PREP	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	RELEASE PREP	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	ACTIVITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
STAFF	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	1	3.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
LIBRARIANS	LIBRARY	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.61
SUPERVISOR	AGRICULTURE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
FOREMEN	AGRICULTURE	DAY, M-F	N	3.0	0	3.00
DIRECTOR	C. EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
ADMINISTRATORS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	6.0	10	6.00
TEACHERS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	29.0	0	29.00
COUNSELORS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	6.0	0	6.00
CLERKS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	7.0	0	7.00
VOCED	EVENING	EVE, M-F	N	4.5	0	4.50
TEACHERS	EVENING	EVE, M-F	N	14.0	0	14.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						105.11

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PHYSICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	0.5	14	0.50
ADMINISTRATOR	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHYSICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DENTIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OPTOMETRIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHARMACIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MED TECH	AMBULANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	AMBULANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
HEAD NURSE	INFIRMARY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
NURSES/TECHS	INFIRMARY	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.46

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CHIEF	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	11	1.00
CLERK	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TRAINING OFFICER	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CAPTAINS	ALL SHIFTS	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	12	4.96
CAPTAIN	ASSIGN/ADJUST	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERK	ASSIGN/ADJUST	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
LIEUTENANTS	ZONES 1-3	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	2	14.88
LIEUTENANTS	ZONES 4&5	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	2	6.61
SERGEANT	ADM BLDG	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	3	3.31
SECURITY	CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.31
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						44.03

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

PATROL#1	OUTSIDE	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
INFORMATION	ENTRANCE BLDG	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.92

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT SUPERVISION

SERGEANTS	UNIT 1	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	4.96
OFFICERS	UNIT 1	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	9.92
SERGEANTS	UNIT 2	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	4.96
OFFICERS	UNIT 2	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	14.88
SERGEANTS	UNIT 3	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	4.96
OFFICERS	UNIT 3	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	14.88
SERGEANTS	UNIT 4	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	4.96
OFFICERS	UNIT 4	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	14.88
SERGEANTS	UNIT 5	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	4.96
OFFICERS	UNIT 5	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	14.88
SERGEANTS	UNIT 6	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	4.96
OFFICERS	UNIT 6	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	9.92
SERGEANT	BLDG19, 3FL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	4.96
SERGEANT	BLDG19, 1FL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	4.96
OFFICERS	BLDG19, 2&3	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	9.92
OFFICERS	BLDG19, 1FL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.31
MEAL RELIEF	BLGD19, 1FL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.31
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						135.58

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICERS	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	0	4.00
OFFICER	IDENTIFICATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	LOBBY DESK	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.31
OFFICER	VISITING	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.31
OFFICER	TELEPHONE	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.65
OFFICER	MEAL RELIEF	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	4.96
SERGEANT	TOWN SQUARE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.31
OFFICER	EDUCATION	DAY&EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	4.72
OFFICER	EDUCATION	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	VOCATIONAL	DAY&EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	2.36
OFFICER	ROUSTABOUTS	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	LOCKSMITH	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	ROAD GANG	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
OFFICER	TELEPHONE	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	YARD	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	LIBRARY	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	LAUNDROMAT	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	LAKE	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	SWIMMING	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	PICNIC AREA	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.47
OFFICER	COMMISSARY	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.18
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						36.94
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
LIEUTENANT	TRANSPORTATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
OFFICER	TRANSPORT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						2.00
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						422.88

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	9.0	2.1	1.6	\$ 31,810
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	19.0	4.5	3.3	\$ 57,328
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	46.8	11.1	8.1	\$ 141,330
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	105.1	24.9	18.1	\$ 317,154
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	14.5	3.4	2.5	\$ 56,095
CONTROL POINTS	44.0	10.4	7.6	\$ 106,275
PERIMETER SECURITY	9.9	2.3	1.7	\$ 23,946
UNIT SUPERVISION	135.6	32.1	23.4	\$ 327,257
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	36.9	8.7	6.4	\$ 89,171
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	2.0	0.5	0.3	\$ 4,828
TOTAL	422.9	100.0	72.9	\$1,155,193

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	60	10	4	1	3	1	75	13
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	93	16	22	4	1	0	120	21
UNIT OFFICERS	28	5	28	5	26	4	136	23
OTHER OFFICERS	43	7	19	3	8	1	93	16
TOTAL	224	39	73	13	38	7	423	73

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	4.14	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	238.00	MEDICAL:	10	2
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	0	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	238.00	INDUSTRY:	4	1
TOTAL POST REQT.:	228.47	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	61	11
DIFFERENCE:	9.53	CLERICAL:	30	5
CONGRUENCE:	0.96			

SUMMARY CHART  
VIENNA CORRECTIONAL CENTER

POPULATION LEVEL 580 XXXXX  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 18 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 39 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 13 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 7 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 73 XXXXXXX  
 CONGRUENCE 0  
 SPAN OF CTRL 4 ####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 13 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 21 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 23 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 16 #####  
 MEDICAL 2 ##  
 MENTAL HEALTH 0  
 INDUSTRY 1 #  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 11 #####  
 CLERICAL 5 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 5 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 5 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 4 ####

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	286	3427	243	2916
HOLIDAYS	190	2285	162	1944
ILLNESS LEAVE	152	1828	130	1555
TRAINING DAYS	57	685	49	583
MILITARY LEAVE	38	457	32	389
OTHER LEAVE	38	457	32	389
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
F.C.I. FORT WORTH  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	22
HOLIDAYS:	11
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	6
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	5
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	1
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	215
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.21
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.10
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.70

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING

5.

