

SCANNED

9/4/09

## Preface

This report was prepared to provide Mr. Gregory Werich with baseline information to assess the extent to which the Wells County Probation Department conforms to the workload guidelines promulgated by the Indiana Judicial Center. Every effort was made to ensure that the information reported within this document is accurate. Like all evaluation research, however, there are limitations to the data. Wherever appropriate in the text of this report, the authors discussed the limitations of the data.

The authors are willing to conduct additional analyses to clarify concerns or provide answers to unexplored questions. We believe that while this document contains a wealth of valuable information, there is still much to be learned from the data. For example, it is our intention to examine the importance of information management among probation officers and assess the utility of risk assessment instruments for male and female probationers. If there are other ideas that might provide information leading to improved probation supervision in Wells County, Indiana, the authors are open to suggestions.

In its present format, this document is organized into three chapters. Chapter 1 is an analysis of summary data provided in quarterly reports. An attempt is made to directly apply workload measures to the data provided in these reports. Chapter 2 examines time and supervision issues through probation case notes for a "typical week" in probation. Chapter 3 reports professional activities for the "typical week" through the use of journals maintained by probation officers during the study period. Closing comments are offered for consideration.

*Michael P. Brown*

Michael P. Brown, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor

*C. Ted Ward*

C. Ted Ward II, MSM  
Instructor

Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology  
Ball State University

Submitted: Saturday, November 22, 2003

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	i
Chapter 1.....	1
Chapter 2.....	11
Chapter 3.....	26
Closing Comments.....	29
Appendices.....	30

## **Chapter 1**

### **Indiana Workload Measures and Wells County Probation**

#### **Standard Administration and Workload of the Department**

In attempting to organize a department, a strategy must be developed to carry out the tasks, duties and responsibilities thereby assigned by the Courts both by order and by statute. In beginning to examine the workload, one must decide how best to proceed.

While there are many variations, there are two basic administrative strategies currently utilized in practice today. One is a caseload strategy and the other is a workload strategy.

A caseload strategy is one that divides out the work on a case equivalent basis. That is, in basic terms, we might take the total number of cases administered by a department and divide them by the number of probation officers available. So for a department that has 5 officers and 367 adult cases, each officer would receive approximately 74 cases. Additionally for 63 juvenile cases, each officer would receive approximately 13 juveniles. The additional responsibilities of the department (reports, investigations, court-time, etc.) would be meted out in a similar fashion.

A workload strategy is one that recognizes the individual complexities of each case and assigns a “typical” or “standard” time allotment for each case category. The workload strategy typically uses a risk management tool to divide cases by the estimated time it should take to supervise, based on traditional factors that indicate the likelihood of success or failure. The additional activities of the office are calculated on a task completion time basis, and are divided out amongst the departmental staff.

Advantages and disadvantages to Wells County using the Workload strategy as opposed to the Caseload strategy?

The Judicial Conference of Indiana, through the Indiana Judicial Center recommends the use of a workload measure system (see tables 1-3 below). This system utilizes standardized time values to represent the supervision and contact activities on a per month basis. The recommended time values represent the “average” amount of time it took participating departments to complete the tasks associated with each “risk” category. However, it should be noted that these times are not accurate to the minute. It may take more or less time each month per case according to individual circumstances surrounding that case. What follows are the recommended time values for each supervision category represented by the range of time estimated as duplicated from the Workload Measures section of the Probation Deskbook.

Table 1  
Adult Time Values (represented in minutes per month)

	<b>LOW</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>HIGH</b>
High Supervision	90	115	150
Medium Supervision	42	65	85
Low Supervision	25	40	62
Administrative Supervision	9	12	16

Table 2  
Juvenile Time Values (represented in minutes per month)

	<b>LOW</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>HIGH</b>
High Supervision	120	180	225
Medium Supervision	75	95	110
Low Supervision	30	45	60
Administrative supervision	21	30	40

Table 3  
Non-supervision Time Values (represented in minutes per task)

	LOW	RECOMMENDED	HIGH
Pre-sentence Report	320	480	600
Pre-disposition Report	189	200	235
Preliminary Inquiry	60	92	150

**Wells County Applied Data**

To apply the recommended time values to Wells County, data contained in the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Annual Report was utilized. This report was believed to be an appropriate measure of the “average” workload, as it contained information from the survey period and it readily organized the cases according to their “risk” category.

The workload is divided into case supervision activities by type of case (adult felony, adult misdemeanor, and juvenile), and then also by Non-supervision time utilized by the office during the month. In the tables, data are presented according to the division by category of supervision, number of cases per supervision category, and the low, recommended and high time values associated with each category. The established time values (Tables 1-3) are multiplied by the determined number of cases and then applied per case total.

Table 4  
FELONY Adult Time Values (represented in minutes or hours per month)

SUPERVISION	# CASES	LOW	RECOMMENDED	HIGH
High	23	2070 minutes 34.5 hours	2645 minutes 44.08 hours	3450 minutes 57.5 hours
Medium	39	1638 minutes 27.3 hours	2535 minutes 42.25 hours	3315 minutes 55.25 hours
Low	18	450 minutes 7.5 hours	720 minutes 12 hours	1116 minutes 18.6 hours
Administrative	22	198 minutes 3.3 hours	264 minutes 4.4 hours	352 minutes 5.87 hours
<i>Totals</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>4356 minutes</i> <i>72.6 hours</i>	<i>6164 minutes</i> <i>102.73 hours</i>	<i>8233 minutes</i> <i>137.22 hours</i>

Table 5  
MISDEMEANOR Adult Time Values (represented in minutes or hours per month)

