

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
Pursuant to P.A. 154 of 2005
Section 606(1-2)
Parole and Probation Agent Workload Study

Michigan Department of Corrections
Probation and Parole Agent Workload Study

February 2006

National Council on Crime and Delinquency

426 South Yellowstone Drive, Suite 250
Madison, Wisconsin 53719
Website: <http://www.nccd-crc.org>

voice (608) 831-8882
fax (608) 831-6446

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND: WORKLOAD, CASE MANAGEMENT, AND PUBLIC SAFETY IN PROBATION AND PAROLE	3
III. WORKLOAD ESTIMATION METHODS FOR PROBATION AND PAROLE.....	4
IV. MICHIGAN PROBATION AND PAROLE AGENT WORKLOAD STUDY	7
A. Participating Agents.....	7
B. Selection of Supervision Cases/Investigations for Study	8
C. Agency Supervision and Investigation Standards	9
V. MICHIGAN WORKLOAD STUDY FINDINGS	9
A. Monthly Hours Available per Agent	10
1. Time Available for Court-Appointed Probation Officers.....	14
2. Intensive Reentry Unit Agents.....	16
B. Investigation and Supervision Findings.....	16
1. Investigation Findings.....	17
2. Supervision Findings	19
C. Calculating Workload Staffing Estimates.....	20
1. Approximating MDOC Workload Demand.....	20
VI. SUMMARY OF WORKLOAD STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ...	23

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Probation and Parole Supervision Standards
Case Support and Administration Form Definitions

Appendix B: Impact of Including On-the-Job Training of New Agents in Time Available
Comparison of MDOC Leave Time Categories
Agent Time Available – Comparison between Current Study and 1986 Study
Workload Study Findings in Hours
Urban Versus Rural Differential in Investigations and Supervision Cases
Workload Study Case Finding Detail

Acknowledgments

This workload study was a joint effort involving the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) and the Michigan Department of Corrections Probation and Parole. NCCD would like to thank Russ Cilibrise, the project manager, and all the agency managers, supervisors, and line staff who served on the workload study design committee. Committee members spent several days designing a study that would accurately reflect the case supervision and investigation activities performed by agents in the field. In addition, the study would not have been possible without the commitment and cooperation of the all the line staff and supervisors who spent two months participating in the workload study while performing their normal duties.

I. INTRODUCTION

The last workload study of Michigan Department of Corrections probation and parole field agents was completed in 1991. In 2005, the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) management and the United Auto Workers (UAW) representing field agents agreed that a new workload study was needed to reflect current supervision and investigative practices. The UAW, MDOC, and Office of State Employer made a joint decision to contract for a workload study. After a competitive bidding process, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) was selected to assist in conducting the study. Subsequent to the planning and implementation of the workload study, PA 154, which was passed on September 30, 2005, included the following language:

Sec. 606. (1) It is the intent of the legislature that the department shall conduct or contract for a study of parole and probation agent workloads. The study shall analyze agent workloads, caseloads, and responsibilities and provide recommendations for changes to workload computations and offender-agent workload or caseload ratios.

Consistent with goals established by legislative intent, the workload study described here has two primary objectives:

1. Estimate the number of agents MDOC requires to supervise offenders on probation or parole and complete field investigations. This task involved conducting a field study to estimate the agent time required, on average, to supervise offenders and to conduct investigative tasks *according to existing agency standards for adequate performance*. The study procedures recognize that public safety is enhanced when agents can effectively perform the agency's public protection mission in compliance with the standards established by current agency policy. In addition, the study also estimates the time agents have available to perform tasks essential to the agency's public protection mission after allowances are made for their vacation, sick leave, case support or administrative duties, and training.
2. Update the workload estimation currently employed by MDOC. The study findings outlined provide the basis for updating the agency's current workload estimation system. It will permit the Department to estimate workload demand more accurately and deploy available staff resources more efficiently.

A variety of changes have been made in the fourteen years since the conduct of the last workload study. Statewide implementation of the Offender Management Network Information (OMNI) system began in 1998, and most of the major functions were operating in all three regions of Michigan at the end of 2002. The automation of supervision notes, contacts, and investigations was a major change in the way probation and parole agents conduct day-to-day business and document their activities. With the exception of Special Alternative Incarceration (SAI) Phase III intensive supervision revisions,¹ current supervision standards for agent face-to-face contacts with offenders are largely consistent with those in place during the 1991 workload study. These range from eight face-to-face agent contacts with the offender each month to a contact every six months, based on the risk the offender poses to community safety. There have, however, been a number of other factors that have impacted supervision standards other than the required face-to-face contacts. Offenders assigned to SAI, Technical Rule Violation (TRV), and Specialized Services Unit (Wayne County) all require a minimum of 90 days, 120 days, and 120 days, respectively, of intensive level supervision. Additionally, most sex offenders now require supervision at the intensive level and no lower than at the medium level.

There also have been a number of changes in supervision strategies related to specialized caseloads. Each worksite has at least one agent designated as the sex offender specialist. Other specialized caseloads include Court Appointed Probation Officers (CAPO), Electronic Monitoring Supervision (EMS), Felony Non-Support, Domestic Violence, Mental Health, Drug Court, Intensive Reentry Unit (IRU), and the newly implemented Institutional Agents.

While there have not been significant changes in the use of EMS since 1991, additional monitoring technologies have been adopted. Approximately 300 offenders are on the Sobriator and an additional 85 or so are on Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM). Four Michigan locations utilize polygraph testing on sex offender parolees. Further, MDOC anticipates

¹ See FOA Numbered Memorandum 1994-02, Revision of SAI Phase III Intensive Supervision Standards.
[O:\671MI\Final Reports\MIWorkloadFinalReport.doc]

using GPS technology to assist in monitoring community corrections offenders in the near future. Active use of these technologies may impact agent workload.

Collection and/or monitoring of financial assessments are additional agent tasks that were not captured in the earlier study. On at least a monthly basis, agents now make a specific case note entry related to monitoring and documenting payment of court ordered assessments for a large percentage of offenders. Supervision fee collection has also been added, as have statutory biannual restitution reviews. In addition, supervision standards also require collateral contacts, substance abuse testing, treatment verifications, employment verifications, and job development sessions for many MDOC supervision levels, and these activities are typically documented.

During the last 20 years, NCCD has conducted approximately 80 workload studies of juvenile or adult correctional agencies. These studies were conducted to help agencies enhance public safety and promote rehabilitation by accurately documenting the staff resources required to provide adequate supervision to offenders in the community. However, each study is unique because it must identify the essential tasks and activities performed by agents in the field and estimate the time required to complete them in a manner that meets agency standards. NCCD worked closely with MDOC staff to ensure that the study accurately reflects the duties field agents are asked to perform.

II. BACKGROUND: WORKLOAD, CASE MANAGEMENT, AND PUBLIC SAFETY IN PROBATION AND PAROLE

An increasing workload burden is one of the critical problems facing America's probation and parole agency managers. Since 1990, the number of offenders receiving probation supervision increased from 2.7 million to more than 4.1 million, an increase of more than 50.0%. Parole supervision increased by only 10.0%, but parole is a very small part of the total community corrections caseload. A recent report by the federal Bureau of Justice Statistics placed Michigan

among the ten states with the largest 2004 probation and parole populations. In addition, between 1995 and 2004, Michigan had the third largest increase in its probation population after California and Pennsylvania.² While each correctional agency operates in a different environment, increased demand for community supervision is attributable to several factors, including increased use of probation as a direct sentencing option, diversion of offenders from crowded institutions, higher arrest and conviction rates, and longer probation terms.