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ASSOCIATE WARDEN	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
ASSOCIATE WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	13	1.00
RESEARCH ANALYST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ASSOC. WARDENS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RESEARCH ASSISTANT	RESEARCH	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	RESEAAARCH	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ASSOC WARDENS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC-TOR	#	SPAN OF CON-TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	---------	---	------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

PERSONNEL OFFICER	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
COORDINATOR	STAFF TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PERSONNEL MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SECRETARIES	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ASST. BUSINESS MANAGE	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
SUPERVISOR	ACCOUNTING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ACCOUNTANTS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	4.0	1	4.00
PURCHASING AGENTS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
STOREKEEPER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SUPPLY CLERKS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
RELIEF CLERK	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CLERKS	TRUST FUND	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICE MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ACCOUNTANT	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						21.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

FACILITY MANAGER	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
MANAGER	SAFETY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SECRETARY	FACILITY MANAGER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHIEF	UTILITIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
FOREMEN	UTILITY MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OPERATORS	BOILER SYSTEM	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	0	5.00
GENERAL FOREMEN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	9	1.00
FOREMEN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	9.0	0	9.00
ASST. ADMINISTRATOR	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
COOK FOREMEN	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	2.4	0	8.00
GENERAL FOREMAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						31.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC-TOR	#	SPAN OF CON-TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	---------	---	------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

COORDINATOR	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
SUPERVISOR	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
PROGRAM OFFICER	COMMUNITY SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
PRINCIPAL	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	13	1.00
SUPERVISOR	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
COORDINATOR	WORK RELEASE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
SECRETARY	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COORDINATOR	LEARNING CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
TEACHER	LEARNING CENTER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TEACHERS	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	9.0	0	9.00
RECREATION SPECIALIST	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
PUBLICATION MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
INDUSTRY MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PRINTING MANAGER	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
MANAGER	SIGN FACTORY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
DUPL EQUIP OPERATOR	INDUSTRIES	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RECORDS CLERKS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CASE MANAGERS	CHSU UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERKS	CHSU UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CASE MANAGER	DRUG ABUSE UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERKS	DRUG ABUSE UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CASE MANAGERS	NARA UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERKS	NARA UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGERS	STAR UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CLERKS	STAR UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CASE MANAGERS	WOMEN'S UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERKS	WOMEN'S UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						51.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

CHIEF PSYCHOLOGIST	PSYCHOLOGY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
MEDICAL OFFICER	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	HOSPITAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
PHARMACIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHYSICIANS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
DENTISTS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
DENTAL TECH	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	NURSES/MEDTECHS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	13	1.00
NURSES/MED TECHNICIAN	MEDICAL	CONTINUOUS	*	1.6	0	8.00
CLERKS	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
PSYCHOLOGISTS	PSYCHOLOGY	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						23.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CHIEF SUPERVISOR	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CLERK	CORRECTIONAL SUPERVIS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CORRECTIONAL SUPERVIS	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	*	1.4	10	7.00
OFFICER	CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.10
OFFICER	LOBBY	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.40
SECURITY OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						19.50
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
OFFICER	PATROL	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.80
OFFICER	ENTRANCE	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	ENTRANCE	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.23

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
UNIT MANAGER	DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
UNIT MANAGER	NARA UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
UNIT MANAGER	STAR UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
UNIT MANAGER	WOMEN'S UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
UNIT MANAGER	CHSU UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
OFFICER	UNITS	CONTINUOUS	Y	5.0	0	25.49
OFFICER	UNITS	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.40
OFFICER	UNITS	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	UNITS	WKND,DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.49
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						35.59
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICER	VISITING ROOM	DAY,ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.40
OFFICER	ACTIVITY AREAS	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.40
OFFICER	YARD	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.80
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	RECEIVING & DISCHARGE	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.43
OFFICER	EDUCATION	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	YARD	WKND,DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.49
OFFICER	VISITING	WKND,DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.49
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	CLOTHING ROOM	DAY,M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	YARD PATROL	WKND,DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.49
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						22.34
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OFFICER	OTHER POSTS	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.40
OFFICER	BUS	DAY,M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.43
OFFICER	EXECUTIVE RELIEF	DAY,M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						7.83
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						229.48



SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
F.C.I. FORT WORTH

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	9.0	3.9	1.6	\$ 32,655
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	21.0	9.2	3.7	\$ 65,044
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	31.0	13.5	5.5	\$ 96,018
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	51.0	22.2	9.0	\$ 157,964
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	23.0	10.0	4.1	\$ 91,593
CONTROL POINTS	19.5	8.5	3.5	\$ 48,313
PERIMETER SECURITY	9.2	4.0	1.6	\$ 22,861
UNIT SUPERVISION	35.6	15.5	6.3	\$ 88,192
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	22.3	9.7	4.0	\$ 55,348
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	7.8	3.4	1.4	\$ 19,394
TOTAL	229.5	100.0	40.6	\$ 677,382

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	51	9	3	1	1	0	61	11
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	68	12	2	0	2	0	74	13
UNIT OFFICERS	13	2	6	1	5	1	36	6
OTHER OFFICERS	30	5	9	2	2	0	59	10
TOTAL	162	29	20	4	10	2	229	41

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	3.87	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	100.00	MEDICAL:	15	3
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	4	1
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	100.00	INDUSTRY:	8	1
TOTAL POST REQ.:	94.48	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	14	2
DIFFERENCE:	5.52	CLERICAL:	19	3
CONGRUENCE:	0.94			

SUMMARY CHART  
F.C.I. FORT WORTH

POPULATION LEVEL	560	XXXXX
COVERAGE FACTOR	21	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	29	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	4	####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	2	##
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	41	#####
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	4	####
ADM/SPT STAFF	11	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	13	#####
UNIT CO'S	6	#####
OTHER CO'S	10	#####
MEDICAL	3	###
MENTAL HEALTH	1	#
INDUSTRY	1	#
EDUCATION/VOTEC	2	##
CLERICAL	3	###
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	1	#
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	1	#

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	173	2079	248	2970
HOLIDAYS	87	1039	124	1485
ILLNESS LEAVE	47	567	68	810
TRAINING DAYS	39	472	56	675
MILITARY LEAVE	8	94	11	135
OTHER LEAVE	8	94	11	135
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACILITY  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	10
HOLIDAYS:	11
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	12
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	7
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	3
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	217
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.20
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.05
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.68

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 13

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
COMMISSIONER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
DPTY. COMMISSIONER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
PLAN & RESEARCH DIR.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						7.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

ACCOUNTANT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERK	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

SUPPORT DIRECTOR	SUPPORT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
MAINT. LT.	SUPPORT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
MAINT. OFFICER	SUPPORT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLANT SUPERV.	BOILER	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
PLANT OPERATORS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
STOREKEEPER	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.05