SUPERVISION	# CASES	LOW	RECOMMENDED	HIGH
High	43	3870 minutes 64.5 hours	4945 minutes 82.42 hours	6450 minutes 107.5 hours
Medium	129	5418 minutes 90.3 hours	8385 minutes 139.75 hours	10,965 minutes 182.75 hours
Low	53	1325 minutes 22.08 hours	2120 minutes 35.33 hours	3286 minutes 54.77 hours
Administrative	40	360 minutes 6 hours	480 minutes 8 hours	640 minutes 10.67 hours
<i>Totals</i>	<i>265</i>	<i>10,973</i> <i>minutes</i> <i>182.88 hours</i>	<i>15,930 minutes</i> <i>265.5 hours</i>	<i>21,341</i> <i>minutes</i> <i>355.68 hours</i>
<i>Aggregate</i>	<i>367</i>	<i>255.48</i>	<i>368.23</i>	<i>492.90</i>

Since Ind. Standards do not differentiate between Fel and Mis cases, I suggest a combined total # in each category

There were a total of 367 adult cases supervised at the end of the year's 4<sup>th</sup>

Quarter. This represents an average number of adult cases being supervised at any given time. Of that total, 102 cases involved felony criminal supervision and 265 cases involved persons convicted of a misdemeanor charge. There were a total of 66 high risk

Shouldn't the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter numbers be a true average, not just a representation using year end total (367)?

supervisions, 168 medium supervisions, 71 low risk supervisions, and 62 administrative supervisions.

5

The times associated with each of these supervisions are divided by risk level and are applied as follows using the recommended column.

High Risk Cases	126.50 hours
Medium Risk Cases	182.00 hours
Low Risk Cases	47.33 hours
Administrative Cases	12.4 hours

*Total Time Estimate 368.23 hours*

When tables 4 and 5 are compared, it is noted that more than double the amount of time would be spent on supervision activities related to misdemeanor cases. This is a result of the higher volume of misdemeanor cases ordered by the Courts to be provided with probation supervision.

Additionally, the total number of hours recommended for medium risk cases surpasses those for high risk cases. Again, this is a result of the higher number of medium risk cases when compared to those that meet the criteria for high risk supervision.

This department, if following the workload measures strategy, would spend three times the amount of time on medium-risk, misdemeanor supervisions than it would on high-risk felony supervisions. Additionally it would spend about twice the amount of time supervising high risk, misdemeanor cases as it would supervising high risk, felony cases.

I really need a graph to illustrate the different categories (High, medium, low, administrative)

Table 6  
Juvenile Time Values (represented in minutes or hours per month)

Supervision	# CASES	LOW	RECOMMENDED	HIGH
High	15	1800 minutes 30 hours	2700 minutes 45 hours	3375 minutes 56.25 hours
Medium	31	2325 minutes 38.75 hours	2945 minutes 49.08 hours	3410 minutes 56.83 hours
Low	7	210 minutes 3.5 hours	315 minutes 5.25 hours	420 minutes 7 hours
Administrative	10	210 minutes 3.5 hours	300 minutes 5 hours	400 minutes 6.67 hours
<i>Totals</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>4545 minutes</i> <i>75.75 hours</i>	<i>6260 minutes</i> <i>104.33 hours</i>	<i>7605 minutes</i> <i>126.75 hours</i>

Again, shouldn't the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter numbers be a true average, not just a representation using year end total (63)?

There were a total of 63 juvenile supervisions at the end of the year's 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter. This represents an average number of juvenile cases being supervised at any given time. Of that total, 15 cases were requiring high risk supervision, 31 cases required a medium risk supervision, 7 cases required a low risk supervision and 10 cases involved administrative supervision only.

The times associated with each of these supervisions are divided by risk level and are applied as follows using the recommended column.

High Risk Cases	45.00 hours
Medium Risk Cases	49.08 hours
Low Risk Cases	5.25 hours
Administrative Risk Cases	5.00 hours

A graph here would be helpful.

**Total Time Estimate 104.33 hours**

This comparison is not nearly as skewed for juveniles as it is for adults. When high risk supervisions are compared to medium risk supervisions, it is determined that the department could supervise more than twice the number of juvenile supervisions in just

slightly more time than it would take to supervise the high risk supervisions.

Furthermore, low risk supervisions are fairly comparable to administrative supervisions.

Not sure where this comment is going?
--

Additionally the department has some standardized activities that are not specifically supervision related. These tasks satisfy orders from the Court, and support the supervision activities in various ways. These activities additionally aid in case decision making in prior to supervision, in lieu of supervision, or once supervision is established. The activities contained within Table 7 are those that could be determined utilizing the same 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter report as was utilized for the data in tables 4-6.

Table 7  
Non-supervision Time Values (represented in minutes per task)

<b>TASK</b>	<b># EVENTS</b>	<b>LOW</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>HIGH</b>
Pre-Sentence Report	18	5760 minutes 96 hours	8640 minutes 144 hours	10,800 minutes 180 hours
Pre-Disposition Report	1	189 minutes 3.15 hours	200 minutes 3.33 hours	235 minutes 3.92 hours
Preliminary Inquiry	60	3600 minutes 60 hours	5520 minutes 92 hours	9000 minutes 150 hours
<i>Totals</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>9549 minutes 159.15 hours</i>	<i>14,360 minutes 239.33 hours</i>	<i>20,035 minutes 333.92 hours</i>

There were a total of 79 activities accounted for in the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report.

Preliminary Inquiry activities far surpassed the other two categories in terms of quantity.

However, the time associated with completing 18 Pre-Sentence reports surpassed the other two activities total. It should be noted that only one Juvenile Pre-Disposition report was completed during the quarter. The department could be utilizing some other information gathering tool, along with the Preliminary Inquiry report to satisfy the need

for adjudication purposes. It is also important to note that these activities do not include other reports, or tasks as performed regularly by the officers of the Wells County Probation Department.