In many jurisdictions, the increase in the number of offenders placed on community supervision has not been accompanied by an increase in the agents who supervise them in the field. When a correctional agency is not adequately staffed, an agent's ability to control offenders may be reduced to a level at which supervision is no longer effective. Failure to maintain credible supervision or investigation standards may have an adverse impact on public safety.

III. WORKLOAD ESTIMATION METHODS FOR PROBATION AND PAROLE

The NCCD employs a prescriptive, case-based methodology for conducting correctional workload studies. The workload estimates are established during a field study in which agents are asked to record, under actual field conditions, the time required to supervise a sample case during a month. Agents are asked to meet applicable agency performance standards for each case, and supervisors are asked to review their efforts. Investigations are observed in a similar fashion. The workload study findings factor performance standards into time estimates by observing sample cases and investigations that met or exceeded agency standards in the field study.

² Bureau of Justice Statistics, Probation and Parole in the United States, 2004, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, November 2005 see page 5.

The United States Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has advocated this prescriptive approach to workload measurement because it helps ensure that critical agency tasks can be performed in a manner that will have a positive impact on public safety. In 1981, after a three-year research and demonstration effort, NIC adopted a model probation and parole case management system called the Case Classification Staff Deployment (CCSD) system. A large number of state corrections agencies have since implemented it. Michigan adopted the system in 1986 and still employs it to estimate workload. It was developed to serve a simple purpose: reduce criminal offending and improve public safety by more efficiently managing staff resources. This is accomplished by establishing a workload management system that responds directly to the risk offenders pose to public safety. An actuarial risk assessment procedure is employed to estimate the probability, or risk, that the offender will commit a new offense during community supervision. If that probability of re-offending is high, a correspondingly high standard of supervision involving frequent agent contact (ranging from eight to four each month) and more active surveillance such as employment or treatment verifications is applied. For low risk offenders, a lower supervision standard requiring less agent contact and surveillance activity (often one agent contact per month or less) is applied. Michigan supervision standards were designed in this manner. For instance, eight face-to-face contacts are required each month for SAI Phase III cases, four contacts with a maximum risk offender, two for medium risk, and one contact for minimum risk. Additional activities are required to verify employment, residence, or treatment participation, and they are also part of the supervision standard.

The operating assumption of risk-based supervision is simple. Since agencies have limited agent staff resources, high risk offenders (e.g., those most likely to re-offend) are supervised much

more closely than low risk offenders. This strategy was adopted because research studies observed significantly reduced criminal behavior among closely supervised high risk offenders.³

The implication of these findings is that a correctional agency can enhance public safety by closely supervising high risk offenders. To obtain this result, however, the agency has to accurately identify high risk offenders *and* have adequate field staff to meet the supervision standards. This is why the standards agencies adopt are essential reference points for a prescriptive workload study. They represent minimum criteria for adequate case supervision and investigation activity for agents in the field. Standards also set expectations for monitoring staff performance and are an important mechanism for ensuring public safety.

The importance of a prescriptive approach to workload estimation can be illustrated by two simple examples. A field agent could routinely supervise maximum risk offenders without contacting them or verifying their employment, treatment, arrest, or residence status. Since this approach would require very little staff time, a small number of agents could serve a large number of maximum risk cases. Unfortunately, supervision performed in this manner is unlikely to reduce criminal activity among the offenders who received it. More importantly, it would not meet the MDOC supervision standard for a maximum risk case, which requires at least four monthly face-to-face contacts with the offender, plus additional status verifications.

A similar example can be drawn for pre-sentence investigations. Agents could complete them without examining the offender's prior criminal history, investigating the circumstances of the offense, or contacting victims. Again, this level of investigative effort would minimize the time required to prepare each pre-sentence report, but sub-standard investigative practices may lead to

³ Eisenberg, Michael and Gregory Markley, "Something Works in Community Supervision," Federal Probation, Vol. 51, No. 4, 1987. Baird, Heinz and Bemus, A Two-Year Follow-Up of the Alabama Case Classification Project, American Correctional Association Monograph (1981). Researchers observed two groups of high risk offenders. One group received one officer contact per month or less and the other group received two or more. Criminal activity among offenders receiving more supervision time and multiple monthly contacts was significantly reduced.

poorly informed sentencing decisions, which could adversely impact public safety. These examples illustrate why the study employs a prescriptive, standards-based approach to workload estimation.

IV. MICHIGAN PROBATION AND PAROLE AGENT WORKLOAD STUDY

The conduct of a workload study is a labor-intensive process for agency staff. To reduce the burden on agency operations and improve the study's utility, NCCD staff actively involved agency management and field staff in the design and conduct of the study. In May 2005, NCCD staff began meeting with a twenty-five member workload study planning group to design the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) Probation and Parole study. Group members included supervisors and field agents from each region of the state and were selected by UAW and MDOC managers. The group met several times prior to the study to identify agent duties, review agency standards for investigation and supervision, design data collection forms, test study procedures, and review the training procedures employed by NCCD staff during the field phase.

A. Participating Agents

Since the MDOC employs approximately 1,100 field agents, the study employed sampling to reduce the high operational and logistical cost of having every MDOC agent participate in the workload study. Three-hundred fifty agents from 22 counties were selected as study participants. Agents were sampled to represent each of the three MDOC regions, both urban and rural field offices, and various specializations, including 19 Court-Appointed Probation Officers (CAPOs) and four Intensive Reentry Unit (IRU) agents. Each agent participating in the workload study received approximately three hours of training from NCCD staff at one of 11 training sessions conducted at various sites in Michigan during the last two weeks of July 2005. The trainings familiarized agents and supervisors with the purpose of the study and instructed them on procedures for time recording.

Each agent was asked to record all the time he/she spent (including case contacts with the offender or collaterals, case documentation, etc., and all related travel) serving randomly selected supervision cases and completing sampled investigations over a two-month period that began on August 1 and ended on September 26, 2005. Agents also recorded the time spent providing general case support and performing non-case related administrative tasks such as unit meetings, completing travel claims, statistical reports, supervisory reviews, etc. It should be noted that only field agent time was recorded. The time that administrative support staff, supervisors, and other parties may spend supporting a field agent is not included in this study. Field unit supervisors were, however, actively involved in implementing the study because they assigned sample cases selected by NCCD, reviewed agent time recording, and certified that agency standards were met for sample cases.

B. Selection of Supervision Cases/Investigations for Study

Each participating agent recorded time for at least one new supervision case and at least three ongoing supervision cases during the study. The number of cases varied according to agent type, with increased numbers assigned to agents with specialized caseloads. NCCD obtained case lists for each participating agent and randomly selected the ongoing cases for which time would be recorded. During the training sessions, the lists were distributed to supervisors who assigned them, in addition to an indicated number of new supervision cases, to their agents.

Sampled pre-sentence investigations, as well as other types of offender investigations chosen for time recording, were also assigned randomly to agents by supervisors during the first month of the study. Most agents were assigned approximately six investigations for time recording; however, the number and type of investigations assigned varied by agent type and specialization.

The employed sampling procedures ensure that participants could not choose the supervision cases or investigations assigned to them for time recording. Supervision case time was recorded for two separate one-month periods. Investigation time was recorded from assignment until completion.

