



Missouri Juvenile Officer Workload Assessment Study

Final Report

November 2013

**NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS
COURT CONSULTING SERVICES DIVISION
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80202**



Missouri Juvenile Officer Workload Assessment Study

Final Report

November 2013

Project Staff

Suzanne Tallarico, Project Director
John Douglas, Project Consultant
Erika Friess, Project Analyst

Daniel J. Hall, Vice President
Court Consulting Services
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80202

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
Introduction	1
Overview of a Workload Assessment Model	3
Methodology	5
<i>Time Study</i>	5
<i>Data Elements</i>	6
Determining Juvenile Officer Availability	8
Missouri Juvenile Officer Time Study and Workload Values	10
Qualitative Assessment of Workload Values	13
Juvenile Officer Workload Calculation and Resource Needs	16
Keeping the Workload Assessment Model Current and Future Use of the Model	18
<i>Recommendations</i>	19
Appendix A:	22
Missouri Juvenile Officer Workload Study Case Types and Activities	22
Appendix B:	25
Missouri Juvenile Officer Resource Need Model by Circuit	25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Any project in which consultants are hired to work in a state requires a high level of coordination between the consulting staff and the agency with whom they are working. We were fortunate to work with Richard (Rick) Morrissey and Rick McElfresh, who were both very capable and dependable resources on this project. We also worked with a knowledgeable and involved Advisory Committee who met frequently throughout the project. Both Rick and Rick were always available when any information was needed or to answer our questions that helped us understand the Juvenile Court System in Missouri.

Conducting meaningful workload studies also requires the dedication and effort of an Advisory Committee that can help guide the project to meet the needs of the state. In this capacity, we worked with a very capable group of Juvenile Court representatives. This committee reviewed documents and provided useful and thoughtful feedback. The project team would like to thank our very capable committee, whose names are listed below.

Advisory Committee Members

Judge Patricia Joyce, Chair
Judge Scott Lipke
Matthew Holt
Russell Shelden
Bill Lawson
Terri Goodall
Ernie Painter
Tammy Walden
Perry Epperly
Adrienne Lloyd
Jay Rodieck
Sherri Paschal
Cindy Garrett
Mike Hancock

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

Excessive probation caseloads jeopardize both public safety and the quality of supervision officers can provide to the youth they supervise in the community. The quality of investigation and supervision services is directly related to the number of deputy juvenile officers available to handle the probation supervision work in Missouri.

Currently, the state of Missouri uses workload standards that were developed in 2006¹ on which to base its need for deputy juvenile officers. The Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to update the workload assessment study for juvenile probation in 2013.

The NCSC has conducted workload assessment studies for many years. The weighted caseload method uses time as a measure for workload and is based on the assumption that the more time required to process, manage, or supervise a case, the more work is involved.

In this study, a case weight or *workload value* is defined as the average amount of time it takes to oversee or supervise a particular type of case by a juvenile officer. Workload values are computed based upon the average number of minutes it takes to complete tasks associated with various screening, processing and supervision cases. Using workload values, the number of *juveniles* can be translated into *workload* for deputy juvenile officers.

Methodology

The core of the workload assessment model is a time study wherein deputy juvenile officers (DJOs) kept track of the amount of time they spent on the various case types and on non-case-specific responsibilities such as work-related community activities, committee work and meetings. The time study was conducted during a four-week period: April 15 through May 10, 2013. All of the 240 deputy juvenile officers from each of the 35² multi-county judicial circuits were expected to participate in the study; 232 officers recorded data, for a participation rate of 96.7%. Additionally, any probation

¹ The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) conducted the 2005-2006 workload assessment study for the juvenile probation system in Missouri.

² There are 45 judicial circuits in Missouri; ten of the circuits, including the 6th, 7th, 11th, 16th, 19th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 29th and 31st are single-county circuits, and they were not included in the present study.

staff members who occasionally engage in case-related work with juvenile juveniles recorded their case-related activity.