Instead of "other" insert "Non-supervision" activities

When all supervision and other activities are combined as indicated by the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter report and applied to the recommended workload time values, the following summary is available for the Wells County Department and represented in *hours* per month:

	<u>Low</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>High</u>	
I previously talked to Ted about using an average of PSI, PDR and Prelim (dividing the amount by three). I came up with 552.34 instead of 711.  And, a graph here would be helpful.	<b>Adult Time Estimate</b>			
	Supervision	255.48	368.23	492.90
	Pre-Sentence	96.00	144.00	180.00
	<b>Juvenile Time Estimate</b>			
	Supervision	75.75	104.33	126.75
	Pre-Disposition	3.15	3.33	3.92
	Preliminary Inquiry	60.00	92.00	150.00
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>490.38</b>	<b>711.89</b>	<b>953.57</b>

Given the average number of cases and activities represented by the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report, the majority of the time spent by Wells County Probation should be on adult case supervision activities. Time spent on the pre-sentence investigation for adult offenders would surpass the time it would take to supervise juvenile cases. The amount of time spent completing 60 preliminary inquiries on juveniles would be comparable to the amount of time it would take to supervise 63 juvenile cases.

It is important to note that these total time estimates do not include additional time spent in the courtroom, participating in community activities, in training or development, etc. While these activities are not part of the workload outlined in the above, they are

nonetheless an integral part of probation's responsibilities. These activities do coexist and support the outlined workload.

### Determination of Eligible Hours

As a companion to the workload activities structure and time estimate, the hours available to each department to conduct these activities should be calculated as well. The following is a conservative estimate of the hours available for the Wells County Probation Department to carry out its duties and responsibilities:

40 hours each week multiplied by 52.2 weeks each year = 2088 per officer.

37.5 hour week  
for Wells County  
= 1957 hours

Holidays account  
for at least 15  
days of a Wells  
County employee  
(and in 2003, it  
was 16).

No paid lunch

Other?

Subtract for standard leave:

Vacation Time (est. 10 days)	80.0 hours per year
Holidays (est. 12 days)	96.0 hours per year
Sick Time (est. 7 days)	56.0 hours per year
Paid Lunch	130.5 hours per year
Other (est. 4 days)	32.0 hours per week

*Subtotal subtraction*      *394.5 hours per year*

Subtract for discretionary leave:

Training (est. 7 days)	56.0 hours per year
Administrative time/staff meetings	104.4 hours per year
Break time (0.5 hours each day)	130.5 hours per year
Personal Time (est. 3 days)	24.0 hours per year

*Subtotal subtraction*      *314.9 hours per year*

***Total Subtraction*      *709.4 hours each year subtracted***

709.4 hours subtracted from 2088 hours = 1378.6 hours each year available per officer

1378.6 hours multiplied by 4 (Traditional Officers) = 5514.40 hours each year

A study done  
by  
predecessor  
determined  
the total  
number of  
hours to be  
712.29.

1378.6 hours multiplied by 0.25 (Chief Officer case duties) = 344.65 hours each  
year

5859.05 combined hours available each year for the department's entire workload

*5859.05 divided by 12 months =*

***488.25 hours available each month for all department  
responsibilities***

A graph here is needed to compare the  
standards with reality

### **Summary of Workload Information**

There are approximately 489 hours available each month for the Wells County Probation Department to complete the assigned responsibilities. According to the recommendations of the Judicial Center, it would take approximately 712 hours to complete the standardized workload. When a comparison is made between the hours available and the hours recommended as a requirement, an interesting conclusion could be reached using deductive reasoning.

Given the current staffing resources (4 Traditional Officers and 1 Chief officer with 25% traditional duties), the department is unable to perform its functions according the recommended standards for division of workload. This inability to complete the responsibilities is further exacerbated by the notion that the additional activities of Court attendance, participation in community functions, and other miscellaneous activities are not accounted for in the standardized workload recommendations. Beyond the hypothetical conclusion, an even more interesting question arises about how the activities and responsibilities are being determined and handled by the Wells County Probation Department.

What is the hypothetical conclusion?

## **Chapter 2**

### **Electronic Probation Case Notes, Case Contacts, and Case-Related Activities**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the nature and extent of probation services in Wells County, Indiana. It would be an unmanageable task to examine all work days for the period under investigation – August 1 2001 through January 31, 2002 – in order to ascertain the extent to which probation services in Wells County, conform to Indiana’s workload measures. (Workload measures were discussed in Chapter 1.) A reasonable (and methodologically valid) alternative is to select a series of days that might be representative of a “typical week” for probation officers in Wells County.

The process by which the “typical week” was selected is as follows. First, personal journals were reviewed for holidays, social events, and sick/vacation days, for example. When one or more probation officers were not present on a particular day, that day was excluded as a possible day for inclusion in the “typical week.” There are a number of events and activities that led to the exclusion of certain days from consideration. Table 1 contains a list of those days.

Table 1  
Days excluded from consideration of “typical week”

Reason	Month/Day
POP AI Conference	August 8, 9, 10
Labor Day	September 3
Terrorist Attack	September 11
Street Fair Week	September 17 through 21
Tour of Ladoga	October 2
Columbus Day	October 8
Sick/vacation day	October 16 and 17
Vacation	October 26, 29, 30, and 31
	November 1 and 2
Regional PO meeting in Ft. Wayne	November 2
Veteran’s Day	November 12
Funeral	November 21
Sick/vacation day	December 12, 14 and 17
Christmas	December 24, 25, 27, and 28
New Years	December 31, January 1 through 4
Sick/vacation day	January 28

The remaining days were then arranged according to the day of the week. There were 17 Mondays, 19 Tuesdays, 19 Wednesdays, 22 Thursdays, and 18 Fridays from which to randomly select days for the “typical week.” A table of random numbers was used to select the days that would be included as Monday through Friday of the “typical week.” The “typical week” is as follows:

Monday, November 5, 2001  
 Tuesday, December 11, 2001  
 Wednesday, August 29, 2001  
 Thursday, January 17, 2002  
 Friday, August 31, 2001

I am not in agreement that August 29<sup>th</sup> is a typical day - two officers were shooting at the range all day. It skewed the number of contacts a PO has.