\*\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM DIRECTOR	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
RELEASE DIRECTOR	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
EDUCATION DIRECTOR	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
COUNSELORS	PROGRAM/INTAKE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
REC. SUPERV.	GYMNASIUM	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
REC. LEADERS	GYMNASIUM	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERICAL AIDE	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	INTAKE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						11.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PSYCHOLOGIST	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00

\*\*\*\*\* CONTROL POINTS

CUSTODY DIR.	CONTROL CTR	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	7	1.00
SUPPORT SUPERV	CONTROL CTR	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	16	1.00
CONTROL CTR	CONTROL CTR	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
FRONT DESK	FRONT DESK	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.10

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

PATROL	PERIMETER	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
PATROL	PERIMETER	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.37

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT SUPERVISION

UNIT SUPERV.	UNITS	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	4	5.05
WEST WING SUPV	WEST WING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	3	5.05
A FLAGGING	WEST WING	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
F FLAGGING	WEST WING	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
GALLERIES	WEST WING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
GALLERIES	WEST WING	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
EAST WING SUPV	EAST WING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.05
R-S GALLERIES	EAST WING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
R-S GALLERIES	EAST WING	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
Y DESK	EAST WING	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
WOMEN'S WING DESK	WOMEN'S WING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	1	5.05
M-N GALLERIES	WOMEN'S WING	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
M-N GALLERIES	WOMEN'S WING	DAY,ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
PQWX GALLERIES	SPEC. HOUSING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						53.88

\*\*\*\*\* INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

BOOKING	INTAKE	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
IDENTIFICATION	INTAKE	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PACKAGES	FRONT DESK	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SEARCH/VISIT	VISITING	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CUST.SERV.SUPV	ADMINISTRATION	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	12	1.00
FARM SUPERV	FARM	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
LAUNDRY	LAUNDRY	DAY,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
GROUND	GROUND	DAY,M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
FOOD SERV.	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE,ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.74

\*\*\*\*\* EXTERNAL AND OTHER

TRANSPORT	INTAKE	DAY&EVE,M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						118.14

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACILITY

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	7.0	5.9	4.4	\$ 89,688
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	3.0	2.5	1.9	\$ 32,813
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	11.1	9.4	6.9	\$ 120,877
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	11.0	9.3	6.9	\$ 120,313
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	1.0	0.8	0.6	\$ 14,063
CONTROL POINTS	12.1	10.2	7.6	\$ 105,903
PERIMETER SECURITY	3.4	2.9	2.1	\$ 29,468
UNIT SUPERVISION	53.9	45.6	33.7	\$ 471,482
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	14.7	12.5	9.2	\$ 128,935
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.0	0.8	0.6	\$ 8,750
TOTAL	118.1	100.0	73.8	\$1,122,289

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	17	11	1	1	1	1	21	13
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	12	8	0	0	0	0	12	8
UNIT OFFICERS	14	9	11	7	7	4	54	34
OTHER OFFICERS	15	9	6	4	3	2	31	20
TOTAL	58	36	18	11	11	7	118	74

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 4.10

AUTHORIZED CO'S: 86.00  
 OVERTIME CO FTE: 0.00  
 TOTAL FTE CO'S: 86.00  
 TOTAL POST REQ.: 85.09  
 DIFFERENCE: 0.91  
 CONGRUENCE: 0.99

KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS # R

MEDICAL: 0 0  
 MENTAL HEALTH: 1 1  
 INDUSTRY: 0 0  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC: 1 1  
 CLERICAL: 8 5

SUMMARY CHART  
ONONDAGA COUNTY CORRECTIONS FACILITY

POPULATION LEVEL 160 #####  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 20 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 36 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 11 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 7 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 74 XXXXXX  
 CONGRUENCE 0  
 SPAN OF CTRL 4 ####  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 13 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 8 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 34 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 20 #####  
 MEDICAL 0  
 MENTAL HEALTH 1 #  
 INDUSTRY 0  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 1 #  
 CLERICAL 5 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 9 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 7 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 4 ####

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	71	851	28	331
HOLIDAYS	78	936	30	364
ILLNESS LEAVE	85	1021	33	397
TRAINING DAYS	50	596	19	231
MILITARY LEAVE	7	85	3	33
OTHER LEAVE	21	255	8	99
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTIONS  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR: 365  
 REGULAR DAYS OFF: 104  
 TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR: 261  
 VACATION DAYS: 20  
 HOLIDAYS: 12  
 AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN: 9  
 CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS: 5  
 AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN: 1  
 AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN: 1  
 TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE: 213  
  
 COVERAGE FACTOR: 1.23  
 CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR: 5.15  
 SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE: 1.72

