

COLORADO JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT  
PROBATION OFFICER WORKLOAD STUDY  
FINAL REPORT

AUGUST 1990  
BRIAN BEMUS CONSULTANT

## INTRODUCTION

Probation workload has been a major topic of debate since the 1950's. Early emphasis on caseload size recognized that line staff were a fixed resource but failed to be accepted because the recommended limits were arbitrary, did not directly relate to sanctioning goals and were not flexible enough to adapt to management's need to balance resources between offenders with varying service needs and other services that support the overall justice system.

Initial efforts at more "scientific" approaches to measure workload suffered from limited technologies and ill-defined goals. The results of these efforts led to studies that described what a probation officer does and how it is done (functional officer based DESCRIPTIVE analysis) but failed to give administrators information necessary to develop staffing requirements based on any minimum standards associated with client / program specific requirements (client based PRESCRIPTIVE analysis).

By the late 1970's, longitudinal client based prescriptive studies were developed. These studies are characterized by following samples of clients or programmatic duties over a period of two (2) to three (3) months and recording all time spent to supervise the case or complete the prescribed duty. Only those cases that met minimum standards are analyzed to determine staffing needs. This new design, PRESCRIPTIVE, tied resource acquisition and deployment needs to formal client assessments (classification) and minimum standards (a measure of productivity and value). As a result of the focus on client / program driven workload measurement, administrators were able to tie together sanctioning goals, program goals and resource management goals into one system. This system

is collectively referred to as, "case management."

In 1984 the Colorado Judicial Department committed to a formal "case management" system that included an assessment of the potential risk and demonstrated needs of each offender, a structured interview process to develop client specific supervision strategies, prescriptive workload measures and an MIS based on each component. To assist the department a grant from the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) was used to implement the system state wide. The workload portion of the system was completed in 1985 and was used as the foundation for budget requests and staffing allocation.

Between 1985 and 1990 the Judicial Department underwent significant program changes that required corresponding adjustments to their case management system. Examples included the development of intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, drug screening and interstate compact programs. In addition it was felt that the original study was conducted before the case management system was comfortably in place and therefore studied a system in transition. As a result, from 1983 through 1989 the department made a significant effort to adjust the classification, MIS and workload component of their case management system. The validation of the adult and Juvenile risk assessment scales as well as the initial pilot of a decentralized MIS are noteworthy examples of the commitment to case management as a management philosophy. Equally significant is the commitment to modifying the workload measurement portion of the system.

This report describes the study, its results and offers recommendations. Please note that the analysis and interpretation of the results are those of the author and may not reflect the views of the Colorado Judicial Department or the National Institute of Corrections.

## STUDY DESIGN

The most significant characteristic of the design is that it is prescriptive. As previously stated, prescriptive studies focus on the time required to meet the minimum standards that clients require as measured over a longitudinal period of time. This design allows us to focus on the client or client related duties as the unit of analysis as opposed to the line officer.

To operationalize this method the department selected nine (9) Judicial Districts and the Denver Juvenile Court to participate in the study. The districts represent the diversity of the states geography, population and ethnicity. Included in the study were all adult and juvenile supervision and investigation functions. By design, each officer participating in the study recorded each activity and the amount of time spent on that activity on a randomly selected sample of cases and investigations Over a 10 day period from October 16, 1989 through January 12 , 1990.

To minimize the errors associated with officers self reporting their own data three precautions were taken. First, the time study forms etc. were piloted for two weeks to allow feedback regarding flaws or difficulties with the design and implementation process. Second, six (6) core team members were assigned districts to provide on site training and follow up. Finally, all data collection instruments were to be screened on a monthly basis to catch potential problems and provide ongoing resolution of those problems. The overall goal of the on site training and monitoring of the study participants was to continually demonstrate, to the participating officers, the implications of the study and the importance of the results to the management and operation of the Judicial

Department. APPENDIX A contains the instructions and forms used In the study.

STUDY RESULTS - STATE WIDE

The following tables illustrate the overall results of the workload study. It is these results that are used as basic inputs to the staffing model used by the Judicial Department. It must be noted that these are basic study results. The Department may choose to alter the values based on proposed policy changes. In most cases, the proposed policy change can be simulated based on the data in the workload study.