C. Agency Supervision and Investigation Standards

As noted previously, the study employs a prescriptive standard for workload estimation by averaging recorded case times from sample cases in which agency supervision or investigation standards were met or exceeded by the participating agent. The result is an estimate required to meet the minimum MDOC standard applicable to the case. Supervisors were asked to review cases to determine if standards were met. Agents recorded all the time spent (including all case contacts, paper work, computer/file documentation, phone calls, fee collection, drug testing, status verifications, court appearance, travel, etc.) supervising or investigating sampled cases. Much of the time recorded is associated with meeting these applicable standards. However, responding to non-routine situations that may arise in the case is also recorded because that is an important part of correctional work. Table A1 in Appendix A contains the MDOC supervision standards employed during this study.

V. MICHIGAN WORKLOAD STUDY FINDINGS

An agency staffing estimate examines the balance between agency workload supply and workload demand. In probation and parole agencies, workload demand is represented by the number of offenders that the agency must supervise and the investigations it is asked to complete. Agents are assigned to perform these tasks, and each one places a demand on their time. The field study described above estimates the time agents require to complete these work tasks while meeting applicable standards. Workload supply is the agent staff time available to meet the demand for supervision and investigation work. Agencies such as MDOC employ a known number of field

agents, and the time they have available to perform supervision and investigation tasks each month was also estimated in this study. The findings are described below.

A. Monthly Hours Available per Agent

An initial step in calculating a workload estimate is securing an estimate of the hours the average agent has available to perform the critical agency tasks of supervising offenders and conducting field investigations. Based upon a standard 40-hour work week, full-time agents are employed for 173.3 hours each month. Their actual duty time, however, is significantly reduced by holiday, vacation, military, sick leave, break, and training time. They also perform a variety of administrative and case support activities that further reduce time available for supervising or investigating offenders. Both of these reductions were estimated to establish available time for MDOC field agents.

During the workload study, agents recorded the time they spent performing non-case administrative or case support tasks. Both types of tasks are routinely performed in every correctional agency because they are essential to agency operations. Agents are involved in case support activity when they perform supervision or investigative work for a case that is not assigned to them. This may involve contacting offenders assigned to the absent agent or performing other supervision/investigation activities. For example, an agent may contact an offender or appear in court because a colleague is on sick or on military leave. CAPO duties are a common example of case support activity in Michigan. Agents assigned to this duty appear in court to assist the assigned supervision agent. In other situations, an agent may provide case support by assisting new agents or providing backup coverage to another agent conducting a home visit or transporting an offender. Non-case administrative time includes unit meetings or briefings, administrative tasks assigned by supervisors, routine preparation of statistical reports, travel claim completion, supervisory reviews, and other administrative functions. Table 1 describes the study's administrative and case support

findings in both hours and work units. The agency employs work units of 80 minutes to estimate agent workload (e.g., each unit is equal to 80 minutes).

Table 1		
Michigan Probation and Parole Agent Workload Study Monthly Case Support and Administrative Time		
	Agent Hours	Work Units*
1. Non-Case Administrative Time		
a. Administrative Tasks/Office Meetings/Committees/Stats/Dailies	5.5	4.1
b. Public Information in Community	0.3	0.2
c. Community Resources	0.2	0.2
d. Other Non-Case Administrative Activities	0.0	0.0
Total Non-Case Administrative Time	6.0	4.5
2. Case Support Activity Time		
a. Case Staffing/Consultation	1.4	1.1
b. Substitute Coverage	3.2	2.4
c. Backup Coverage	0.7	0.5
d. Court/Hearing Appearance or Report for Inactive Cases	1.2	0.9
e. Court-Appointed Probation Officer (CAPO) Duties	4.8	3.6
f. Other Case Support Activity	0.1	0.0
Total Case Support Time	11.3	8.5
3. Total Non-Case Administrative and Case Support Time	17.3	13.0

* Each work units equals 80 minutes.

The combined non-case administrative and case support time estimate for MDOC probation and parole agents is 13.0 work units or 17.3 hours per month. Table A2 in Appendix A provides detailed definitions of each of the items within non-case administrative and case support time.

Additional deductions must be made for holidays, annual leave, sick leave, banked leave, administrative leave, other leave, break time, and training time. These data were secured from MDOC personnel records in the following manner:

Holidays:

This includes the number of paid state holidays authorized by the agency per calendar year.

Annual Leave:	The mean leave time used by agents during the last available operating year was obtained from fiscal year 2005 personnel records.
Sick Leave:	The mean sick leave used by agent staff during the 2005 fiscal year was obtained from personnel records.
Banked Leave:	The mean banked leave used by agent staff during fiscal year 2005 was obtained from personnel records.
Administrative Leave:	The mean administrative leave used by agent staff during fiscal year 2005 was obtained from personnel records. ⁴
Other Leave:	The other leave used by agent staff during the 2005 fiscal year was obtained from personnel records and includes school time, union time, jury duty, military leave, initial leave, comp time, non-exempt, deferred hours 1982, lost time, non-pay status, voluntary reduction plan, and temporary lay-off hours.
Break Time:	Break time is usually set by fair labor standards and averages 0.25 hours per half-day shift or 0.5 hours for an eight-hour work day.
Training Time:	The mean training time used by experienced agent staff reflects the annual training requirement.

The findings are shown in Table 2. Each agent has approximately 127.2 hours available each month after deductions for his/her leave and training time. This is reduced to 109.9 hours or 82.4 work units for each experienced agent by deductions for case support and non-case administrative time shown in Table 1. A further adjustment is required to account for new agents because they must complete a training program that averages 38.3 hours per month during their first year.⁵ As a result, new agents may have only 74.9 hours (56.2 units) available to supervise offenders or complete investigations. At present, approximately 7.4% of the agents MDOC employs are in this training status. When time available is adjusted to reflect new agent status, it falls to 107.3 hours or

⁴ A small portion of this time may include training time, but clear identification of hours potentially “overlapping” with training time was not possible.

⁵ New agents have 40 hours of initial training, 360 hours of on-the-job training, 40 hours of new agent training, and 20 hours of OMNI training.

80.5 units.⁶ We note that some portion of the 360 hours of new agent on-the-job training may supplement the supervision activity of experienced agents and could be considered in the time available. See Appendix B for an explanation of the impact of including on-the-job training of new agents in time available.

The function and use of certain leave categories changes within MDOC from year to year. For example, fiscal year 2005 indicated the use of substantial banked leave time, which has not been authorized at times in the past. Table B1 in Appendix B compares leave data for the past three fiscal years to provide an illustration of the potential impact of total leave time on time available.

Table 2		
Michigan Probation and Parole Agent Workload Study		
Estimated Hours/Units Available		
	Monthly Hours	Monthly Units*
1. Total Monthly Hours/Units	173.3	130.0
a. Average Holiday Time	8.0	6.0
b. Average Annual Leave	11.7	8.7
c. Average Sick Leave	6.5	4.9
d. Average Banked Leave Time	4.3	3.2
e. Average Administrative Leave Time	0.6	0.4
f. Average Other Leave Time*	0.8	0.6
g. Average Break Time (0.5 hours per day)	10.9	8.2
h. Average Training Time (40 hours per year)	3.3	2.5
2. Monthly Hours/Units Available After Above Deductions	127.2	95.4
a. Case Support Time	11.3	8.5
b. Non-Case Administrative Time	6.0	4.5
3. Monthly Hours/Units Available Per Experienced Agent	109.9	82.4
4. Monthly Hours/Units Available Per New Agent (adjusted for training)	74.9	56.2
5. Monthly Hours/Units Available All Agents (92.6% experienced, 7.4% new)	107.3	80.5

* Each work units equals 80 minutes.