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 19

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
A: COMMISSIONER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
A: SPECIAL ASSISTANT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
A: SECRETARY	COMMISSIONER	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
A: WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
A: SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
P: ASSOC. WARDEN	PENITENTIARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
P: SNR. ASST. WARDEN	PENITENTIARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
P: SECRETARY	ASSOC WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
J: ASSOC. WARDEN	JAIL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
J: SR. ASST. WARDEN	JAIL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
J: SR. TYPIST	ASSOC WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
J: TYPIST	GENERAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
W: CAPTAIN	WOMEN'S UNIT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						13.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
A: TRAINING OFFICER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00
***** SUPPORT OPERATIONS						
P: MANAGER	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
P: SENIOR COOK	PENITENTIARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
P: COOKS	PENITENTIARY	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	2.0	0	7.00
P: MAINTENANCE MAN	PENITENTIARY	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
P: STOREKEEPER	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
J: MAINTENANCE MAN	JAIL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						13.00
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
P: CLERK	INTAKE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00
***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT						
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						0.00
***** CONTROL POINTS						
P: CAPTAIN	TOUR SUPERVISOR	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.9	10	3.00
P: CAPTAIN	POST 1	CONTINUOUS	*	0.8	0	4.00
P: OFFICERS	WEST CONTROL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICERS	CONTROL CENTER	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICERS	RECORDS/FRONT OFFICE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.86
J: CAPTAIN	TOUR SUPERVISOR	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	13	5.00
J: OFFICERS	G-CONTROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	15.44
J: OFFICER	CONTROL CENTER	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
J: OFFICER	SEARCH	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
J: OFFICER	SEARCH	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
W: SERGEANT	TOUR SUPERVISORS	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	6	5.00
W: OFFICERS	CENTRAL CONTROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						65.03
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						0.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
P: SERGEANT	UNIT SUPERVISOR	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	9	5.00
P: OFFICERS	A BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
P: OFFICERS	A BLOCK	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICERS	B BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
P: OFFICERS	B BLOCK	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICERS	D BLOCK	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
P: OFFICERS	D BLOCK	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.86
P: OFFICERS	F UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
P: OFFICERS	F UNIT	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICERS	C BLOCK	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICERS	C BLOCK	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.72
P: OFFICER	UNIT FLOATER	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.72
J: SERGEANT	UNIT SUPERVISOR	CONTINUOUS	*	1.0	10	5.00
J: OFFICERS	CENTER	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	15.44
J: OFFICERS	EAST	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	3.0	0	10.29
J: OFFICERS	WEST	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	4.0	0	13.72
J: OFFICERS	EAST & WEST	EVENING, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.15
J: OFFICERS	G-BLOCK	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
J: OFFICER	MEDICAL UNIT	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.29
W: OFFICERS	EAST BLOCK 1&2	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.29
W: OFFICERS	WEST BLOCK 1&2	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.29
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						133.52
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
P: OFFICER	IDENTIFICATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICER	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICER	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.23
P: OFFICER	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
P: OFFICER	CLOTHING/TAILOR	OFFICE HRS	Y	2.0	0	2.45
J: OFFICER	BOOKING	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.15
J: OFFICER	BOOKING	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
J: OFFICER	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.86
J: OFFICER	COMMISSARY	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.23
J: OFFICER	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
J: OFFICER	SUPPLY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
J: OFFICER	IDENTIFICATION	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.45
W: OFFICERS	KITCHEN/MEAL RELIEF	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.43
W: OFFICER	COMMISSARY	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.23
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						42.17
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
P: OFFICER	TRANSPORT	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.23
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.23
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						269.94

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
 NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTIONS

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	13.0	4.8	2.1	\$ 42,302
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	1.0	0.4	0.2	\$ 2,778
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	13.0	4.8	2.1	\$ 36,111
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	1.0	0.4	0.2	\$ 2,778
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ 0
CONTROL POINTS	65.0	24.1	10.3	\$ 144,519
PERIMETER SECURITY	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ 0
UNIT SUPERVISION	133.5	49.5	21.2	\$ 296,702
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	42.2	15.6	6.7	\$ 93,715
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.2	0.5	0.2	\$ 2,723
TOTAL	269.9	100.0	42.8	\$ 621,628

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	22	3	2	0	0	0	27	4
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
UNIT OFFICERS	28	4	33	5	17	3	134	21
OTHER OFFICERS	33	5	24	4	10	2	108	17
TOTAL	84	13	59	9	27	4	270	43

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	4.56	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	254.00	MEDICAL:	0	0
OVERTIME CO FTE:	1.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	0	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	255.00	INDUSTRY:	0	0
TOTAL POST REQ'T.:	241.95	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	0	0
DIFFERENCE:	13.05	CLERICAL:	6	1
CONGRUENCE:	0.95			

SUMMARY CHART  
 NY: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CORRECTIONS

POPULATION LEVEL	630	XXXXXX
COVERAGE FACTOR	22	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	13	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	9	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	4	####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	43	#####
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	5	####
ADM/SPT STAFF	4	####
MED/PGRM/CASE	0	#
UNIT CO'S	21	#####
OTHER CO'S	17	#####
MEDICAL	0	
MENTAL HEALTH	0	
INDUSTRY	0	
EDUCATION/VOTEC	0	
CLERICAL	1	#
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	4	####
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	5	#####
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	3	###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	403	4839	47	560
HOLIDAYS	242	2903	28	336
ILLNESS LEAVE	181	2178	21	252
TRAINING DAYS	101	1210	12	140
MILITARY LEAVE	20	242	2	28
OTHER LEAVE	20	242	2	28
CO OVERTIME	18	213	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD



#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	27
HOLIDAYS:	0
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	6
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	6
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	2
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	20
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	200
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.31
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.48
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.83

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 16

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* ADMINISTRATION

WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
ASST. DPTY WARDEN	COURT DIVISION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ASST DEPUTY WARDEN	ENVIRONMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ASST DEPUTY WARDENS	TOUR COMMAND	CONTINUOUS	*	1.5	1	8.00
CAPTAIN	INVESTIGATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						15.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

CAPTAIN	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
CAPTAIN	GENERAL OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	15	1.00
ADM. ASSISTANT	GENERAL OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK SUPERVISOR	GENERAL OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
OFFICE AIDES	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	1	2.00
OFFICE ASSOCIATE	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TRANSCRIBER	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MANAGER	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

CAPTAIN	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CAPTAIN	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	12	1.00
CAPTAIN	SANITATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
OPERATORS	ELEVATOR	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.8	0	3.00
OFFICE ASSISTANTS	GENERAL OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ELECTRICIAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
STAFF	MAINTENANCE	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.8	0	3.00
PLUMBER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
PLUMBER'S HELPER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
EXTERMINATOR	SANITATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
RODENT CONTROL AIDE	SANITATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
MANAGER	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CHIEF COOK	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.5	1	2.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.6	0	6.00
MEAT CUTTER	KITCHEN	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
ENGINEERS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	0.9	0	5.00
AIDE	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
LOCKSMITH	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						34.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
CAPTAINS	VISITS & PGRMS	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	19	2.00
ADM. ASSISTANT	SOCIAL SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
LEGAL COORDINATOR	LAW LIBRARY	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
DOCCS STAFF	SOCIAL SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
DIRECTOR	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	0.8	0	3.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.00
***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT						
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						0.00
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CAPTAINS	HOUSE #1&2	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	13	10.96
CAPTAIN	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CAPTAIN	CONTROL ROOM	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	MAIN GATE	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	MAIN CORRIDOR	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	CONTROL ROOM	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	SECURITY AREAS	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
OFFICER	VISIT CONTROL	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	ELECTRONIC INSPECTION	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	2ND FL CONTROL	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	VISIT SEARCH	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						36.19
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
OFFICER	OUTSIDE PATROL	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.4	0	5.12
OFFICER	OUTSIDE PATROL	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.94