ADULT SUPERVISION

SUPERVISION TYPE	TIME"	N	% MEETING STDS
Administrative	.64	105	NOT APPLICABLE
Minimum	.64	108	65
Medium	.95	217	79
Maximum	2.80	110	60
IIS	3.00	79	32
New	1.10	148	NOT APPLICABLE

JUVENILE SUPERVISION

SUPERVISION TYPE	TIME"	N	% MEETING STDS
Administrative	.30	61	NOT APPLICABLE
Minimum	.90	80	74
Medium	1.90	95	23
Maximum	3.00	103	10
New	2.50	90	NOT APPLICABLE

\* All time in HOURS

ADULT IN-VESTIGATIONS

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TIME*	N
Felony PSI	6.5	350
Misdemeanor PSI	5.1	79
Deferred Sentence	6.1	26
35B	5.5	6
Interstate Compact	1.7	21

JUVENILE INVESTIGATIONS

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TIME*	N
custody	0.00	0
Preliminary	0.00	0
Detention	1.20	141
Pre-Plea	3.40	1
Intake	5.80	1
Pre-Disposition	7.90	124
Transfer	14.40	6

\* All time in HOURS

DISCUSSION

In general, the "first cut" or initial view of these results is satisfactory. As with any study it is anticlimactic to reduce 90 days of data collection, hours of review, data entry and analysis to a few numbers. However, these overall results form the basis for administrators to develop staffing models and other strategic plans that effect the probation operations of the Judicial Department.

The most significant problem with the study is the small proportion of supervision cases on which standards were met. This problem is somewhat mitigated by the large initial sample size and will be addressed in the management recommendations section.

STUDY RESULTS - BY DISTRICT (ALL TIME IN HOURS)

	DISTRICT								
	1	2	4	5	8	10	13	14	21
ADULT INVESTIGATIONS									
FELONY PSI	6.4	6.0	5.9	4.5	6.4	5.5	2.9	8.0	7.9
MISDEMEANOR PSI	5.5	6.1	5.5	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.7	6.5	
DEFERRED SENTENCE	-	6.7	-	7.7	-	-	2.0	5.5	-
35B	-	-	5.3	-	2.8	-	-	-	-
INTERSTATE COMPACT	-	1.5	-	-	-	2.3	-	-	-
JUVENILE INVESTIGATIONS									
CUSTODY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRELIMINARY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DETENTION	-	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRE PLEA	-	-	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
INTAKE	-	-	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRE DISPOSITION	5.8	10.0	6.4	6.7	-	4.9	3.9	-	7.7
TRANSFER*									
ADULT SUPERVISION									
ADMINISTRATIVE	.6	.6	.5	.6	.6	.5	.4	.7	.6
MINIMUM	.6	.6	.5	.6	.5	.6	.5	.5	.7
MEDIUM	1.0	1.2	.8	.8	1.1	1.0	.8	.9	1.1
MAXIMUM	2.9	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.0
ITS	2.3	2.3	3.1	2.6	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.8	3.2
NEW	1.1	1.0	1.1	.8	1.0	.9	.9	.9	1.1
JUVENILE SUPERVISION									
ADMINISTRATIVE	.2	.4	.3	.3	.2	.2	.4	.3	.2
MINIMUM	.8	1.1	.8	.8	.9	.8	.9	.8	.8
MEDIUM	1.9	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.9
MAXIMUM	2.8	3.4	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.0	1.9	1.8	3.1
NEW	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.6

\* TRANSFER investigations were computed as a composite of felony psi's without drug tests and juvenile disposition reports and therefore no district by district analysis was conducted.

It should be noted that the district by district comparisons are made for illustration purposes only. Where a (-) occurs no cases were available for analysis. Also, District 2 under all Juvenile headings is exclusively Denver Juvenile court. The district by district values are discussed in the recommendations section.



## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the major effort to conduct a workload study of this magnitude the value the results are sure to be examined from many perspectives. To mitigate on "over evaluation" (of the results two (2) basic perspectives, updating the budget / resource allocation staffing models and the implications of the study results compared to the overall case management system will be addressed.

The grant application specifically states the needs of the Judicial Department,

"The principle objective is to provide revised workload values by use of a longitudinal prescriptive time study design. Budget development and resource allocation models will be upgraded to include revised values."

based on this statement the study has achieved its primary purpose. The study values (in some cases legitimately modified based on revised policies) were accepted and proposed to upgrade the department staffing model. The proposed application of the study results are illustrated in a June 6th memorandum in Appendix B.

There is one caution that must be used in applying these workload values to resource allocation decision making. Based on this data it is not recommended that district specific values be used. There is no doubt that there are some differences between districts based on geography, client types and workload levels. However, two (2) factors make district specific decisions impossible. First, the sampling process was developed to minimize the intrusion of the study and therefore each districts' sample sizes are not sufficient for specific analysis. Second, the overall percentage of cases meeting standards is very low. In order to make district specific allocations it is necessary to have at least 60

cases per workload category that meet or exceed standards. As a result, until the technology or methodology of workload measurement improved, state wide averages should be applied to each district. It should be noted that this application is still far superior to any ratio method.

The fact that a significant percentage of study cases did not meet minimum supervision standards raises a number of issues. First, one might expect that officers in the study would have made a special effort to attend to every detail of the study cases in order to achieve results that indicate the need for significant staff increases. Since this did not occur it is likely that officers have not been complying, in general, with the case management-system and are likely performing at levels consistent with individually or district determined standards. It follows then that these results are somewhat conservative in that special consideration was not given to the study cases.

The second issue is the existence of "truly different" supervision levels or clients. Dramatically different results are not expected between minimum and administrative categories since service levels are very low for both. However, if the overall case management system is to be valid there should be significant differences between the clients and the time required to supervise them according to their supervision level. Recent validation studies indicate dramatic differences in revocation rates between offenders classified according to the Departments' risk scales. The workload study indicates, when controlling for supervision standards, a nearly 4 fold difference required to supervise minimum vs maximum cases at or above the minimum standard.

Based on this information it is clear that the classification system identifies significantly different groups and that the minimum

standards associated with these groups are also significantly different. Therefore, based on the small proportion of cases meeting standards it can be concluded that in spite of valid classification instruments and differential supervision standards the line officers are not actively using the case management system.

Based on the analysis of the data and discussions with Judicial Department staff the following recommendations should be considered

- That the Department accept and apply the workload study values to its staffing model. In all but a few cases, where some workload categories are rarely performed, the values for state wide averages are based on sufficient data to be used as primary input to the staffing model.

- That the Department should immediately develop plans for a quality control process focused at the first line supervisors. The goal of this process is to improve officer understanding, acceptance and compliance with the case management system. This task should be assigned to the core team.

It is very clear that the Department has a valid case management system. It is also clear that the system is under utilized by line staff. This is not uncommon and is most likely the result of a failure of middle management to enforce the system. As a result, line staff see that their non compliance is either unnoticed or not a concern to their immediate supervisor or district and is therefore not really all that important. By focusing responsibility for compliance on the middle manager the Department accomplishes two (2) goals. First

it illustrates the importance top management places on the attributes of the case management system. Second, it provides a formal role for the supervisor in the process. Without a formal role for the supervisor line staff often feel that the weight of departmental changes falls on their shoulders alone, especially if they see that they are required to make significant changes while their supervisors are not.

o That the current workload study data be specifically analyzed to assess what type of supervision line staff are currently providing. This analysis is based on individual contacts not controlling for compliance with standards. This type of analysis is not useful for budget development but can be very useful to determine what line staff feel are important supervision requirements and how they currently perform their activities. An assessment of this data compared to current standards will give the department an idea of the degree to which officer compliance and acceptance of case management exists.

o subsequent workload studies should be conducted at no greater than three (3) year cycles. Two (2) year intervals are the ideal. With nearly five (5) years between studies many changes had taken place. In addition, some of the lessons learned from the first workload study may have been forgotten. By reviewing the system every two or three years the Department can actively maintain control to the systems performance and make changes as

soon as possible. This process will keep the overall system fresh and consistently illustrates the Departments' commitment to case management.