While one could argue that non-holiday work days with the absence of one or more probation officers may have been included among the days of a “typical week,” we believe that the size of the department, the need to cancel appointments, adjusting one’s work day to fill the void for the absence of a probation officer would distort the picture of

a “typical day” in the probation department. Future analyses may want to examine how the absence of one or more probation officer affects others in the department.

### **Characteristics of Case Contacts**

An analysis of the electronic case notes reveals that during the “typical week,” there were 305 case-related contacts, 221 (72.5%) of which involved adult probation cases and 84 (27.5%) involved juvenile probation cases. Each case-related contact involved one or more activities. For example, case-related contacts may have involved the probationer meeting face-to-face with a probation officer or there may have simply been something – such as a report from a therapeutic organization, for example – that caused the probation officer to open a particular case and record that information. The diversity of activities related to case contacts is presented below in Table 2.

A graph here would be nice.

Case-related activities may be conceptualized as falling into four distinct categories. The following Matrix (Matrix 1) is intended to conceptually organize the diverse and often complex activities in which probation officers participate. There may be other conceptualizations that provide insight into the practice of probation supervision and related services, but insight is perhaps best achieved through a system that recognizes the need for probation officers to be information managers. As information managers, probation officers retain what is needed to understand and effectively control their clients and, at the same time, supply information to other decision-makers so that they might make informed decisions about service delivery and the probationer’s status. Information managers not only take in and store information, they also disseminate (information out in Matrix) information, follow through on what the court orders, and maintain each case

so that information is obtained easily and efficiently. A complete listing of case-related activities is found in Appendix A

### **Matrix 1: A Conceptualization of Probation Officer Case-Related Activities**

#### **Information in**

Progress report received from counseling agency:  
 Client demonstrating positive life changes:  
   ...better decision making skills  
   ...active during group counseling  
   ...insight  
 Client having difficulty focusing on goals  
 Changes in medication causing mood swings  
 Professional drug/alcohol/anger management assessment received  
 Probationer will begin drug/alcohol/anger management treatment as a result of assessment  
 Probationer provided proof of alcohol program completion  
 Report from citizen that probationer left jurisdiction  
 Home visit report: probationer (un)available during visit  
 Probationer called to report:  
   ...change in work schedule  
   ...unable to attend meeting  
 Community corrections reports completion of programming  
 Request for courtesy supervision  
 Parent/school report that probationer is not following rules  
 Offender released from prison to probation  
 Probationer reported as directed:  
   ...change/no change in residence, employment...

...contact/no contact with police  
 ...signed interstate compact papers  
 Probationer started community corrections programming  
 Prosecutor files new charges

#### **Court/Legal Activities**

New date/time of hearing set  
 Defense attorney appointed for revocation hearing  
 Modification hearing set  
 Probation revocation petition filed  
 Probation modification  
 Probationer institutionalized

#### **Information Out**

Probationer informed of change in hearing date  
 Failure to appear letter to probationer  
 Probation is informed of probation user fees  
 Progress report is sent to the agency for which Wells County is providing probation supervision

#### **Case Maintenance**

Probationer paid user fees, fines, court costs, or restitution  
 All condition of probation completed  
 Completed community corrections programming

---

Note: Activities are drawn from actual case notes but should not be construed as reflecting all activities

Table 2 shows the distribution of case contacts across the “typical week.” Most case contacts were made on Monday. Similar amounts of case contacts are found on Tuesday through Friday. As indicated earlier, there were 305 case contacts during the “typical week.”

Table 2  
Distribution of Case Contacts for the “Typical Week”

<u>Day</u>	<u>Number of Case Contacts</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Monday	121	39.67
Tuesday	43	14.10
Wednesday	45	14.75
Thursday	57	18.69
<u>Friday</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>12.79</u>
Total	305	100.00

### Number of Case Contact Activities

For each case that came to the attention of a probation officer during the “typical week,” there were from 1 to 9 case-related activities (see Table 3). While most case contacts involved only one activity, there were 219 case contacts with two activities, 110 with three activities, 55 with four activities, and 22 with five activities. Very few cases had more than five case-related activities.

Lots of clarification needed from this point forward. And graphs may be most helpful.

Table 3  
Number of Case Contact Activities

<u>Number of Case-related activities</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1	305	-----
2	219	71.8
3	110	36.1
4	55	18.0
5	22	7.2
6	12	3.9
7	7	2.3
8	3	1.0
9	2	.7

### Case Contact Activities Across the “Typical Week”

Table 4 contains information about case-related activities for each day of the “typical week.” As can be seen, the table is partitioned into nine sections. Each partition reflects an activity-level for each case contact. That is, the partitions reflect case contacts with one activity, two activities, three activities, and so on, for each day of the typical week.