108

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
OFFICER	ONE NORTH	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	TWO, S&W	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.96
OFFICER	THREE, N, S, W-A	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	16.44
OFFICER	THREE, W-B	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	FOUR, N, S, W-A	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	16.44
OFFICER	FOUR, W-B	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	FIVE, N, S, W-A	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	16.44
OFFICER	FIVE, W-B	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	SIX, S&W	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	SIX, WEST-B	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						85.87
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICERS	CLINIC	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICERS	CHAPEL & ESCORT	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	DESK: RECEIVING ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICERS	CARDS: REC. ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.4	0	1.83
OFFICERS	CARDS: REC. ROOM	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICERS	N & S YARD	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICERS	GENERAL OFFICE	CONTINUOUS	Y	2.0	0	10.96
OFFICERS	CASHIERS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICERS	MAIL & PACKAGE ROOMS	OFFICE HRS	Y	3.6	0	4.70
OFFICER	COUNSEL AREA	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.2	0	1.57
OFFICER	DW PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	Y	3.0	0	3.92
OFFICER	WARDEN'S OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	KITCHEN	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	KITCHEN	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	STOREROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	MAINTENANCE GANG	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICERS	LAUNDRY	OFFICE HRS	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	SANITATION GANG	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICERS	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	3.5	0	12.79
OFFICER	LAW LIBRARY	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.2	0	1.57
OFFICER	METAL DETECTOR LOCKER	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	2ND FL WAIT, IN&OUT	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	INMATE REGISTRATION	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	ELEVATOR	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	VISIT SUPERVISION	EVE, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						80.91
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OFFICER	INST. VEHICLE	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	WRITS/TRANSFERS	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	CAP PGRM ESCORT	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.92
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						283.83

109

283.83

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	15.0	5.3	3.0	\$ 62,121
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	9.0	3.2	1.8	\$ 31,818
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	34.0	12.0	6.9	\$ 120,202
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	12.0	4.2	2.4	\$ 42,424
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ 0
CONTROL POINTS	36.2	12.8	7.3	\$ 102,358
PERIMETER SECURITY	6.9	2.4	1.4	\$ 19,636
UNIT SUPERVISION	85.9	30.3	17.3	\$ 242,862
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	80.9	28.5	16.3	\$ 228,837
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	3.9	1.4	0.8	\$ 11,073
TOTAL	283.8	100.0	57.3	\$ 861,331

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	37	8	6	1	2	0	58	12
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	10	2	1	0	0	0	12	2
UNIT OFFICERS	17	3	17	3	13	3	86	17
OTHER OFFICERS	41	8	34	7	9	2	128	26
TOTAL	105	21	58	12	24	5	284	57

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	4.78	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	204.00	MEDICAL:	0	0
OVERTIME CO FTE:	12.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	0	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	216.00	INDUSTRY:	0	0
TOTAL POST REQT.:	213.83	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	0	0
DIFFERENCE:	2.17	CLERICAL:	4	1
CONGRUENCE:	0.99			

SUMMARY CHART  
NYC: BRONX HOUSE OF DETENTION

POPULATION LEVEL	490	#####
COVERAGE FACTOR	30	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	21	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	12	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	5	#####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	57	XXXXX
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	5	#####
ADM/SPT STAFF	12	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	2	##
UNIT CO'S	17	#####
OTHER CO'S	26	#####
MEDICAL	0	
MENTAL HEALTH	0	
INDUSTRY	0	
EDUCATION/VOTEC	0	
CLERICAL	1	#
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	3	###
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	3	###
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	3	###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	481	5773	158	1890
HOLIDAYS	0	0	0	0
ILLNESS LEAVE	107	1283	35	420
TRAINING DAYS	107	1283	35	420
MILITARY LEAVE	36	428	12	140
OTHER LEAVE	356	4277	117	1400
CO OVERTIME	200	2400	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
MCC: NEW YORK  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	22
HOLIDAYS:	11
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	6
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	5
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	1
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	215
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.21
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.10
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.70

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 1

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
ASSOCIATE WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	10	1.00
ASSOCIATE WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIRECTOR	COMMUNITY TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	6	1.00
SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ASSOC WARDENS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
STATISTICAL ANALYST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
ASST. BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
PURCHASING AGENT	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERKS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
TRUST FUND CLERKS	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
RELIEF CLERK	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PERSONNEL OFFICER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
SPECIALISTS	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK	PERSONNEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SPECIALIST	TRAINING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
MANAGER	ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
MAIL CLERK	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						16.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

ADMINISTRATOR	FOOD SERVICES	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
FACILITIES MANAGER	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
MANAGER	SAFETY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
WAREHOUSE FOREMEN	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	*	1.5	0	5.00
GENERAL FOREMAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	6	1.00
SKILLED TRADES	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	6.0	0	6.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						17.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES						
FOREMAN	BRUSH FACTORY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
DIRECTOR	EDUCATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CHAPLAIN	CHAPEL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COORDINATOR	CASE MANAGEMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PROGRAM SPECIALISTS	COMMUNITY TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASST	COMMUNITY TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
RECORDS CLERK	COMMUNITY TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CLERK	COMMUNITY TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COUNSELOR AIDE	COMMUNITY TREATMENT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COORDINATOR	POPULATION MVT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
SUPERVISOR	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
RECORDS TECHNICIANS	RECORDS	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	0	5.00
CASE MANAGERS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CLERKS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
R&D OFFICER	RECEIVING & DISCHARGE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
R&D OFFICER	RECEIVING & DISCHARGE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.70
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						25.70