- o That the Department consider the core team a permanent "structure" used for systems maintenance and strategic planning. It is now very clear that the idea of installing a case management system that maintains itself is not possible. If the Department is to continue to reap the maximum potential of the system it must formally realize that each of the components will have to be modified, over time. The ongoing support and commitment to a core team allows for a diverse group of line staff, supervisors and administrators to assess the need for changes and have input into the management process.

## APPENDIX A



**Office Of The State Court Administrator**  
**Colorado Judicial Department**

JAMES D. THOMAS  
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

1301 PENNSYLVANIA STREET SUITE 300  
DENVER COLORADO 80203-2416  
(303) 861-1111

September 7, 1989

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: John Hollon, Chief Probation Officer, 1st Judicial District  
Jack Lutes, Chief Probation Officer, 2nd Judicial District  
Timothy Turley, Chief Probation Officer, Denver Juvenile Court  
Kenneth McClelland, Chief Probation Officer, 4th Judicial District  
Thomas Bennhoff, Chief Probation Officer, 5th Judicial District  
John Elliott, Chief Probation Officer, 8th Judicial District  
Allan Enrich, Chief Probation Officer, 10th Judicial District  
Steven Proctor, Chief Probation Officer, 13th Judicial District  
Timothy Walsh, Chief Probation Officer, 14th Judicial District  
Charlie Schmalz, Chief Probation Officer, 21st Judicial District

FROM: Vern Fogg, ISP Administrator *Vern*

SUBJECT: Probation Time Study

---

The time study is scheduled to commence October 16, ending January 12, 1990. I have enclosed the proposed data collection forms, sample selection instructions and coding instructions for your review. Any suggested modifications must be submitted to me by September 18. On-site training should be scheduled September 26-29. You must contact the assigned trainer by September 15 to make specific arrangements.

<u>Trainer</u>	<u>Assigned Districts</u>
Margaret Longo Probation Supervisor 18th Judicial District 794-3224	1st
Art Osier Probation Supervisor 4th Judicial District 719-630-2850	4th and 14th
Nick Rusovick Probation Supervisor 10th Judicial District 719-546-5073	10th
Sharon Wright Probation Supervisor 4th Judicial District 719-630-2850	Denver Juvenile
Vern Fogg ISP Administrator SCA Office 861-1111	2nd and 21st
Sherry Kester Policy Analyst SCA Office 861-1111	8th and 13th

The forms will then be pilot tested the week of October 2-6 1989, for-staff to further comment. Please submit a master list of cases selected for the time study within the maximum, medium, minimum, administrative and ISP categories. It will also be necessary to maintain an assignment list of new, IIS and Investigations throughout the time study. These lists will assist the monitor in reviewing cases for proper coding. If you have any questions, please contact me as soon as possible.

VF/ks

Enclosures

cc: CORE Team



PROBATION TIME STUDY  
SAMPLE SIZE

ADULT SUPERVISION

	DISTRICTS									TOTAL CASES
	1ST	2ND	4TH	5TH	8TH	10TH	13TH	14TH	21ST	
NEW(.06)	15	24	18	5	8	8	5	5	10	98
IIS(.15)	13	10	10	5	8	8	5	5	8	72
MAXIMUM(.15)	15	28	27	6	10	14	5	5	8	118
MEDIUM(.15)	61	30	26	5	15	13	5	5	25	185
MIMIMUM(.15)	33	30	30	5	11	14	5	5	25	158
ADM(.15)	35	33	30	6	12	13	7	6	15	157
ISP(.25)	10	25	25	2	5	5	2	2	4	80
TOTAL	182	180	166	34	69	75	34	33	95	868