Table 4  
Case-related Activities and Days of the “Typical Week”<sup>1</sup>

Activity	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>First Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	107	88	32	74	24	53	48	84	29	74	240	79
Information out	03	03	01	02	02	04	02	04	06	15	14	05
Court/Legal Activities	08	07	06	14	19	42	06	11	02	05	41	13
Case Maintenance	03	03	04	09	00	00	01	02	02	05	10	03
<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>		<b>43</b>		<b>45</b>		<b>57</b>		<b>39</b>		<b>305</b>	
<b>Second Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	80	89	25	73	18	50	24	75	22	82	169	77
Information out	05	06	01	03	03	08	03	09	03	11	15	07
Court/Legal Activities	04	04	03	09	14	39	03	09	02	07	26	12
Case Maintenance	01	01	05	15	01	03	02	06	00	00	09	04
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>		<b>34</b>		<b>36</b>		<b>32</b>		<b>27</b>		<b>219</b>	
<b>Third Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	42	91	17	85	06	50	17	94	12	86	94	85
Information out	01	02	00	00	01	08	01	06	01	07	04	04
Court/Legal Activities	00	00	01	05	05	42	00	00	01	07	07	06
Case Maintenance	03	07	02	10	00	00	00	00	00	00	05	05
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>		<b>20</b>		<b>12</b>		<b>18</b>		<b>14</b>		<b>110</b>	
<b>Fourth Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	22	88	10	91	02	67	04	67	08	80	46	84
Information out	01	04	00	00	00	00	00	00	01	10	02	04
Court/Legal Activities	00	00	01	09	01	33	00	00	00	00	02	04
Case Maintenance	02	08	00	00	00	00	02	33	01	10	05	09
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>		<b>11</b>		<b>03</b>		<b>06</b>		<b>10</b>		<b>55</b>	
<b>Fifth Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	11	92	01	100	00	00	02	100	05	71	19	86
Information out	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Court/Legal Activities	01	08	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	01	05
Case Maintenance	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	02	29	02	09
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>01</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>02</b>		<b>07</b>		<b>22</b>	

Table 4 (continued)  
Case-related Activities and Days of the "Typical Week"<sup>1</sup>

Activity	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Sixth Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	06	86	00	00	00	00	01	50	02	67	09	75
Information out	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Court/Legal Activities	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Case Maintenance	01	14	00	00	00	00	01	50	01	33	03	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>07</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>02</b>		<b>03</b>		<b>12</b>	
<b>Seventh Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	04	80	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	04	57
Information out	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Court/Legal Activities	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Case Maintenance	01	20	00	00	00	00	01	100	01	100	03	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>05</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>01</b>		<b>01</b>		<b>07</b>	
<b>Eighth Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	02	67	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	02	67
Information out	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Court/Legal Activities	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Case Maintenance	01	33	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	01	33
<b>Total</b>	<b>03</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>03</b>	
<b>Ninth Case-related Activity</b>												
Information in	02	100	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	02	100
Information out	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Court/Legal Activities	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
Case Maintenance	02	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
<b>Total</b>	<b>02</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>00</b>		<b>02</b>	

1. Percentages may not total due to rounding

There are a number of points that might be made about the data in Table 4. For instance, Monday is by far the busy day of the week. Most of the activities associated with case contacts involve the gathering of information. In fact, gathering information (i.e., information in) represents about 80 percent of the activities performed by probation officers when there is one activity or two through six activities.

### Time and Case Contacts

In the electronic case notes, probation officers summarize their discussions with probationers; record progress notes from counselor, for example; and indicate the time they spend with particular cases. Of the 305 case contacts during the “typical week,” probation officers recorded the time spent during 258 case contacts. Therefore, data are missing (with regard to time) on 47 cases. Table 5 provides a distribution of actual time spent on 258 case contacts.

Table 5  
Time Spent on Case Contacts

Minute(s)	# of case contacts	Subtotal	Cumulative Percent	Cumulative Minutes
1	40	40	15.5	40
2	32	64	27.9	104
3	31	93	39.9	197
4	15	60	45.7	257
5	34	170	58.9	427
6	02	12	59.7	439
7	04	28	61.2	467
8	04	32	62.8	499
10	15	150	68.6	649
11	02	22	69.4	671
12	02	24	70.2	695
13	01	13	70.5	708
15	23	345	79.5	1053
20	!!!!!!!	26	89.5	1573
25		15	95.3	1948
28		01	95.7	1976
30		06	98.1	2156
40		02	98.8	2236
45		01	99.2	2281
60		01	99.6	2341
75		01	100.0	2416

Mean = 9.364 minutes

Median = 5.000 minutes

Mode = 1.000 minutes

2416 minutes / 60 minutes/hr. = 40 hours 27 minutes

Not only would a graph be helpful, but subdividing the times into useful time management blocks.

The actual time spent on each case contact is relatively brief, with the average being nearly 10 minutes and the median time being 5 minutes. These data indicate that there were over 40 hours logged during 258 of 305 case contacts during the “typical week.” Dividing this time over five probation officers, this measure of case contact suggests that each probation officer spends about 8 hours per week supervising probationers. This would be a conservative figure given that one probation officer’s primary responsibilities are administrative. It also bears mentioning that we have not yet dealt with the probation journals for the same time period (i.e., the “typical week”). Those data are discussed later.

To give the reader a somewhat different perspective about the amount of time spent on case-related activities, we collapsed the time variable into time intervals. Three intervals were created: one to five minutes (to coincide with the median time spent on case contacts), six to ten minutes (to reflect the average time spent on case contacts), and eleven minutes and longer. The information presented in Table 6 reflects the four case-related activities (that is, Information in, Information out, Court/Legal Activities, and Case Maintenance) discussed earlier in this report for each case contact. Also, it is important to remember that data reflect only those cases (258 of 305) with a time indicated in the probation case notes.

Table 6  
Time Spent on Case Contact Activities

Activities	1 to 5 minutes		6 to 10 minutes		11 or more minutes		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information in	128	57	21	9	74	33	223	100
Information out	2	40	2	40	1	20	5	100
Court/legal activities	21	72	2	7	6	21	29	100
Case Maintenance	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
Total	152	59	25	10	81	31	258	100

As can be seen, although the majority of “information in” activities require very little time (1 to 5 minutes), about a third of them necessitate substantially more time (more than 10 minutes to perform). Disseminating information (i.e., information out activities), court/legal activities, and case maintenance activities tend to be less demanding on a probation officer’s time.