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

MEDICAL OFFICER	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PSYCHIATRIST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
ADMINISTRATOR	HOSPITAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	PSYCHOLOGY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
PHYSICIAN'S ASST	MEDICAL	CONTINUOUS	*	1.6	0	8.00
LAB TECHNICIAN	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
LABTECH ASST	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERK	MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						16.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** CONTROL POINTS						
CHIEF CORRECTIONAL SU	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CORRECTIONAL SUPERVIS	SECURITY	CONTINUOUS	*	1.4	15	7.00
OFFICERS	CONTROL ROOMS	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	15.30
CLERKS	SECURITY	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.40
OFFICER	SECURITY	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						27.69
***** PERIMETER SECURITY						
OFFICER	LOBBY	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.10
OFFICER	PATROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.10
OFFICER	PATROL	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	ENTRANCE	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.63
***** UNIT SUPERVISION						
UNIT MANAGERS	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	5.0	1	5.00
OFFICERS	UNITS	CONTINUOUS	Y	8.0	0	40.79
OFFICERS	UNITS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.80
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						52.59
***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD						
OFFICER	RECREATION	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.70
OFFICERS	VISITING ROOM	DAY, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.40
OFFICER	MAIL ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	CLOTHING ROOM	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.21
OFFICER	YARD PATROL	WKND, DAYS	Y	1.0	0	0.49
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						8.01
***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER						
OFFICERS	OTHER POSTS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	3.0	0	10.20
OFFICER	BUS	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.43
OFFICER	EXECUTIVE RELIEF	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.63
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						198.25

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
MCC: NEW YORK

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	8.0	4.0	1.9	\$ 39,423
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	16.0	8.1	3.8	\$ 67,308
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	17.0	8.6	4.1	\$ 71,514
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	25.7	13.0	6.2	\$ 108,111
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	16.0	8.1	3.8	\$ 86,538
CONTROL POINTS	27.7	14.0	6.7	\$ 93,204
PERIMETER SECURITY	12.6	6.4	3.0	\$ 42,489
UNIT SUPERVISION	52.6	26.5	12.6	\$ 176,975
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	8.0	4.0	1.9	\$ 26,964
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	14.6	7.4	3.5	\$ 49,219
TOTAL	198.2	100.0	47.7	\$ 761,745

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	37	9	1	0	0	0	41	10
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	35	8	2	0	2	0	42	10
UNIT OFFICERS	15	4	10	2	8	2	53	13
OTHER OFFICERS	23	6	11	3	6	2	63	15
TOTAL	110	27	24	6	16	4	198	48

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	4.44	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	94.00	MEDICAL:	11	3
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	2	0
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	94.00	INDUSTRY:	1	0
TOTAL POST REQT.:	115.54	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	1	0
DIFFERENCE:	21.54	CLERICAL:	9	2
CONGRUENCE:	1.23			

SUMMARY CHART  
MCC: NEW YORK

POPULATION LEVEL	410	#####
COVERAGE FACTOR	21	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	27	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	6	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	4	####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	48	#####
CONGRUENCE	23	#####
SPAN OF CTRL	4	####
ADM/SPT STAFF	10	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	10	#####
UNIT CO'S	13	#####
OTHER CO'S	15	#####
MEDICAL	3	###
MENTAL HEALTH	0	#
INDUSTRY	0	#
EDUCATION/VOTEC	0	#
CLERICAL	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	4	####
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	2	##
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	2	##

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	212	2542	152	1819
HOLIDAYS	106	1271	76	910
ILLNESS LEAVE	58	693	41	496
TRAINING DAYS	48	578	34	413
MILITARY LEAVE	10	116	7	83
OTHER LEAVE	10	116	7	83
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD



#####  
 CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
 ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY  
 STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####  
 CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR:	365
REGULAR DAYS OFF:	104
TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR:	261
VACATION DAYS:	10
HOLIDAYS:	11
AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN:	12
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS:	7
AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN:	1
AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN:	3
TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE:	217
COVERAGE FACTOR:	1.20
CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR:	5.05
SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE:	1.68

#####  
 STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 14

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
COMMISSIONER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
DPTY. COMMISSIONER	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	9	1.00
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
PLAN & RESEARCH DIR.	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						7.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

ACCOUNTANT	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERK	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.00

\*\*\*\*\* SUPPORT OPERATIONS

SUPPORT DIRECTOR	SUPPORT	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
MAINT. LT.	SUPPORT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
MAINT. OFFICER	SUPPORT	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
PLANT SUPERV.	BOILER	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	1	1.00
PLANT OPERATORS	BOILER	CONTINUOUS	*	0.8	0	4.00
STOREKEEPER	WAREHOUSE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						10.00

\*\*\*\*\* PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM DIRECTOR	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	5	1.00
RELEASE DIRECTOR	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
EDUCATION DIRECTOR	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
COUNSELORS	PROGRAM/INTAKE	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
REC. SUPERV.	GYMNASIUM	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
REC. LEADERS	GYMNASIUM	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CLERICAL AIDE	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
TYPIST	INTAKE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASE MANAGER	UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.00

\*\*\*\*\* MEDICAL AND TREATMENT

PSYCHOLOGIST	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.00

\*\*\*\*\* CONTROL POINTS

CUSTODY SUPERV.	CONTROL CTR.	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	2	3.37
CONTROL CTR.	CONTROL CTR.	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	8	5.05
CONTROL CTR.	CONTROL CTR.	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
LOBBY	LOBBY	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
REAR CONTROL	REAR CTRL CTR	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						16.84

\*\*\*\*\* PERIMETER SECURITY

PATROL	PERIMETER	NIGHT, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.37
PATROL	PERIMETER	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						5.05

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
----------	----------	-------	-------------	---	----------------------------	------

\*\*\*\*\* UNIT SUPERVISION

HOUSING DIRECTOR	UNITS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	5	1.00
HOUSING MANAGERS	UNITS	DAY&EVE, ALL	N	3.0	5	3.00
CLERK	UNITS	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERV. A	UNIT A	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.05
OFFICERS A	UNIT A	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
OFFICERS A	UNIT A	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CORR. COUNS A	UNIT A	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CORR. COUNS A	UNIT A	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERV. B	UNIT B	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	2	5.05
OFFICERS B	UNIT B	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
OFFICERS B	UNIT B	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CORR. COUNS. B	UNIT B	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CORR. COUNS. B	UNIT B	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERV. C	UNIT C	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	5	5.05
MALE CO'S	UNIT C	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
MALE CO'S	UNIT C	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.74
FEMALE CO'S	UNIT C	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
FEMALE CO'S	UNIT C	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CORR. COUNS. C	UNIT C	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
CORR. COUNS. C	UNIT C	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						66.20