JUVENILE SUPERVISION

CASE TYPE	DISTRICTS									TOTAL CASES	
	1ST	2ND	4TH	5TH	8TH	10TH	13TH	14TH	21ST		
		JUVENILE									
NEW(.15)	16	10	7	5	7	6	5	5	6	67	
MAXIMUM(.25)	11	65	15	5	12	10	5	5	10	138	
MEDIUM(.15)	25	32	25	5	15	16	5	5	15	143	
MIMIMUM(.15)	21	34	15	5	12	11	5	5	10	118	
ADM(.15)	5	59	12	5	15	16	5	5	15	137	
TOTAL	78	200	74	25	61	59	25	25	56	603	

INVESTIGATIONS  
EVERY ADULT AND JUVENILE INVESTIGATION FOR <sup>30</sup>~~60~~ DAY PERIOD



**ADULT SUPERVISION TIME STUDY INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SAMPLE SELECTION**

The supervision time study begins October 16, 1989 ending January 12, 1990, involving a random selection of cases within the supervision classifications. The sample is approximately 5 percent of the total cases. The following criteria is to be used when selecting time study cases. Each district will be provided staff training prior to commencement of the study.

- NEW CASES: Every 3rd case assigned between October 16 and November 15, including "transfer-in" and excluding Interstate Compact cases. All selected cases shall remain a "new" case for 30 days, during which time any risk/need and CMC activities should be performed. All new cases are to be terminated from the time study 30 days after receipt of case. File the completed time study forms with unit supervisor.
- IIS: Every IIS case assigned between October 16 and November 15. IIS cases remain under study for the entire period.
- MAXIMUM: Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- MEDIUM: Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- MINIMUM: Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- ADMIN. : Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- ISP: Every 2nd ISP under supervision on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.

<p>NOTE: All maximum, medium and minimum cases reclassified to Administrative, Transfer-Out or Interstate, during the time study period should be terminated from the sample. A case in which a revocation is filed and the <u>whereabouts of the defendant is unknown</u>, should be classified as administrative. If a revocation is filed and the defendant remains available for supervision or an officer continues involvement, the case remains in the sample for further time study.</p>
--

COMPLETE ALL TIME STUDY FORMS BY JANUARY 12 AND FORWARD TO  
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND ANALYSIS, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE.

**JUVENILE SUPERVISION TIME STUDY INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SAMPLE SELECTION**

The supervision time study begins October 16, 1989 ending January 12, 1990, involving a random selection of cases within the supervision classifications. The sample is approximately 12 percent of the total cases. The following criteria is to be used when selecting time study cases. Each district will be provided staff training prior to commencement of the study.

- NEW CASES: Every 2nd case assigned between October 16 and November 15, including "transfer-in" and excluding Interstate Compact cases. All selected cases shall remain a "new" case for 30 days, during which time any risk/need and CMC activities should be performed. All new cases are to be terminated from the time study 30 days after receipt of case. File the completed time study forms with unit supervisor.
- MAXIMUM: Every 4th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- MEDIUM: Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- MINIMUM: Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.
- ADMIN. : Every 6th case classified on October 16, 1989, not set for termination prior to January 12, 1990.

<p>NOTE: All maximum, medium and minimum cases reclassified to Administrative, Transfer-Out or Interstate, during the time study period should be terminated from the sample. A case in which a revocation is filed and the <u>whereabouts of the defendant is unknown</u>, should be classified as administrative. If a revocation is filed and the defendant remains available for supervision or an officer continues involvement, the case remains in the sample for further time study.</p>
--

COMPLETE ALL TIME STUDY FORMS BY JANUARY 12 AND FORWARD TO  
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND ANALYSIS, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE.

**COLORADO JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT**

**CODING INSTRUCTIONS**  
**SUPERVISION TIME STUDY**

**DISTRICT:** Enter numeric only, i.e., 1; not 1st.

**CLIENT NAME:** Last, First, Middle Initial.

**CASE TYPE:** Check Adult or Juvenile.

**CASE NUMBER:** Court assigned number, i.e., 89CRI010 or 89JVI010.

**START DATE:** Enter beginning of time study: month/day/year.

**DATE COMPLETE:** End of time study.

**TYPE OF OFFENSE:** Check one only, most serious offense.

**LEGAL STATUS:** Check one only in appropriate column. "Conviction refers to offense conviction placed on regular probation, although ISP involves a conviction, do not check multiple boxes.