#### **Probation Officer Time Spent Supervising Probationers Based on Classification**

The present configuration of data sets do not allow for a comprehensive analysis of time spent supervising probationers based upon their supervision status. In other words, the data set that gives insight into time spent on case-related activities does not have information on the probationer’s supervision status (i.e., high, medium, low or administrative). Also, attempts to match cases across data sets have been only partly successful given the use of different case identifiers.

Before trying to extrapolate from the little information we were able to compile about time spent supervising probationers with different supervision levels, an attempt is made to provide insight into important case-related characteristics of probationers. In the

pages that follow, data are presented on case status, probation classification, and offense seriousness for the period under study. Then, data are presented from a convenience sample of probationers that might provide insights into how probation services are provided based on supervision status.

Table 7 contains information on case status for all persons who came into contact with the probation department during the study period. Of the 608 probationers, over one-third (215) were discharged from probation, presumably by successfully completing their probation sentences. Relatively small numbers of probationers absconded (31), were transferred to another state (3), transferred to another jurisdiction within the state of Indiana (40), or placed on limbo (or administrative) status (3). Seventy-two probationers violated the conditions of their sentence, 48 were revoked for new offenses and 24 for technical violations.

Table 7  
Probation/Case Status for Study Period

Status	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Absconded	31	5.1	5.1
Discharged	215	35.4	40.5
Interstate transfer out	3	.5	41.0
Intra state transfer out	40	6.6	47.5
Limbo	3	.5	48.0
Open	244	40.1	88.2
Revoked new offense	48	7.9	96.1
Revoked technical violation	24	3.9	100.0
Total	608	100.0	

During the study period, there were similar numbers of probationers rated as needing medium (36%) and administrative supervision (31%) (see Table 8). About 13 percent of probationers were serving out their probation sentences under high

supervision. A slightly larger percentage were receiving low supervision. Given the small percentage of felony offenders serving probation sentences (about 25%) (see Table 9), it is probably not surprising to find over 50 percent of probationers on medium or low supervision.

Table 8  
Classification<sup>1</sup> for Study Period

Level	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
High	81	13.3	13.3
Medium	220	36.2	49.5
Low	118	19.4	68.9
Administrative	188	31.0	99.9
Total	607	99.9	

1. Data are missing on one case.

Table 9  
Offense Seriousness<sup>1</sup> for Study Period

Offense Classification	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Misdemeanor	454	74.8	74.8
Felony	153	25.2	100.0
Total	607	100.0	

1. Data are missing on one case.

Table 10 presents the relationship between probation classification and offense seriousness, while controlling for case status. Focusing upon the open cases, one can see that most (70%) of the offenders were serving misdemeanor probation sentences. Furthermore, of those with high supervision, two-thirds (67.5%) are misdemeanor offenders.

Of the 73 felony probationers, 18% were on high supervision, 40% were on medium supervision, 23% were on low supervision, and the remainder (19%) were on administrative supervision. By contrast, of the 170 misdemeanor probationers, 16%

were under high supervision, 50% were under medium supervision, 18% were under low supervision, and 16% were on administrative supervision.

#### **A Convenience Sample to Measure Time by Classification**

As indicated above, data were available for a relatively small number of probationers to examine classification and time devoted per case contact. Of the 305 case contacts during the “typical week,” classification and time data were available on 35 (11.5%) cases. There were probationers under high, medium, and low supervision. Data were not available on those under administrative supervision.

The data presented in Table 11 should be viewed with caution and should not be generalized. This convenience sample is presented because it tends to be consistent with the findings presented in Chapter 1. Specifically, data suggest that probationers on lower supervision tend to receive more contact time than more serious offenders. For example, probationers under low supervision had, on average, 5 minutes more per contact than those under high supervision. Also, compared with probationers under high supervision, low supervision probationers had twice the range in case contact minutes: 1 to 75 minutes for low supervision probationers versus 1 to 30 minutes for high supervision probationers.

Table 10  
 Classification by Offense Seriousness, Controlling for Case Status:  
 Case Activities During the Study Period

Case Status	Classification	Offense Seriousness				Total	
		Misdemeanor		Felony		N	%
		N	%	N	%		
Absconded	High	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
	Medium	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
	Low	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Administrative	20	74.1	7	25.9	27	100.0
	Total	24	77.4	7	22.6	31	100.0
Discharged	High	14	73.7	5	26.3	19	100.0
	Medium	65	81.3	15	18.8	80	100.0
	Low	53	81.5	12	18.5	65	100.0
	Administrative	45	88.2	6	11.8	51	100.0
	Total	177	82.3	38	17.7	215	100.0
Interstate Transfer Out	Administrative	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0
Intrastate Transfer Out	Administrative	22	55.0	18	45.0	40	100.0
Limbo	Administrative	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0
Open	High	27	67.5	13	32.5	40	100.0
	Medium	85	74.6	29	25.4	114	100.0
	Low	31	64.6	17	35.4	48	100.0
	Administrative	27	65.9	14	34.1	41	100.0
	Total	170	70.0	73	30.0	243	100.0
Revoked, New Offenses	High	11	91.7	1	8.3	12	100.0
	Medium	17	89.5	2	10.5	19	100.0
	Low	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0
	Administrative	10	71.4	4	28.6	14	100.0
	Total	40	83.3	8	16.7	48	100.0
Revoked, Technical Violations	High	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.0
	Medium	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
	Low	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
	Administrative	5	55.6	4	44.4	9	100.0
	Total	17	70.8	7	29.2	24	100.0

Table 11  
Classification and Time

Classification	N	%	Range	Minutes	
				Total	Mean
High	15	42.9	1 to 30	164	10.93
Medium	7	20.0	2 to 20	84	12.00
Low	13	37.1	1 to 75	206	15.85
Total	35	100.0		454	12.97

## Chapter 3 Probation Officer Journals

### Introduction

Wells County probation officers were asked to maintain a record of their activities for the study period (August 1 2001 through January 31, 2002). Four of the five journals contained detailed records of the officer's daily activities. The following analysis reflects those four journals. Also, the information presented in this chapter reflect the journal entries for the days selected for the "typical week." The processes involved in selecting the days of the "typical week" are described in Chapter 2.