⁶ The adjusted hours available per agent computation is $(109.9 \times .926) + (74.9 \times .074)$. New agents have 35 hours less per month than experienced agents, and they comprise 7.4% of all allocated agents.

The MDOC workload management system currently estimates agent time available at 90 work units or approximately 120 hours per month. The 90-unit estimate was based on an internal workload study conducted in 1986. The current study indicates time available at 80.5 units or 107.3 hours, which is a significant decrease of approximately 10.6%. This decline in time available has a significant impact on agency workload. It is largely attributable to the fact that the current study measured case support time, while the 1986 study did not (Table B2 in Appendix B provides a detailed comparison between time available data from this study and the 1986 study). Case support is an important feature of agency operations, and agents are routinely required to perform it. Also, banked leave time was not used in the 1986 study, and the present use of this leave category increases the total leave time deducted, thus decreasing time available per agent.

As Table 3 indicates, the agent time available, non-case administrative, case support, and training times calculated for MDOC are comparable to state probation and parole agencies observed in recent NCCD workload studies.

Table 3					
Multi-State Comparison of Estimated Agent Time Available in Hours					
	Wisconsin	Alabama	North Dakota	Nevada	Michigan
Time Available in Hours	114.1	107	109.4	112.5	107.3
Non-Case Administrative Time	6.7	10.4	10.4	6.2	6.0
Case Support Time	10.5	10.9	6.7	18.8	11.3
Training Time	6.4	3.7	12.5	5.4	3.3

1. Time Available for Court-Appointed Probation Officers

The agents assigned to court-appointed probation officers (CAPO) duty perform specialized, court-related duties that support agency operations and conduct pre-sentence investigations assigned to them. These agents are typically located in close proximity to court offices and spend a significant percentage of their time in a case support role, completing a variety of court-related tasks

for cases assigned to field agents. The MDOC uses CAPO assignments to efficiently perform certain court tasks that would otherwise be conducted by a large number of individual field agents, each of whom would have to travel to appear in court. Nineteen CAPO staff representing three counties – Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland – participated in the workload study. Table 4 shows case support work units for agents from Oakland and Wayne counties, who reported very similar case support times, and from Macomb. Their estimated time available is also shown in units.⁷

Table 4		
CAPO Case Support Time and Estimated Time Available in Units		
	Case Support Time	Time Available
Wayne/Oakland County (11 agents)	48.5	42.4
Macomb County (9 agents)	35.3	55.7
Workload Study - All Agents	8.5	80.5

The findings indicate that during the average month, CAPO staff spend between 35 and 50 units performing their case support role. Consequently, the time they have available (adjusted for non-case administration, case support, leave, etc.) to conduct pre-sentence investigations is limited to between 40 and 60 work units. This is significantly lower than the 80.5 workload units available to the average MDOC agent.

Since CAPO staff were not examined in a previous workload study, no changes can be observed. The exact number and location of CAPO staff statewide were not available to NCCD for this report. It should be noted that a number of agents recorded at least partial CAPO duties during the study. That time is reflected in case support estimates for all agents shown in previous tables.

⁷ Note that CAPO non-case administrative and case support times are included in the Table 2 estimation of time available for all agents.

2. Intensive Reentry Unit Agents

Intensive Reentry Unit (IRU) agents initiate the Transition Accountability Plan (TAP) as part of the Michigan Prisoner Reentry Initiative (MPRI) process. They interview prisoners regarding home placement and develop the best possible placement options for investigation by the field agent. IRU agents also coordinate family reunification sessions when necessary and arrange treatment appointments for offenders with identified treatment needs. For prisoners going to pilot sites, or institutions that work with communities within specific geographic areas, the agents coordinate transition team meetings at the facilities. Additionally, IRU agents are responsible for maintaining databases and reporting statistics. Specialized duties performed by IRU agents alleviate the responsibility of field agents by providing assistance in securing stable placements and initiating connections with service providers and family members. At the time of this writing, there are five IRU agents at two institutions and nine agents at pilot sites. Four agents from two institutions participated in this study. The IRU agents reported 32.3 units of non-case administrative time and 4.4 units of case support time. Their monthly time available considering all other leave/break deductions was 58.7 work units. Like CAPO agents, IRU staff have much less time available than regular field agents.

B. Investigation and Supervision Findings

The Consolidated Workload Report employed by MDOC is used to estimate agency workload for the entire agency and each state region. It assigns work units (one unit equals 80 agent minutes) to each case the agency serves and each investigation it completes. These work units were derived from previous workload studies that estimated the average time an agent required to meet agency standards. Table 5 shows the investigation and supervision times required to meet standards observed in the current workload study. Study findings are based on NCCD analyses of time agents recorded for sample cases or investigations that meet applicable agency standards. Approximately

1,300 investigations and nearly 1,500 supervision cases were observed. This estimate appears in the first column and is presented in work units to conform to MDOC reporting practice. The second column displays the units currently employed by MDOC for workload estimation. The final column calculates the difference in units and permits a direct comparison of the agent time required to meet agency standards (see Table B3 in Appendix B for these data provided in hours). Some of the case types shown were not included in the previous study because they either did not exist or could not be observed.

1. Investigation Findings

The current workload study observed all major investigation types conducted by MDOC with one exception. An estimate for delayed sentence/HYTA update investigations could not be calculated because only three were ordered during the study.⁸ For a few investigations, the new estimates are higher than previously observed. The PSI updates (1.b.) and misdemeanor conviction reports (1.d.) were significantly higher – 1.0 work unit. Both absconder and apprehension reports (1.f. & 1.g.) increased by one-half unit (e.g., 40 minutes). On the other hand, probation/parole violations (1.e.) decreased by 0.5 units and special investigations (1.h.) decreased by 0.25 units.

The net impact of these investigation time changes on agency demand for agent time is negligible because demand is estimated by considering the number and type of investigations the agency completes. The times increased for both PSI updates and misdemeanor reports, but in an average month, MDOC completes only 758 PSI updates and 85 misdemeanor reports. By comparison, the unit times fell for approximately 2,600 parole/probation violations and 3,200 special investigations.

⁸ All agents were asked to track every delayed sentence/HYTA update investigation assigned during the first weeks of the study, but only three were observed. The current time of 1.50 units should be retained. Since statewide operating data indicate that only 68 are completed in an average month, there is little impact on overall agency workload.

Several types of special investigations were examined in the current study, including transfer-in reports, requests from other counties, and interstate compacts (transfer-out reports). The combined average time estimate for these special investigations was 1.25 units – somewhat lower than the previous study. The time varies somewhat by type of special performed. Polygraph investigations were observed for information purposes. Although parole and probation violation completion times differed (see 1.e.1. and 1.e.2.), they were averaged to estimate the joint time shown in the table (1.e.).