**SUPERVISION TYPE:** Check only one supervision type as classified on the day assigned to the time study.

**REVOCAION:** Complete if revocation is filed during time study. See "NOTE" on sampling instruction.

**CONTACT STANDARDS**

**PERSON:** Enter appropriate code of person/person with whom the officer is communicating.

**METHOD:** Enter appropriate code identifying method of contact. NOTE: Joint face-to-face is a new category to identify multiple officer contact, i.e., team supervision, accompanied curfew checks.

**PLACE:** Enter code of location of contact.

**FUNCTION CODE:** Enter code of activity, further utilizing narrative area to describe contact.

**TIME IN MINUTES:** All time must be entered in minutes, not percentages of hours, i.e., 55 minutes, not 1 hour 5 minutes.

**FUNCTION:** Enter time in minutes to perform identified function.

**TRAVEL:** Enter time in minutes traveling to perform function. Do not include function time in travel time. If multiple cases are handled during any one travel period, assign representative amount to each case, not total amount to each, i.e., 1 hour travel for 4 curfew checks is 15 minutes per case.



**COLORADO JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT**

**INVESTIGATION TIME STUDY**  
**SAMPLE SELECTION**

**All investigations assigned to investigation units between October 16, 1989 and November 17, 1989 shall be assigned to the sample. All activity related to the investigation shall be recorded until completion of the investigation. Investigation shall be considered complete upon filing with the court, if further time is required or upon final disposition of the case.**

**upon the close of the time study on January 12, all incomplete investigations should be forwarded, maintained separately from completed form**

COLORADO JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

CODING INSTRUCTIONS  
SUPERVISION TIME STUDY

DISTRICT: Enter numeric only, i.e., "1"; not 1st.

CLIENT: Last, First, Middle Initial.

CASE TYPE: Check Adult or Juvenile.

CASE NUMBER: Court assigned number, i.e., 89CR1010 or 89JV1010.

START DATE: Date investigation order received.

DATE COMPLETE: See sample instructions for completion definition.

TYPE OF OFFENSE: Check only one, most serious offense.

INVESTIGATION TYPE: Adult: identify the court ordering investigation. Check one investigation type only.

INVESTIGATION TYPE: Juvenile: check one investigation type.

CONTACT STANDARDS

PERSON: Enter appropriate code of person/person with whom the officer is communicating.

METHOD: Enter appropriate code identifying method of contact. NOTE: Joint face-to-face is a new category to identify multiple officer contact, i.e., team supervision, accompanied curfew checks.

PLACE: Enter code of location of contact.

FUNCTION CODE: Enter code of activity, further utilizing narrative area to describe contact.

TIME IN MINUTES: All time must be entered in minutes, not percentages of hours, i.e., 55 minutes, not 1 hour 5 minutes.

FUNCTION: Enter time in minutes to perform identified function.

TRAVEL: Enter time in minutes traveling to perform function. Do not include function time in travel time. If multiple cases are handled during any one travel period, assign representative amount to each case, not total amount to each, i.e., 1 hour travel for 4 curfew checks is 15 minutes per case.





**Office Of The State Court Administrator**  
**Colorado Judicial Department**

JAMES D THOMAS  
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

1301 PENNSYLVANIA STREET SUITE 300  
DENVER, COLORADO 80203-2416  
(303) 861-1111  
September 7, 1989

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Sherry Kester, Margaret Longo, Art Osier, Nick  
Rusovick, and Sharon Wright

FROM: Vern Fogg, ISP Administrator *VF*

SUBJECT: Time Study

---

Enclosed please find the time study forms, sample' instructions, coding instructions and correspondence. The time study commences October 16, 1989, ending January 12, 1990. I have assigned training to each member of the committee. Hopefully, I will have spoken to you prior to your receiving your assignment. Your assigned districts are as follows:

Sherry	8th and 13th
Margaret	1st
Art	4th and 14th
Nick	10th
Sharon	Denver Juvenile
Vern	2nd and 21st

The trainings should be scheduled the week of September 26-29. The Chief Probation Officer of your assigned district has been asked to contact you directly to make arrangements. Please contact them if you do not hear within a reasonable period of time.