\*\*\*\*\* INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD

SEEK & SEARCH	ALL AREAS	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
SCHOOL/REC	SCHOOL/REC	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
BOOKING	INTAKE	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.68
IDENTIFICATION	INTAKE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
MAIL INSPECT	MAIL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
VISITING	VISITATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	6.74
RECEPT/MED	INTAKE	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.05
WORK DETAILS	ALL AREAS	DAY, M-F	N	2.0	0	2.00
PROGRAM CO'S	PROGRAM	OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						26.21

\*\*\*\*\* EXTERNAL AND OTHER

TRANSPORTATION	INTAKE	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.37
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.37
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						150.67

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	7.0	4.6	3.6	\$ 74,740
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	3.0	2.0	1.6	\$ 27,344
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	10.0	6.6	5.2	\$ 91,146
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	12.0	8.0	6.3	\$ 109,375
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	1.0	0.7	0.5	\$ 11,719
CONTROL POINTS	16.8	11.2	8.8	\$ 122,781
PERIMETER SECURITY	5.1	3.4	2.6	\$ 36,835
UNIT SUPERVISION	66.2	43.9	34.5	\$ 482,707
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	26.2	17.4	13.6	\$ 191,089
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	3.4	2.2	1.8	\$ 24,556
TOTAL	150.7	100.0	78.5	\$1,172,291

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	17	9	1	0	1	0	20	10
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	13	7	0	0	0	0	13	7
UNIT OFFICERS	23	12	18	9	7	4	66	34
OTHER OFFICERS	18	9	11	6	4	2	51	27
TOTAL	71	37	30	16	12	6	151	78

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL 3.32

AUTHORIZED CO'S:	117.00
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	117.00
TOTAL POST REQ.:	117.66
DIFFERENCE:	0.66
CONGRUENCE:	1.01

KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
MEDICAL:	0	0
MENTAL HEALTH:	1	1
INDUSTRY:	0	0
EDUCATION/VOTEC:	1	1
CLERICAL:	9	5

SUMMARY CHART  
ONONDAGA COUNTY NEW FACILITY

POPULATION LEVEL 190 #####  
 COVERAGE FACTOR 20 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ DAY 37 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ EVE 16 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ NITE 6 #####  
 STAFF RATE/ TOTL 78 XXXXXX  
 CONGRUENCE 1 #  
 SPAN OF CTRL 3 ###  
 ADM/SPT STAFF 10 #####  
 MED/PGRM/CASE 7 #####  
 UNIT CO'S 34 #####  
 OTHER CO'S 27 #####  
 MEDICAL 0  
 MENTAL HEALTH 1 #  
 INDUSTRY 0  
 EDUCATION/VOTEC 1 #  
 CLERICAL 5 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ DAY 12 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ EVE 9 #####  
 UNIT CO'S/ NITE 4 ###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	98	1177	28	330
HOLIDAYS	108	1294	30	363
ILLNESS LEAVE	118	1412	33	396
TRAINING DAYS	69	824	19	231
MILITARY LEAVE	10	118	3	33
OTHER LEAVE	29	353	8	99
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

#####

CORRECTIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS PROJECT  
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION  
STAFFING PATTERN ANALYSIS

#####

CALCULATION OF COVERAGE FACTOR

TOTAL DAYS PER YEAR: 365  
 REGULAR DAYS OFF: 104  
 TOTAL REMAINING DAYS PER YEAR: 261  
 VACATION DAYS: 27  
 HOLIDAYS: 0  
 AVERAGE ILLNESS LEAVE TAKEN: 6  
 CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING DAYS: 6  
 AVERAGE MILITARY LEAVE TAKEN: 2  
 AVERAGE OTHER LEAVE TAKEN: 20  
 TOTAL ACTUAL DAYS AVAILABLE: 200  
  
 COVERAGE FACTOR: 1.31  
 CONTINUOUS COVERAGE FACTOR: 5.48  
 SEVEN DAY, ONE SHIFT COVERAGE: 1.83

#####

STAFFING PATTERN LISTING 17

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
***** ADMINISTRATION						
WARDEN	ADMINISTRATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	PROGRAMS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	8	1.00
DEPUTY WARDEN	OPERATIONS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASST.	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	WARDEN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SECRETARY	ASSOC. WARDENS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
TYPING POOL	ALL AREAS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						9.00

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
<b>***** BUSINESS MANAGEMENT</b>						
PERSONNEL OFFICER STAFF	PERSONNEL PERSONNEL REPORTS	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
BUSINESS MANAGER	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CASHIER STAFF	BUSINESS OFFICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	3	1.00
	COMMISSARY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
		OFFICE HRS	N	2.0	0	2.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						6.00
<b>***** SUPPORT OPERATIONS</b>						
SUPERVISOR	FOOD SERVICE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	7	1.00
COOKS	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	7.31
MANAGER	MAINTENANCE	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	4	1.00
STAFF	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	1	2.61
PLUMBER	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
ELECTRICIAN	MAINTENANCE	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
INSPECTOR	FIRE SAFETY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						14.92
<b>***** PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES</b>						
AIDE	LIBRARY	EVE, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
COORDINATOR	EDUCATION/VOTEC	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	2	1.00
SUPERVISOR	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
LEADER	RECREATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
COORDINATOR	CHAPLAIN	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
SUPERVISOR	CLASSIFICATION	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
CASE MANAGER	INTAKE SCREENING	CONTINUOUS	*	1.1	0	6.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						12.00
<b>***** MEDICAL AND TREATMENT</b>						
SOCIAL WORKERS	HOUSING UNITS	OFFICE HRS	N	3.0	0	3.00
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						3.00
<b>***** CONTROL POINTS</b>						
CHIEF	SECURITY	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	1	1.00
COMMANDER	TOUR	CONTINUOUS	*	1.1	29	6.00
ASST. COMMANDER	TOUR	DAY, ALL	Y	3.0	4	5.48
SUPERVISOR	CONTROL ROOM	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	CONTROL ROOM A	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	CONTROL ROOM B	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	SCHEDULING	OFFICE HRS	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICERS	VISIT PROCESSING	EVENING, ALL	Y	4.0	0	7.31
OFFICER	BRIDGE GATE	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						36.71
<b>***** PERIMETER SECURITY</b>						
OFFICER	OUTSIDE PATROL	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						5.48