Table 5			
Workload Study Time Estimates Compared to the Current System Time Estimates in Units			
DOC Service Area	Workload Study Units Per Case	Current System Units Per Case	Difference in Units
1. Investigations			
a. Pre-Sentence	5.00	5.00	0
b. PSI Update	4.00	3.00	1.00
c. Pre-Parole	1.50	1.50	0
d. Misdemeanor Conviction Report	4.00	3.00	1.00
e. Parole/Probation Violations	2.50	3.00	-0.50
1. Parole Violations	4.00	NA	NA
2. Probation Violations	2.00	NA	NA
f. Absconder	2.00	1.50	0.50
g. Apprehension	2.00	1.50	0.50
h. Special	1.25	1.50	-0.25
1. Transfer-In Report	1.20	NA	NA
2. Request from Other County	1.00	NA	NA
3. Interstate Compact (Transfer-Out)	2.00	NA	NA
4. Polygraph	2.50	NA	NA
2. Supervision			
a. Electronic Monitoring	3.00	3.00	0
b. Maximum	2.20	2.00	0.20
c. Medium	1.20	1.00	0.20
d. Minimum	0.60	0.50	0.10
e. Administrative/Non-Reporting	0.50	NA	NA
f. Mail-In	0.25	NA	NA
g. SSU	3.00	3.00	0
h. SAI - 4 FTF Contacts/Month	3.00	3.00	0
i. SAI - 8 FTF Contacts/Month	4.50	NA	NA

2. Supervision Findings

As noted previously, supervision case standards vary by the offender risk level. Standards include a monthly face-to-face contact requirement, as well as expectations for a wide variety of additional activities. These include home visits or field contacts, collateral contacts, verifications of employment, school, treatment or residence, substance abuse testing, restitution/fee collection, and supervision plan reviews (detailed descriptions of the standards appear in Appendix A). Supervision procedures necessary to meet standards, the supervision case types, and the manner in which agents document their work have changed since the last study.

Separate SAI/SSU estimates had not been previously examined, but MDOC had adopted a 3.0 unit estimate for the general SAI/SSU case type. These cases were observed for four face-to-face contacts and eight face-to-face contacts, those required for employed and unemployed offenders, respectively. The three predominant supervision types (maximum, medium, and minimum risk) were also examined in this study as well as in the study conducted 14 years ago. Finally, administrative and mail-in case times were observed, but the present system does not identify work unit values for these case types.

Workload study units were slightly higher for the three predominant supervision case types when compared to work units presently shown in the Consolidated Workload Report. Maximum and medium supervision times both increased by 0.2 units (16 minutes), and the minimum case time increased by 0.1 unit (8 minutes). Although the EMS and SAI times employed by MDOC had not been estimated by an empirical study, they proved to be accurate at 3.0 units. The eight face-to-face contact SAI cases required 4.5 units. Administrative and mail-in case times were 0.5 and 0.25 units, respectively.

The study findings indicate a relatively small, upward revision in current supervision case times. This will increase agency workload demand because MDOC has a large number of cases in

maximum, medium, and minimum supervision. Appendix B contains a brief discussion of urban versus rural findings.

C. Calculating Workload Staffing Estimates

The key components in developing an agency workload and staffing estimate are: 1) agent time available; 2) the agent time required to meet standards for each investigation or supervision case type; and 3) the average agency monthly investigation and supervision case counts. Agent time available was described in Table 2, and the time required to meet standards was described in Table 5. Monthly supervision and investigation counts employed in estimates shown below were derived from MDOC Consolidated Workload Report data by averaging monthly agency supervision and investigation activity reported from October of 2004 through June of 2005. The agency employs the Consolidated Workload Report to estimate caseload and workload demand. The existing agent staffing level was obtained from MDOC.

The findings presented here should be viewed as approximations of agency workload demand and staffing need. This is because NCCD simplified case categories employed by the MDOC Consolidated Workload Report. In addition, the proportions of administrative/non-reporting and mail-in cases are not shown in the present consolidated report and were computed from data more recently obtained from MDOC. It should also be noted that workload demand estimations presented here are based on a prior period – October 2004 through June 2005. Estimates reflect the operating period from which they are drawn.

1. Approximating MDOC Workload Demand

The first column in the table below presents the average number of completed investigations on active supervision cases MDOC agents serve each month. These average counts are based on

NCCD approximations. Work units assigned to each case type by the present MDOC workload system appear in the second column. The total agent units computed using the present system appear in the third column. For instance, (see line 1.a.) in an average month, the agency completed 3,274 pre-sentence investigations. Since each one requires 5.0 units of agent time to meet standards, total agency demand for pre-sentence investigations is 16,370 agent units. This is computed by multiplying the work unit of the case type by the number of cases (e.g., 5.0 units x 3,274 pre-sentence investigations). Total demand for all agency investigation work is 36,232 units. A similar computation for active supervision cases indicates a total demand of 71,611 agent units. The investigation and supervision units are combined for a total agency workload demand estimate of 107,843 units (line 3 of the table). Since the present system estimates agent time available at 90 units per agent, approximately 1,198 agents are required to meet investigation and supervision demand (i.e., 107,843 units divided by 90 units). Since MDOC has only 1,094 agents assigned, the present workload computation indicates a need for approximately 104 additional agents (see line 7). In effect, the present MDOC workload estimation procedure indicates that more agents are needed to meet workload demand.

In the two right-hand columns, the findings of this study are used to estimate workload demand. Since these new estimates for supervision, investigation, and agent available time are applied to the same MDOC caseload data, the two methods can be compared. For instance, total workload demand for investigations based on MDOC's present estimation procedure is 36,232 units. Findings from this study indicate a slightly lower demand of 35,878 units, or 354 units less than the present system.

For supervision cases, workload demand increases from 71,611 units using the present system to 80,574 units using the study findings. This represents an 8,963 unit increase in the

demand for agent supervision time. Although the change in supervision times is relatively small, MDOC supervises several thousand offenders.

Total agency workload demand (shown in line 3) is 107,843 using the present estimation method and 116,452 for the study findings. Using the study findings to update investigation and supervision work units result in an 8,609-unit increase in total agency workload demand (i.e., 116,452 units minus 107,843 units).

Table 6					
Michigan Probation and Parole Agent Workload Study					
Present System vs. Study Findings by DOC Service Area (in Units)					
DOC Service Area	Average Monthly Cases	Present Units Per Case	Present Total Agent Units	Study Units Per Case	Study Total Agent Units
1. Investigations					
a. Pre-Sentence	3,274	5.00	16,370	5.00	16,370
b. PSI Update	758	3.00	2,274	4.00	3,032
c. Delay Sent./HYTA Update	68	1.50	102	1.50	102
d. Pre-Parole	900	1.50	1,350	1.50	1,350
e. Misdemeanor Conv. Report	85	3.00	255	4.00	340
f. Parole/Probation Violations	2,677	3.00	8,031	2.50	6,693
g. Absconder/Apprehension	1,934	1.50	2,901	2.00	3,868
h. Special	3,299	1.50	4,949	1.25	4,124
Total Investigations	12,995		36,232		35,878
2. Supervision					
a. Electronic Monitoring	1,444	3.00	4,332	3.00	4,332
b. Maximum	12,292	2.00	24,584	2.20	27,042
c. Medium	21,228	1.00	21,228	1.20	25,474
d. Minimum (75%)	27,100	0.50	13,550	0.60	16,260
e. Admin/Non-Reporting (20%)	7,214	0.50	3,607	0.50	3,607
f. Mail-In (5%)	1,804	0.50	902	0.25	451
g. SSU/TRV/SAI EM/Aftercare	1,136	3.00	3,408	3.00	3,408
Total Supervision	72,218		71,611		80,574
3. Total Agent Units Required to Meet Standards			107,843		116,452
4. Time Available per Agent per Month (in Units)			90		80.5
5. Agent Positions Required			1,198		1,447
6. Current Agents Available			1,094		1,094
7. Difference between Required and Available Agents			104		353

A second and more significant impact of this study is the finding that each agent has only 80.5 units available to perform assigned investigation and supervision activity. This is a 10.6% decrease in agent time available from the present estimate of 90 units. This is attributable to the fact that past workload studies did not account for agent case support, and average total leave time has increased (see Table B2 in Appendix B). As a result, findings from this study indicate that 1,447 agent positions are required to meet MDOC workload demand (116,452 units divided by 80.5 units). Both the present and revised estimation procedures indicate the agency requires more agents than the 1,094 currently assigned. The present workload system estimates that approximately 104 additional positions are needed. Findings from this study indicate that 353 additional agents are required.⁹ Finally, it should be noted that the estimates are approximations. They are based on NCCD's analyses of agency workload reports for a nine-month operating period that ended in June 2005.