Submit any travel expenses directly to me.

Following the training, the district should pilot the form October 2-6, 1989.

I would like to meet on Monday, September 25, 1989 at 2:00 p.m. at the Office of the State Court Administrator to discuss training format and any other issue concerning the study. Please make every effort to make this meeting.

VF/ks  
Enclosures

APPENDIX B



**Office Of The State Court Administrator**  
**Colorado Judicial Department**

JAMES D. THOMAS  
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

1301 PENNSYLVANIA STREET, SUITE 300  
DENVER COLORADO 60203-2416  
(303)861-1111

June 6, 1990

**M E M O R A N D U M**

TO: CORE Team  
FROM: Vern Fogg *VF*  
SUBJECT: Minutes of June 1, 1990 Meeting

---

**Attendance:** Brian Bemus (Consultant), John Elliott, Vern Fogg, Sherry Kester (Staff), Margaret Longo, Art Osier, Jack Ruszczyk, Nick Rusovick, Charlie Schmalz (representing CPO Staffing Model Committee), Becky Stern (CMC Trainer)

Absent: Sharon Wright

- I. Brian Bemus presented preliminary findings of the time study. The below tables provide the findings; the figures in parenthesis () are recommended policy changes. The policy recommendations are discussed in the footnotes.

**Investigations**

<u>Adult</u>			<u>Juvenile</u>		
<u>Type</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>	<u>No. Of Cases</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Hrs.</u>	<u>No. Of Cases</u>
Felony PSI	6.75 (1)	350	Custody	0	0
Misd. PSI	5.1	79	Preliminary	0	0
DS/DJ	6.1	26	Detention	1.2	141
35B	5.5	6	Pre-Plea	3.4	1*
Interstate	1.7	21	Intake	5.8	1*
Total		482	Pre-dispo	7.9	124
			Transfer	14.4 (2)	6*
					273

\*Statistically insignificant.

Supervision

<u>Type</u>	<u>Adult Hours</u>	<u>Juvenile Hours</u>
Administrative	.64	.30
Minimum	.64	.90
Medium	.95	1.9
Maximum	2.8 (3.1)(3.5)(3)	3.0 (5)
IIS	3.0 (4)	---
New	1.1	2.5

- (1) The time study indicated 6.5 hours, however, during FY 91 a drug test will be required at pre-sentence. Values for drug testing taken from the supervision portion of the study are added.
- (2) An insignificant portion of cases were studied. The CORE team agreed to combine the value of a Felony PSI (without drug test value) with juvenile pre-disposition time. The committee agreed that the performance of these two tasks most closely resembles the necessary work of a transfer case.
- (3) The maximum value was 2.8 hours when controlling for the standard. The committee recommends that 1 or 2 additional contacts be added to the maximum supervision category with the appropriate amounts of supervision time 3.1 and 3.5 hours. This recommendation is contingent upon the elimination of the IIS category. (See #4 for explanation.) Additionally, the CORE team recommended to the Standards Advisory Committee that all references to collateral contacts be eliminated. All contact standards will be specific only in face-to-face contacts and home visits. All other contacts should be a function of case management and do not require specific quantification.
- (4) Sixty-eight percent of the cases studied in IIS did not meet the required contacts. When time spent was aggregated only 1.7 hours per case was identified. Controlling for the standards projects 3.0 hours per case, comparable to maximum supervision. The team recommends to the Standard Advisory Committee that IIS supervision be eliminated in lieu of increasing the maximum supervision standards and hours. This policy recommendation is based on several factors.
  - a) Data does not indicate that the standard has been performed.
  - b) Initial review of the Standards survey does not indicate support by the field for such activity.
  - c) An increased maximum standard would provide a more uniform level of supervision.