POSITION	LOCATION	SHIFT	FAC- TOR	#	SPAN OF CON- TROL	TOTL
<b>***** UNIT SUPERVISION</b>						
OFFICERS	UNIT CONTROL STATIONS	CONTINUOUS	Y	8.0	0	43.85
UNIT OFFICERS	UNITS 4,7,10	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	16.44
UNIT OFFICERS	UNITS 5,6,8,9,11	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	10.0	0	36.54
PATROL OFFICERS	UNITS 5,6,8,9,11	DAY, ALL	Y	5.0	0	9.14
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						105.97
<b>***** INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD</b>						
OFFICER	STORES/LOADING DOCK	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
OFFICER	LAUNDRY	DAY, M-F	Y	2.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	ELEVATOR	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	SECURITY/TOOL CTRL	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	0	1.00
OFFICER	SANITATION	DAY, M-F	N	1.0	2	1.00
OFFICER	SANITATION DETAIL	DAY, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
OFFICER	KITCHEN	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICERS	MAIL ROOM/PACKAGES	DAY, M-F	Y	3.0	0	3.02
OFFICER	LEGAL LIBRARY	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
OFFICER	RECREATION	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	2.0	0	7.31
SUPERVISOR	VISITING	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	8	1.83
OFFICERS	VISITING ROOM	EVENING, ALL	Y	2.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	RECEPTION VISITING	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
SUPERVISOR	RECEIVING	DAY, M-F	Y	1.0	18	1.31
OFFICERS	RECEPTION PROCESS	CONTINUOUS	Y	3.0	0	16.44
OFFICER	RECEIVING ESCORT	DAY&EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	2.61
OFFICER	RECEIVING SEARCH	DAY&EVE, ALL	Y	1.0	0	3.65
OFFICER	RECEIVING MEDICAL	OFFICE HRS	Y	1.0	0	1.31
OFFICER	CLINIC A	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICER	CLINIC PATROL	NIGHT, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
OFFICER	CLINIC PATROL	EVENING, ALL	Y	1.0	0	1.83
SUPERVISOR	THIRD FLOOR	CONTINUOUS	Y	1.0	0	5.48
OFFICERS	PROGRAM CENTERS	DAY, ALL	Y	3.0	0	5.48
OFFICERS	PROGRAM CENTERS	EVENING, ALL	Y	6.0	0	10.96
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						94.13
<b>***** EXTERNAL AND OTHER</b>						
OFFICER	HOSPITAL TRANSFER	EVE, M-F	Y	1.0	0	1.31
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL:						1.31
TOTAL STAFF COUNT:						288.51

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERN  
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION

AREA	POSITIONS	%	RATE PER 100 P.	STANDARD COST PER 100 PRIS.
ADMINISTRATION	9.0	3.1	2.3	\$ 46,125
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	6.0	2.1	1.5	\$ 26,250
SUPPORT OPERATIONS	14.9	5.2	3.7	\$ 65,266
PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES	12.0	4.2	3.0	\$ 52,500
MEDICAL AND TREATMENT	3.0	1.0	0.8	\$ 16,875
CONTROL POINTS	36.7	12.7	9.2	\$ 128,485
PERIMETER SECURITY	5.5	1.9	1.4	\$ 19,184
UNIT SUPERVISION	106.0	36.7	26.5	\$ 370,881
INTERNAL ACTIVITY AND YARD	94.1	32.6	23.5	\$ 329,466
EXTERNAL AND OTHER	1.3	0.5	0.3	\$ 4,568
TOTAL	288.5	100.0	72.1	\$1,059,599

STAFF SUMMARY BY SHIFT

	DAY		EVE		NITE		TOTL	
	#	R	#	R	#	R	#	R
ADMINISTRATIVE & SUPPORT	24	6	2	1	0	0	30	7
MEDICAL, PGRM, & CASE MNGT	9	2	2	1	1	0	15	4
UNIT OFFICERS	26	7	21	5	11	3	106	26
OTHER OFFICERS	37	9	33	8	10	3	138	34
TOTAL	96	24	58	15	22	6	289	72

AVE. SPAN/ SUPERV. CTRL	5.62	KEY FUNCTION POSITIONS	#	R
AUTHORIZED CO'S:	245.00	MEDICAL:	0	0
OVERTIME CO FTE:	0.00	MENTAL HEALTH:	3	1
TOTAL FTE CO'S:	245.00	INDUSTRY:	0	0
TOTAL POST REQ.:	243.60	EDUCATION/VOTEC:	2	1
DIFFERENCE:	1.41	CLERICAL:	5	1
CONGRUENCE:	0.99			

SUMMARY CHART  
NYC: MANHATTAN HOUSE OF DETENTION

POPULATION LEVEL	400	#####
COVERAGE FACTOR	30	#####
STAFF RATE/ DAY	24	#####
STAFF RATE/ EVE	15	#####
STAFF RATE/ NITE	6	#####
STAFF RATE/ TOTL	72	XXXXXXX
CONGRUENCE	0	
SPAN OF CTRL	6	#####
ADM/SPT STAFF	7	#####
MED/PGRM/CASE	4	###
UNIT CO'S	26	#####
OTHER CO'S	34	#####
MEDICAL	0	
MENTAL HEALTH	1	#
INDUSTRY	0	
EDUCATION/VOTEC	1	#
CLERICAL	1	#
UNIT CO'S/ DAY	7	#####
UNIT CO'S/ EVE	5	#####
UNIT CO'S/ NITE	3	###

DAYS, ACCRUED BY MONTH & YEAR, FOR SPECIAL FUNCTIONS

	OFFICERS		NON-OFFICERS	
	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YEAR
ANNUAL LEAVE	548	6577	101	1213
HOLIDAYS	0	0	0	0
ILLNESS LEAVE	122	1462	22	270
TRAINING DAYS	122	1462	22	270
MILITARY LEAVE	41	487	7	90
OTHER LEAVE	406	4872	75	898
CO OVERTIME	0	0	0	0

NOTE: NON CO TRAINING ESTIMATED FROM CO STANDARD

**END**