VI. SUMMARY OF WORKLOAD STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This workload study was conducted in 2005 to update workload estimates observed in a previous study completed in 1991. During May, June and July of 2005, NCCD staff met several times with a twenty-five member workload study planning group to design the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) Probation and Parole field study. Members of this planning group included agency managers, supervisors, and field agents from each region of the state. The field study was conducted over a two-month period that began during late July. Over three hundred agents participated in the study by recording time spent completing investigations and supervising offenders. Agent time available was estimated by analyzing non-case administrative and case

⁹ Note that of the 353 necessary additional agents indicated by this study, 104 positions were indicated by analysis of the present system, 142 positions were indicated by application of the updated time available computed in the current study, and 107 positions were indicated by application of the updated investigation and supervision case times computed in the current study.

support time recorded by field agents and data from MDOC personnel records. The study also estimated the agent time required to meet agency standards for completing investigations and supervising offenders. These estimates were drawn from more than 2,500 randomly sampled cases.

The Department has approximately 1,094 agent positions available to perform supervision and investigation work. The agency's present workload accounting system, which incorporates findings from a 1991 workload study, estimates a need for approximately 104 additional agents given recent agency workload demand. The findings from the 2005 study estimate that 353 additional agents may be required.

These findings are approximate because they are based on analyses of operating data derived from a prior operating period. It should be noted that agency workload demand is subject to change over time and that efforts to estimate future staffing needs should be periodically updated to reflect more recent operational trends. Based on this study, NCCD recommends that: 1) MDOC update current workload accounting procedures to reflect the findings of this study; 2) future workload estimates be completed at least annually using operating data for case supervision and investigation observed over a lagging twelve month period; 3) the agency personnel records be monitored to permit updates of agent time available.

Appendix A

Probation and Parole Supervision Standards

Case Support and Administration Form Definitions

Table A1

Probation and Parole Supervision Standards¹⁰

<u>Initial Orientation</u> – within 30 days <u>Home Call (HC)</u> – within 30 days or within two wks of move <u>Residence Verification (RV)</u> – every three mo* <u>LEIN check</u> – 30 days before discharge (all) one before reduction in supervision (SAI), after one yr supervision (Maximum/ Medium), and prior to warrant (Maximum/Medium/Minimum)*		<u>Payment Review</u> – one/mo* <u>Supervision Plan Review</u> – within 30 days and every three mo <u>Classification Review</u> – within 30 days and every six mo <u>Restitution Review</u> – every six mo and 90 days before discharge <u>SAT/TV/SV(if ordered)</u> – within 30 days (and as scheduled)
Supervision Level	Offender Contacts	Other Requirements
a. SAI/SAI EMS - Team Caseload	<u>IPC</u> – two/mo reduced intensity; four/mo intensive <u>CC</u> – eight/mo <u>Field Contacts</u> – two/mo (one HC) reduced intensity; four/mo (two HC) intensive, employed; eight/mo (two HC) intensive, unemployed <u>SAT</u> – two/mo reduced intensity; four/mo intensive	<u>EV/SV</u> – two/mo <u>TV</u> – four/mo <u>Job Development</u> – four/mo for intensive; two/mo for reduced intensity (unemployed) Note: The team will make a minimum of 26 contacts/verifications per offender per month
b. SAI/SAI EMS - Individual Caseload or SSU	<u>IPC</u> – four/mo employed; eight/mo unemployed <u>Field Contacts</u> – one/mo (every other mo HC) <u>CC</u> – one/mo <u>SAT</u> – one/mo without history; four/mo with history of SA	<u>EV/SV</u> – two/mo <u>TV</u> – four/mo <u>Job Development</u> – eight/mo for unemployed
c. SAI Residential	Per policy	<u>Discharge Restitution Review</u> – 90 days before discharge (parole); 60 days before discharge (probation)
d. Maximum or EMS	<u>IPC</u> – two/mo employed; four/mo unemployed <u>CC</u> – one/mo <u>SAT</u> – one/mo <u>Telephone Report</u> – alternate weeks for employed	<u>EV</u> – two/mo for employed <u>SV/TV</u> – (if ordered) one/mo <u>Job Development</u> – four/mo if unemployed
e. Medium	<u>IPC</u> – one/mo employed; two/mo unemployed <u>CC</u> – one/mo <u>SAT</u> – one/mo	<u>EV</u> – one/mo for employed <u>SV/TV</u> – (if ordered) one/mo <u>Job Development</u> – two/mo unemployed <u>Parole Early Discharge Review</u> – every six mo
f. Minimum	<u>IPC</u> – one/mo <u>SAT</u> – (if ordered) at agent discretion	<u>SV/TV</u> – (if ordered) at agent discretion <u>Parole Early Discharge Review</u> – every six mo
g. Minimum Mail-in	<u>IPC</u> – within 30 days and every six mo * <u>RV</u> – at each required IPC (every six mo) <u>SAT</u> – (if ordered) at agent discretion	<u>Parole Early Discharge Review</u> – every six mo <u>Mail-in Report</u> – one/mo * <u>Payment Review</u> – every six mo
h. Minimum Administrative or Paroled in Custody	<u>IPC</u> – within 30 days <u>SAT</u> – (if ordered) at agent discretion	
i. Non-Reporting	<u>IPC</u> – within 30 days <u>CC</u> – every six mo	* <u>LEIN check</u> – every six mo
Absconder Warrant Status (Parole) – CC three mo and six mo after warrant issued		

¹⁰ * indicates that standard varies by case type. IPC = in person contact, CC = collateral, SAT = substance abuse testing, EV = employment verification, SV = school verification, TV = treatment verification.

Table A2

Contact Codes and Definitions for Agent Administrative and Case Support Forms

Code	Code Value	Description
Non-Case Administrative Activities	Describes the nature of non-case administrative activities or tasks.	
1	Training (Provide or Receive)	Indicates activities that are designed to enhance staff skills and functioning. This category includes both mandatory and non-mandatory training received in attendance at workshops, conferences, etc. This category also includes any training that an agent may provide to another agent that is not case related.
2	Administrative Tasks/Office Meetings/Committees/Stats/Dailies	Indicates internal agency activities that are routine or periodic organizational requirements such as participating in office staff meetings, committees and task forces, or other administrative tasks such as daily/monthly reports, completing expense forms, responding to staff surveys, or personnel related activities.
3	Public Information in Community	Indicates external activities that are designed to provide information or education about the P & P or DOC's responsibilities and functioning on broader crime issues and programs. Examples include engagements at local schools, law enforcement, or professional organizations, and responding to requests for information and advice about agent's role, programs, or services (that are NOT in relation to specific cases).
4	Community Resources	This includes the coordination/development of DOC programs or services that support the supervision program (NOT specific case related).
5	Vacation/Sick Leave/Other Leave	Indicates any type of leave taken during the study.
6	Other Non-Case Administrative	If you perform administrative activities in a way not described in Codes 1 through 5, indicate the activity in the "notes" section of the form.
Case Support Activities	Describes the nature of case support activities or tasks.	
7	Case Staffing/Consultation (not my case)	Participation in formal staffings or informal meetings with coworkers about their cases, including consultation with an intern or mentor concerning a case not assigned to you .
8	Substitute Coverage (not my case)	Covering an active case for another agent because that agent is out ill, out of the office, or otherwise unavailable. This includes covering court for someone else's case(s), transportation, and office visits/contacts toward meeting standards. It also includes assigned court duty responsibilities. All on-call/rotation case activity should be reported here.
9	Backup Coverage (not my case)	Accompanying and/or assisting another agent with a case not assigned to you, such as a home visit or transportation.
10	Court/Hearing Appearance or Report for Inactive Cases	This may be a case that was previously on your caseload but is not currently on your caseload, where you are required to attend court or parole hearing.
11	Court-Appointed Probation Officer (CAPO) duties	This code is reserved specifically for use by CAPO or agent substitutions in that role. These duties include all activities related to this position such as preparation for court, court appearance, report writing, and associated travel.
12	Other Case Support	If you provide case support activities in a way not described in Codes 7 through 11, indicate what the support activity was in the "notes" section of the form.