### Journal Entries: Activities and Time

Probation officers made numerous journal entries for the days of the "typical week." These entries were then grouped into 15 categories. See Table 3.1 for the list of categories.

Table 3.1  
Probation Officer Activities:  
Reflected in Journal Entries

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Home visits</li> <li>• Initial hearings</li> <li>• School visits</li> <li>• Preliminary inquiries</li> <li>• Preliminary reports</li> <li>• Firearms training</li> <li>• Pre-sentence Investigation(s)/Report(s)</li> <li>• Staffing(s)</li> <li>• General office activities (e.g., file, mail, review monthly roster, document activities, review supervision list)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General court-related activities (e.g., submitting early termination(s) and reviewing court orders)</li> <li>• Recording and writing home visit reports</li> <li>• Prepare probation violation paper work</li> <li>• Work on waiver</li> <li>• Juvenile detention hearing</li> <li>• Prepare predisposition report(s)</li> </ul>
--	---

---

Over the course of the “typical week,” probation officers reported 3,838 minutes of activities or 63.967 hours. In general, journal entries account for nearly 16 hours per week for the four probation officers represented by this data (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2  
Journal Entries and Time by the Day of the Week

Activities	Total minutes	Conversion	
		Hours	P.O.
<b>Monday</b>	822	13.700	3.425
Home visits			
Initial hearing(s)			
Staffing(s)			
General Office Work			
Preliminary inquiry(s)			
Preliminary Report			
Court-related			
PSI/PSR			
<b>Tuesday</b>	805	13.417	3.354
PSI/PSR			
Staffing(s)			
Home visit report/recorded			
General Office Work			
Court-related			
Review PV file/paperwork			
<b>Wednesday</b>	1125	18.75	4.687 <sup>1</sup>
Firearms Training			
PSI/PSR			
Staffing(s)			
General Office Work			
Juvenile detention hearing			
<b>Thursday</b>	627	10.450	2.612
School visit			
PSI/PSR			
Staffing(s)			
General Office Work			
Predisposition report			
Preliminary inquiry(s)			
Court-related			
<b>Friday</b>	459	7.650	1.912
PSI/PSR			
General Office Work			
Court-related			
<b>Total</b>	<b>3838</b>	<b>63.987</b>	<b>15.99</b>

1. This number is inflated by two officers spending a day with firearms training.

Table 3.3 provides information on the time spent performing the categories of activities reported by probation officers. It is interesting to note the extent to which court documents consume an officer's day. See, for example, the amount of time spent writing preliminary reports, pre-sentence reports, and predisposition reports. It is also noteworthy to mention that a considerable amount of time is spent on general office activities, such as filing, dealing with mail, and reviewing supervision lists.

Table 3.3  
Activities and Time

<u>Activity</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Total Minutes</u>	<u>Mean Minutes</u>
Home visits	2	240	120.00
Initial hearing(s)	1	10	10.00
School visit(s)	1	90	90.00
Preliminary inquiry	3	163	54.33
Preliminary report(s)	1	12	12.00
Firearms training	2	870	435.00
Pre-sentence investigation(s)/Report(s)	25	1162	46.48
Staffing(s)	18	254	14.11
General office activities	33	531	16.09
General court-related activities	7	143	20.43
Recording and writing home visit reports	2	15	7.50
Prepare probation violation paper work	1	10	10.00
Work on waiver	1	90	90.00
Juvenile detention hearing	1	45	45.00
Prepare predisposition report	4	203	50.75
Total	102	3838	37.63

A graph here is needed to compare different categories (courtroom, reports, office, prelim/report, staffings, field visits, training)

## Closing Comments

Presented in this report are three components to consider when planning the administration of the duties associated with a probation department. Utilizing a case management strategy (Chapter 1) that considers the amount of work necessary to perform duties at an optimum level seems reasonable, especially when concerned about recidivism, restoration and community safety. Once it is understood what time and resources would be necessary, a comparison can be made to those case activities (Chapter 2) and those additional, non-case specific activities (Chapter 3) associated with the “typical week” in probation. As a combination, conclusions can be drawn from the data to suggest areas of improvement or change. Additionally questions that arise can be further analyzed to determine the extent to which they impact probation practice.

Once the data are understood, recommendations can be developed to foster a strategic plan. Programs can then be implemented to achieve the desired philosophical and policy-related changes desired by administrators. The authors of this report were not inclined to initially offer conclusions or recommendations until the Chief Probation Officer had an opportunity to examine the report. While this approach may seem unconventional, it is believed by the authors that this method allows for unguided discovery and productive innovation on a future direction for the Wells County Probation Department.

**Appendix A**  
**Case Related Activities**

**INFORMATION IN:**

Received CAP progress report  
 CAP report: probationer attended all treatment sessions  
 CAP report: probationer demonstrating positive life changes  
 CAP report: probationer demonstrating better decision making skills  
 CAP report: Probationer active during group process  
 CAP report: probationer demonstrating insight  
 Reviewed statement that probationer was seen at a bar  
 CAP report: probationer having difficulty focusing on material to achieve goals and make better decisions  
 CAP report: changes in medication causing unstable moods  
 CAP report: probationer denies using drug/alcohol  
 Probationer is making progress on 12-step program  
 Received CAP Assessment  
 Probationer will begin treatment as a result of assessment  
 Probationer provided verification of completion of drug/alcohol counseling  
 Change in hearing date/time  
 Reviewed evaluation by MAPPS regarding anger management  
 Reviewed evaluation by MAPPS regarding drug/alcohol treatment  
 Probationer reports marital problems  
 Took picture of probationer  
 Received progress report  
 Progress report: probationer not compliant  
 Progress report: probationer has poor attendance record  
 Progress report: probationer suspended until re-admittance requirements satisfied  
 Assessment is scheduled at therapist  
 Report from citizen: probationer has left jurisdiction  
 Received home visit report  
 Home visit report received: no one at home  
 Received telephone call: probationer is in the hospital  
 Probationer reports new job  
 Probationer calls: out of town on business on particular days  
 CAP report:  
     Attitude is fair/good a  
     Attentive  
     Needs to improve participation  
     Improvement made in stress management  
     Focused on treatment program  
     Motivated to learn, good attitude .  
     Open to feedback  
 Monthly "MI" received  
 "MI"-No Change  
 Received verification of completion of "DDS"  
 Telephone call from probationer