- d) The development of specialized drug caseloads will provide increased supervision of identified drug-using offenders, a majority of the current IIS population.
  - e) A more simplified standard would increase compliance and review capability.
- (5) The juvenile maximum Value was 3.0 when controlling for the standard. Only 10% of the study cases meet or exceeded the standard. Several examinations and statistical constructions could not alter the finding. This finding was similar to the finding of the 1985 study: however, in 1985 the committee chose to use only those cases, at the mean time value or above to develop the current value of 4.7 hours. This was done simply based upon an impression that juvenile cases take longer, and that the data was inaccurate. The current finding suggests that the 1985 policy decision was in error. The committee, after long discussion, supports a 3.0 hour value.

\*The staffing model committee recommends that the 4.7 hour value remain. The attached allocation models reflect the 4.7 hour value.

## II. Staffing Model

The staffing model within the initial supervision and investigation value was presented to the committee. A second model was developed with IIS eliminated and maximum supervision increased. The attached table reflects that model. This model indicates that 31.7 probation officers are needed, a 12.65% system-wide need.

Both models will be presented at the CPO Staffing Model Committee on June 7. Clerical allocation will be made following agreement on the structure of the model.

## III. Other

Committee recommendations regarding study results:

- 1) Brian needs to include in his report the degree to which standards were met in the study.
- 2) Brian to include any management recommendations raised by the results of the study.
- 3) Jack should place time-study results on Supervisors Organization Agenda.
- 4) Brian to specifically review data regarding juvenile maximum supervision values.

## IV. CMC/SJS

The CORE team concurs that the responsibility for the development and implementation of CMC/SJS should be with

the State Training Committee. Any specific policy questions, i.e., expanded application, should be referred to the CORE team for input.

V. Management Review Process

The CORE team recommends that the case management review process be subject to a field advisory process. It is recommended that either Standards Advisory or the CORE team act in that capacity.


VI. Membership for FY 1991

Several members have resigned or retired. The committee recommends the following membership:

- 2 - CPO's, appointed by the CCPOA
- 4 - Supervisors, appointed by Supervisor Organization
- 2 - line officers, appointed by CAP0
- 2 - At large, no organizational representation
- 1 - SCA, Chair

June 8, 1990

M E M O R A N D I U M

TO: Jim Thomas  
FROM: Vern Fogg, Chair, Probation CORE Team   
SUBJECT: Recommendation From the CORE Team Meeting June 1, 1990

---

The CORE Team, Created in 1985 to oversee the implementation of the probation case Classification program, continues as an active, viable committee. Most recently the committee completed the new time study, resulting in the revised workload values utilized in the 1991 probation staffing model. The committee also revised and validated the risk/need assessment program.

At the June 1 meeting several recommendations were developed regarding the future activities of this committee. I have included these recommendations to you, as well as those to the Standards Advisory Committee. The Standards Committee will also consider these recommendations in the September 1990 report to be provided to you.

**Recommendation 1:** The CORE Team should continue in FY 1991 to review the case classification components, with a specific object of developing cooperative training efforts regarding the management of the classification systems.

**Recommendation 2:** The CORE Team should be restructured as follows:

- 2 - CPO's, appointed by the CCPOA
- 4 - Supervisors, appointed by Supervisor Organization
- 2 - Line officers, appointed by CAPO
- 2 - At large, no organizational representation
- 1 - SCA, Chair

**Recommendation 3:** The time study results indicate that the IIS (Initial Intensive Supervision) category of adult supervision, created by Justice Quinn in 1986, be eliminated. The following reasons are offered:

- 1) Data does not indicate that the function has been performed in accordance with the standard.
- 2) Initial review of the standards survey does not indicate support by the field for such an activity.
- 3) An increased maximum standard would provide a more uniform level of supervision.

Jim Thomas  
June 8, 1990  
Page 2

- 4) The development of specialized drug caseloads will provide increased supervision of identified drug-using offenders, a majority of the current IIS population.
- 5) A more simplified standard would increase compliance and review capability.

**Recommendation 4** The management review process should be subject to a field advisory group. The CORE Team recommends that the Standard Advisory Committee should perform that function.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me or any member of the committee.

VF/ jt  
cc: CORE Team: John Elliott  
Steve Proctor  
Jack Ruszczyk  
Art Osier  
Margaret Longo  
Sharon Wright  
Nick Rusovick  
Charlie Schmalz