Appendix B

Impact of Including On-the-Job Training of New Agents in Time Available

Comparison of MDOC Leave Time Categories

Agent Time Available – Comparison between Current Study and 1986 Study

Workload Study Findings in Hours

Urban Versus Rural Differential in Investigations and Supervision Cases

Workload Study Case Finding Detail

Impact of Including On-the-Job Training of New Agents in Time Available

NCCD was informed that new agents were not eligible to carry caseloads—time available was adjusted to reflect that. Approximately 7.4% of the agents employed by MDOC are new agents. It is possible to treat part of the 360 hours of new agent on-the-job training as “caseload-carrying time” and alter time available to reflect that if the duties include case support activities. If, for instance, all 360 hours of agent on-the-job training were considered to be case-carrying, new agents would have five hours less time available per month than experienced agents (460 hours minus 360 hours on-the-job training = 100 hours. 100 hours minus 40 hours of required annual training for all agents = 60 hours. 60 annual hours/12 months = 5 hours per month). This would calculate to 104.9 hours or 78.7 units per month of estimated time available for each new agent. It would change the reported time available for all agents from 80.5 to 82.1 units.

Comparison of MDOC Leave Time Categories

Table B1 provides an illustration of each of the leave categories for which data is collected within the MDOC personnel system. The columns represent fiscal years 2005, 2004, and 2003, respectively. The number of FTEs represented in the fiscal year data is used to calculate the annual hours per agent for each of the leave categories. The average total leave time deducted monthly per agent, the final row in the table, indicates an increase over the past few years. The four categories presently accounting for the majority of total leave time are annual leave, holiday hours, sick leave, and banked leave time. In this comparison, standard annual holiday time was applied consistently across the fiscal years. Use of annual and sick leave has steadily increased between 2003 and 2005, whereas banked leave time has substantially increased. Note that this does not include standard training and break times employed in the study.

Table B1						
Comparison of MDOC Leave Time Categories for Fiscal Years 2005, 2004, and 2003						
	FY05 Data 1,163 FTEs	Annual Hrs/Agent	FY04 Data 1,096 FTEs	Annual Hrs/Agent	FY03 Data 1,198 FTEs	Annual Hrs/Agent
Annual Leave Used	162,741.5	139.9	148,098.6	135.1	158,692.0	132.5
Sick Leave Used	90,297.0	77.6	80,546.6	73.5	83,047.9	69.3
Banked Leave Time Used	60,041.8	51.6	30,716.8	28.0	0.0	0.0
Comp Time Used	0.3	0.0	1,911.5	1.7	4,401.0	3.7
School Time Used	2,487.2	2.1	1,770.0	1.6	1,593.5	1.3
Union Time Used	755.3	0.6	519.9	0.5	1,075.2	0.9
Jury Duty Used	323.0	0.3	498.8	0.5	348.0	0.3
Military Leave	192.0	0.2	601.0	0.5	3,584.0	3.0
Initial Leave Used	678.5	0.6	479.7	0.4	686.5	0.6
Comp Time Non-Exempt Used	812.3	0.7	297.7	0.3	792.2	0.7
Deferred Hours 1982 Used	278.8	0.2	52.0	0.0	56.0	0.0
Lost Time	617.1	0.5	570.5	0.5	1,541.6	1.3
Nonpay Status	3,504.0	3.0	5,312.0	4.8	1,626.7	1.4
Voluntary Reduction Plan	766.0	0.7	2,497.0	2.3	395.0	0.3
Temporary Lay-Off Hours	456.3	0.4	20,788.0	19.0	0.0	0.0
Holiday Hours	Standard	96.0	Standard	96.0	Standard	96.0
Administrative Leave Time	7,738.0	6.7	3,558.6	3.2	6,799.8	5.7
Average Total Leave Time Deducted Annually Per Agent	381.1 hours		367.9 hours		317.0 hours	
Average Total Leave Time Deducted Monthly Per Agent	31.8 hours		30.7 hours		26.4 hours	

Agent Time Available – Comparison between Current Study and 1986 Study

It does not appear that a full time available estimate was calculated for agents in the 1991 study. The January 1986 time study results indicated that the time available was 90 work units for each field agent. Since 90 units (points) is the present value MDOC employs, it was carried forward from the 1986 study. The following table shows both the annual and the monthly hours for the current study and the 1986 study. The final column is the difference calculated between the current study and the 1986 study values.

Table B2					
Michigan Probation and Parole Agent Workload Study					
Current Estimated Hours Available Compared to 1986 Study					
	Current Study		1986 Study		Difference in Monthly Hours
	Annual Hours	Monthly Hours	Annual Hours	Monthly Hours	
Total Hours	2,080	173.3	2,088	174	-0.7
Average Holiday Time	96	8	96	8	0
Average Annual Leave	139.9	11.7	144	12	-0.3
Average Sick Leave	77.6	6.5	62	5.2	1.3
Average Banked Leave Time	51.6	4.3	NA	NA	4.3
Average Administrative Leave Time	6.7	0.6	36	3	-2.4
Average Other Leave Time*	9.3	0.8	NA	NA	0.8
Average Break Time (.5 hours per day)	130.5	10.9	114	9.5	1.4
Average Training Time	40	3.3	40	3.3	0
Total Personnel Time Deductions	551.6	46.1	492	41	5.1
Case Support Time	135.6	11.3	NA	NA	11.3
Administrative Time**	72	6.0	156	13	-7
Total Deductions (Time Not Available)	759.2	63.4	648	54	9.4
Total Time Available (Experienced Agents)	1,320.8	109.9	1,440.0	120.0	-10.1

* Includes school time, union time, jury duty, military leave, initial leave, comp time non-exempt, deferred hours 1982, lost time, nonpay status, voluntary reduction plan, and temporary lay-off hours.

** The 1986 administrative time was calculated for Probation and Parole agents (77.6 annual hours) and CRP and Resident Home agents (278.6 annual hours). Based on the conclusion of 120 hours per agent per month, it appears that a formula of 61.0% Probation and Parole agents and 39.0% CRP Resident Home agents was applied.

The average banked leave time in the current study is the predominant factor in the difference computed for overall personnel time deductions. Further, the 1986 study adjusted the time available to consider different administrative times calculated for Probation and Parole versus CRP and Resident Home agents as described in the table note above. Agent case support time was not estimated in the 1986 study, and this also contributes to the difference in time available. All recent correctional workload studies estimate case support time to account for on-call work, back up coverage and special duty assignments such as CAPO. Please note that the total time available in this table applies to experienced agents only.