Health problems reported by probationer  
No transportation to appointment, need to reschedule  
Probationer discharged from CAP  
Received mail from probationer  
Probationer reports all is well, no change in status  
Received letter from CC (Community Corrections)  
Probationer completed home detention  
Received update, P.C.  
Probationer in compliance  
Probationer tested positive for alcohol  
Probationer tested positive for other illegal drugs  
Probationer passed drug screen  
Probationer lost job due to incarceration  
Probationer reports looking for a job  
Probationer reports steady employment  
Probationer reports new residence  
Probationer reports seeking placement in women's shelter  
Probationer is released from probation, all conditions met in other county  
Probationer supervised in other county, owes PUF  
PO calls other PO (in other county) for information  
Defense Attorney (met with Defense Attorney)  
Request by other Probation Department for courtesy supervision by Wells County  
Probation Officer receives call from other P.O. from other county  
Probation at home, home visit report  
Received monthly CAP update  
Making progress toward Community Service  
Not following rules at school  
Not following rules at home  
Call from parent/teacher about child on probation  
PO receives report card, for review and discussion  
Probationer involved with sports  
Probationer's residence is other than parents' residence, permission to spend night with  
parent/ adult relative  
Bus referral/warning  
Spending time at B & G  
Requested for extension to pay PUF  
Probationer placed in institution  
Discussed conditions of courtesy supervision  
Probationer was working, unable to attend meeting  
Probationer failed (terminated) WCCC  
Has not made progress in treatment program  
Progress has been made in treatment program  
Probationer admits to using illegal substances (marijuana)/ or alcohol  
Probationer not making child support payments  
Prosecutor's office requests information

Probationer in jail  
 Probationer loses good-time credit in jail  
 Well's County requests court supervision in other county  
 Other county refuses court supervision, failure to pay fines/fees....  
 Probationer is supervised in other county (courtesy)  
 Prisoner released from prison to probation  
 Requested time to hire attorney for impending hearing  
 Probationer attending college classes  
 Well's county probation supervision as courtesy supervision  
 Letter from Prosecutor, requesting PV filed  
 Requested child support payment summary  
 Need to reschedule appointment, worked late.  
 Will begin anger management counseling  
 PO calls Probationer  
 PO calls alternative school for progress report  
 Probationer is making progress toward G.F.D.  
 Requesting release at age 18  
 Received signed school release  
 Teaching parents how to deal with anger issues in home  
 Probationer wants to stay at alternative school.  
 Reported as directed  
     RAD- No change in status  
     RAD- No contact with police/arrests  
     RAD- No job  
     RAD- Interview setup  
     RAD- Completed anger management  
     RAD- Continuing Drug and Alcohol classes  
     RAD- Home detention is done  
     RAD- UDS (drug screen), given reports it will be positive  
     No change in address/residence  
     No change in job/employment (employed)  
     Counseling is going well, as per probationer  
     Employment/income unstable or inconsistent  
     Got driver's license back  
     Behind in making court ordered payments  
     Probationer wrote in to report, as directed, that nothing has changed  
     Probationer called to request transfer upon release from jail  
     Unable to report as directed, rescheduled appointment  
     Completed driving awareness course  
     In anger management class  
     Probationer failed to appear as directed  
     Having trouble at school  
     Probationer is on H.D.  
     Discussed finds/fees/restitution/child support  
     Reviewed rules

Signed interstate complaint papers  
 New changes filed against probationer  
 Completing community service  
 File set up and appointment set for first meeting

### **INFORMATION/REQUESTS OUT**

Change/set in hearing date/time  
 Failure to appear, letter sent to probationer  
 Rescheduled probation meeting, after FTA  
 Sent letter to probationer, regarding payment of fees  
 Letter sent to agency, Wells County will accept request for courtesy supervision  
 Letter sent to probationer that Wells County will supervise him  
 Request that other county probation supervises  
 Progress report sent to other probation department  
 Supervising county informed of warrant  
 PO referred probationer to treatment program  
 Meeting rescheduled, probationer called in advance  
 Wells County requests another jurisdiction to supervise probationer

### **COURT/LEGAL ACTIVITIES**

New date/time of hearing reset  
 Defense attorney appointed at probationers violation hearing  
 Revocation hearing held  
 Amended Revocation Petition filed  
 Recommending: Probation Revocation Petition filed  
 Modification hearing set  
 Probationer discharged (successful) today  
 Depositions completed and probationer's new offense charges will be dismissed  
 Warrant issued, FTA  
 Revocation hearing continued  
 Conference scheduled for next appointment  
 PV hearing, other jurisdiction  
 Disposition hearing  
 Placed in Whites Foster Home  
 Annual Review hearing  
 Probationer admitted P.V.  
 Probationer serving jail/prison time due to previous violation  
 Probation terminated because of violation  
 Transport order filed so that probation is present at hearing  
 Probation modified after P.V./revocation hearing  
 Probationer sentenced to prison/jail because of violation  
 Order to dismiss petition, cased closed