The combination of the case-specific time study data and the average number of cases in each workload value category creates the individual workload values for each case type category. The workload values represent the average annual amount of time a DJO is expected to work on each case (in minutes) for each case type category. By applying the workload values to current or projected new cases, a measure of case-specific workload can be computed. For cases that are supervised over a number of months, monthly case weights have been developed.

Case-specific workload divided by the amount of time available per deputy juvenile officer for case-specific work provides an estimate of DJO resources required to manage the variety of cases in each judicial circuit. This approach, which involves few complicated procedures, is sufficiently rigorous to provide a model for measuring resource demands and evaluating resource allocations.

Findings

The Advisory Committee reviewed the workload values for each case type in July; additionally, two focus groups including Chief Probation Officers and line staff were held in August to review and discuss the workload values to determine whether any qualitative adjustments were necessary. Based upon the focus group discussion and a second review of all of the time study data, the Advisory Committee discussed each case type and workload value.

The Advisory Committee took heed of two consistent recommendations that were made by the focus groups to collapse certain case categories. Specifically, the workload values for low risk, medium risk, high risk and intensive supervision categories for formal supervision status cases were collapsed into one supervision category of all risk levels and the same measure was taken with formal supervision law cases. All other workload values were left in their original state, as measured by the time-and-motion study. With the exception of the two adjustments, the committee agreed that it was best to maintain the remaining workload values as measured.

Based on the average number of cases in FY 2013 (referred to as the average daily population, or ADP), the DJO workload assessment model estimates that a total of 243.51 DJO FTEs are needed to fully staff the 35 multi-county circuit juvenile probation departments. When considering only those circuits for which there is a positive staffing

need, these circuits are understaffed by 40.27 FTE. It is important to note that this needs assessment study focused only on DJO work, and as such only reflects DJO FTE needs.

The final case weights and the overall DJO resource needs model are presented in Figures ES 1 and ES 2.

Figure ES 1: Final Missouri DJO Case Weights

Case Category	Monthly Workload Value (Hours per Case)
Diversion	5.10
Status Offenses:	
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30
Informal processing	3.74
Formal processing	4.10
Truancy court	6.56
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	1.88
Informal supervision	2.06
Delinquency (Law) Cases:	
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90
Informal processing	3.92
Informal supervision	0.95
Formal processing	19.79
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	3.41
Treatment (drug, other) court	1.41
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:	
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62
Informal processing	7.15
Formal processing	15.30
Formal supervision/placement	0.61
Protection orders	0.66
Treatment court	2.90
Informal supervision	1.19
Alternatives to Detention	
Alternatives (all types)	1.21
Termination of Parental Rights Cases:	
Screening	3.03
Court-related activity	2.26

Figure ES 2: Statewide Juvenile Probation Officer Resource Needs for the Multi-County Probation Departments