Workload Study Findings in Hours

Table B3 mirrors Table 5 from the report, except the numbers are reported in hours instead of units.

Table B3			
Workload Study Time Estimates Compared to the Current System Time Estimates in Hours*			
DOC Service Area	Workload Study Hours Per Case	Current System Hours Per Case	Difference in Hours
1. Investigations			
a. Pre-Sentence	6.67	6.67	0
b. PSI Update	5.33	4.00	1.33
c. Pre-Parole	2.00	2.00	0
d. Misdemeanor Conviction Report	5.33	4.00	1.33
e. Parole/Probation Violations	3.33	4.00	-0.67
1. Parole Violations	5.33	NA	NA
2. Probation Violations	2.67	NA	NA
f. Absconder	2.67	2.00	0.67
g. Apprehension	2.67	2.00	0.67
h. Special	1.67	2.00	-0.33
1. Transfer-In Report	1.60	NA	NA
2. Request from Other County	1.33	NA	NA
3. Interstate Compact (Transfer-Out)	2.67	NA	NA
4. Polygraph	3.33	NA	NA
2. Supervision			
a. Electronic Monitoring	4.00	4.00	0
b. Maximum	2.93	2.67	0.27
c. Medium	1.60	1.33	0.27
d. Minimum	0.80	0.67	0.13
e. Administrative/Non-Reporting	0.67	NA	NA
f. Mail-In	0.33	NA	NA
g. SSU	4.00	4.00	0
h. SAI - 4 FTF Contacts/Month	4.00	4.00	0
i. SAI - 8 FTF Contacts/Month	6.00	NA	NA

*Given that one unit equals 80 minutes, the conversion from units to hours is: units * 80 minutes / 60 minutes = hours.

Urban Versus Rural Differential in Investigations and Supervision Cases

In some states, rural agents must travel farther to meet the same standards for investigation or supervision work. Prior studies have found a significant rural/urban differential in a few states that warranted a travel time adjustment for rural agents. In this study, counties were assigned to either urban or rural by office size and function. For example, offices with eight or fewer agents responsible for both parole and probation supervision were identified as rural, whereas offices with specialization and greater than eight agents were identified as urban. Using this definition, the average travel time differential for investigation and supervision work was very small – less than a ten minute difference. Given these findings, a rural travel adjustment is not required.

Upon comparing investigation travel times for the six agents in Upper Michigan to the rest of the agents, a greater difference is evident. The agents in Upper Michigan reported an average investigation travel time of 0.65 units, while the average for other agents was 0.27 units. This difference of 0.38 units converts to over half an hour per investigation; however, it is important to note that the volume of investigations in Upper Michigan is quite small. NCCD has often seen substantially greater travel times for agents who, for example, cover more than one county and/or court. Travel time recorded for minimum, medium, and maximum supervision cases combined showed an insignificantly higher time for Upper Michigan (i.e., just over two minutes).

Workload Study Case Finding Detail - Investigation

Table B4				
Type of Agent Contact in Minutes by Investigation Type				
Investigation Type	Type of Contact in Minutes			Total Minutes
	Offender	Other Person	None	
PSI	92	252	60	400
PSI Update	77	198	45	320
Misd. Conviction Report	28	76	17	120
Pre-Parole	10	99	211	320
Parole/Prob. Violation	40	110	50	200
Absconder/Apprehension	61	192	67	320
Special	34	33	33	100
Polygraph	106	46	48	200

* Includes all agent contacts

Table B5					
Method of Agent Contact in Minutes by Investigation Type					
Investigation Type	Method of Contact in Minutes				Total Minutes
	Face to Face	Phone, Fax, Email, Mail	Paperwork, Computer	All Other	
PSI	116	32	228	24	400
PSI Update	99	22	179	19	320
Misd. Conviction Report	35	10	71	5	120
Pre-Parole	163	51	70	32	320
Parole/Prob. Violation	56	34	100	10	200
Absconder/Apprehension	90	35	179	16	320
Special	53	13	25	8	100
Polygraph	136	20	44	2	200

Table B6				
Place of Agent Contact in Minutes by Investigation Type				
Investigation Type	Place of Contact in Minutes			Total Minutes
	P & P Office	Offender Home	All Other	
PSI	304	0	68	400
PSI Update	224	0	74	320
Misd. Convict Report	103	0	8	120
Pre-Parole	131	0	61	320
Parole/Prob. Violation	162	0	32	200
Absconder/Apprehension	227	0	70	320
Special	54	37	9	100
Polygraph	166	24	10	200

Table B7			
Agent Travel vs. Activity Time in Minutes by Investigation Type			
Investigation Type	Activity vs. Travel Time in Minutes		Total Minutes
	Activity	Travel	
PSI	368	32	400
PSI Update	288	32	320
Misd. Convict Report	113	7	120
Pre-Parole	218	102	320
Parole/Prob. Violation	188	12	200
Absconder/Apprehension	285	35	320
Special	72	28	100
Polygraph	188	12	200

Table B8		
Average Monthly Agent Contacts with Offender by Investigation Type		
Investigation Type	Average Monthly Contacts	Number of Cases
PSI	1.40	416
PSI Update	1.20	78
Misd. Conviction Report	1.40	28
Pre-Parole	1.40	101
Parole/Prob. Violation	0.10	144
Absconder/Apprehension	0.90	205
Special	0.60	241
Polygraph	1.70	15

Workload Study Case Finding Detail - Supervision

Table B9				
Type of Agent Contact in Minutes by Supervision Case Type				
Supervision Case Type	Type of Contact in Minutes			Total Minutes
	Offender	Other Person	None	
SAI/EMS	113	84	43	240
Maximum	93	49	49	176
Medium	52	26	26	96
Minimum	28	10	10	48
Administrative	16	9	9	40

* Includes all agent contacts

Table B10					
Method of Agent Contact in Minutes by Supervision Case Type					
Supervision Case Type	Method of Contact in Minutes				Total Minutes
	Face to Face	Phone, Fax, Email, Mail	Paperwork, Computer	All Other	
SAI/EMS	154	41	38	5	240
Maximum	114	30	30	2	176
Medium	60	17	16	2	96
Minimum	30	6	11	1	48
Administrative	18	7	15	1	40

Table B11				
Place of Agent Contact in Minutes by Supervision Case Type				
Supervision Case Type	Place of Contact in Minutes			Total Minutes
	P & P Office	Offender Home	All Other	
SAI/EMS	154	60	29	240
Maximum	127	35	14	176
Medium	69	15	12	96
Minimum	29	7	12	48
Administrative	20	1	20	40

Table B12			
Agent Travel vs. Activity Time in Minutes by Supervision Case Type			
Supervision Case Type	Activity vs. Travel Time in Minutes		Total Minutes
	Activity	Travel	
SAI/EMS	197	43	240
Maximum	153	23	176
Medium	84	12	96
Minimum	42	6	48
Administrative	37	3	40

Table B13

Average Monthly Face-to-Face Agent Contacts by Supervision Case Type

Supervision Case Type	All Offender	Office	All Collateral	Number of Cases
SAI/EMS	5.6	3.9	6.0	55
Maximum	5.0	4.2	3.9	150
Medium	2.7	2.3	0.7	344
Minimum	1.4	1.0	0.6	798
Administrative	0.5	0.1	0.0	181