Case Category	Monthly Workload Value (Hours per Case)		Average Monthly Cases		Monthly Workload Hours		Annual Workload Hours
Diversion							
Diversion	5.10	x	100	=	510	x1.2	6,120
Status Offenses:							
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	x	587	=	763	x1.2	9,157
Informal processing	3.74	x	290	=	1085	x1.2	3,015
Informal supervision	2.06	x	993	=	2046	x1.2	24,547
Formal processing	4.10	x	72	=	295	x1.2	3,542
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	1.88	x	340	=	639	x1.2	7,670
Truancy Court or other specialty court	6.56	x	0	=	0	x1.2	-
Delinquency (Law) Cases:							
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	x	690	=	1311	x1.2	15,732
Informal processing	3.92	x	353	=	1384	x1.2	6,605
Informal supervision	0.95	x	1531	=	1454	x1.2	7,453
Formal processing	19.79	x	124	=	2454	x1.2	29,448
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	3.41	x	1036	=	3533	x1.2	42,393
Juvenile treatment court	1.41	x	1	=	1	x1.2	17
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:							
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	x	695	=	1126	x1.2	3,511
Informal processing	7.15	x	119	=	851	x1.2	2,010
Informal supervision	1.19	x	265	=	315	x1.2	3,784
Formal processing	15.30	x	296	=	4529	x1.2	54,346
Formal supervision and out-of-home placement	0.61	x	5623	=	3430	x1.2	41,160
Protection orders	0.66	x	375	=	248	x1.2	2,970
Family treatment court	2.90	x	28	=	81	x1.2	974
Other							
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	3.03	x	38	=	115	x1.2	1,382
Termination of Parental Rights: Court-related activity	2.26	x	115	=	260	x1.2	3,119
Alternatives to Detention (all types)	1.21	x	220	=	266	x1.2	3,194
Annual Case-Specific Workload (workload value x ADP)							20,351
Probation Officer Annual Availability (in Hours) (22.6 days)							1,781
Full Year (365 days)							
Weekends (104 days per year)							
State holidays (13 days per year)							
Training (4.5 days per year)							
Vacation/Sick Leave (20.9 days per year)							
(Subtract) Annual Travel Hours per Officer (5.1 hours per day)							114
(Subtract) Annual Non-Case-Specific Time per Officer (1.58 hours per day)							352
Annual Case-Specific Work Availability (in Hours)							1,316
Juvenile Probation Officer Demand							243.43
Juvenile Probation Officer Current FTE							12.50
Additional or Subtracted FTE Need							30.93
Positive Staffing Need Only							40.27

Model Considerations

This report presents the findings from the workload analysis performed by the NCSC for Missouri deputy juvenile officers. In the absence of any significant changes in case management, organizational structure or legislation in the Missouri juvenile probation system, the case weights developed during the course of this study should be accurate for several years. However, periodic updating, like that conducted here, is

necessary to ensure that the case weights continue to accurately represent DJO workload. Increased efficiency, statutory or procedural changes, or implementation of various case management initiatives over time may result in significant changes in case processing.

The workload assessment models are tools that can be used effectively in DJO resource management. Workload models are quantitative analysis not qualitative evaluation. The 2013 ADP data were used to develop the model, and indicate the DJO resource needs for that year. The standards should be applied to new cases (or projected new cases) for successive years to determine DJO needs in the future. The real power of the model lies in its applicability in predicting future DJO resource needs with caseload projection analysis.

Introduction

Nationally, probation leaders face continual challenges of effectively managing rising caseloads, limited probation officer staff, and increasing supervision requirement expectations. The American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) has tried for years to develop national standards for caseload sizes; but has been unsuccessful because of the vast variation in state and local investigation and supervision practices. Even so, the APPA recognizes the need for developing national standards as guidelines, but strongly endorses the need for states to determine local workloads based on carefully conducted time studies (Burrell, 2006). In a joint BJA-APPA publication in 2011, the authors describe the varied benefits of conducting time studies, from making funding requests based on empirical findings to identifying areas for improving efficiencies and effectiveness to assisting in the development of guidelines in performance evaluations (DeMichele, Payne and Matz, 2011).

In response to these multiple and sometimes conflicting challenges and problems, state probation leaders are increasingly turning to more sophisticated techniques to provide quantitative documentation of probation resource needs. Two constant and recurring problems are inherent with these challenges: (1) objectively assessing the number of probation officers required to handle current and future caseloads, and (2) deciding whether probation resources are being allocated, geographically, according to need. Assessing the probation workload through the development of a weighted workload assessment model is a rational, credible, and practical method for meeting these objectives and determining the need for probation officers.

Currently, the state of Missouri uses workload standards that were developed in 2006 on which to base its need for deputy juvenile officers (DJOs). The Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to update the workload values in 2013.

The NCSC has conducted workload assessment studies for many years across a variety of disciplines, including judges, court staff, probation officers and parole officers. The weighted caseload method uses time as a measure for workload and is based on the assumption that the more time required to process, manage, or supervise a case, the more work is involved.

The DJO workload assessment study was designed to measure the workload of Missouri's deputy juvenile officers. At the time this study commenced, there were 212.5 FTE DJOs employed by the state and working in the 35 multi-county judicial circuits in Missouri. Deputy juvenile officers in Missouri are officers of the court and, as such, are expected to deliver quality services and public protection in the course of their work. The Missouri DJOs are also unique in that, in addition to supervising youth who have been placed on formal probation supervision, they also investigate and actively supervise status offenders that the court feels are in need of services and supervision as well as child welfare cases, including child abuse and neglect and other child welfare cases and provide support to the court in termination of parental rights cases. In a sense, the DJOs in Missouri are a hybrid between traditional probation officers who supervise delinquent youth and social services caseworkers who investigate and provide services to youth and families for status and child welfare situations.

The current study developed workload values for each of the primary types of cases that DJOs in Missouri investigate and/or supervise in an effort to accurately determine adequate staffing levels for the multi-county circuits. In this study, a workload value is defined as the average amount of time it takes to investigate or supervise a particular type of case. Workload values are computed based upon the average number of minutes (or hours) it takes to complete tasks associated with juvenile probation investigations and supervision. Using workload values, the number of *juveniles* can be translated into *workload* for DJOs.

This report details the methodology of the Missouri juvenile probation officer workload assessment study. A workload assessment model containing differentiated case management processing times is presented for each of the major case categories handled by the deputy juvenile officers.³ Specific objectives of the DJO workload assessment study are as follow:

- To conduct a quantitative assessment of deputy juvenile officers' work requirements for the multi-county circuits.
- To develop accurate and representative workload values for the appropriate investigation and supervision case categories.
- To provide an accurate and understandable model that presents the need for deputy juvenile officers.

³ A workload assessment model is a quantitative representation of the inter-related variables that work together to determine probation services resource needs. A change in one variable will affect other variables and the total determination of the juvenile probation officer resource needs. The term "model" is commonly used in the social sciences to denote this relationship of variables.

Overview of a Workload Assessment Model

Theory and National Context of Weighted Workload Assessment

The NCSC has conducted workload assessment studies for many years. These studies aim at assisting states in developing meaningful, easily understood criteria for determining overall resource needs, taking into account both case specific and non-case specific workload factors. In all, the NCSC has conducted more than 70 workload and staffing assessments in the last ten years. The studies have been performed in a variety of contexts – statewide and local efforts, and general and limited jurisdiction courts. These studies have involved judges, quasi-judicial officers, administrative and clerical staff, court clerks, public defenders and probation and parole officers. All of these studies are anchored in a “weighted caseload” model that directly measures the variations in time required to manage different case types within the appropriate context.

The weighted caseload method uses time as a measure for workload and is based on the assumption that the more time required to process, manage, or supervise a case, the greater the workload value should be. Assessing workload through the development of a weighted caseload model is being adopted by an increasing number of states.⁴

The NCSC workload studies are grounded in the principle that adequate resources are essential to the effective management of cases, delivering quality service to the public and maintaining public safety. Meeting these challenges in Missouri involves the objective assessment of the number of DJOs needed to achieve their mission and objectives.

For deputy juvenile officers, a workload value is defined as the average amount of time it takes to manage or supervise a particular type of case. Workload values are computed based upon the average number of minutes (or hours) it takes to complete tasks associated with probation management and supervision. Given the nature of probation work, workload values are developed as a monthly measure of time, but can be easily aggregated to represent an annual workload requirement.

While case filings and new placements to probation can help determine the demands placed on DJOs, unadjusted filing or placement figures offer only minimal guidance regarding the amount of work generated by these cases. Deputy juvenile

⁴ See Douglas, John. *Examination of NCSC Workload Assessment Projects and Methodology: 1996-2006*, March 2007 for a detailed description of weighted workload studies conducted by the NCSC between 1996 and 2006.

officers in Missouri are officers of the court and, as such, are expected to deliver quality services and public protection in the course of their work. The inability to differentiate the work associated with each type of referral or level of supervision could create the misperception that an equal number of cases referred to or placed on probation for two different types should result in equivalent workloads when it comes to investigation and supervision requirements. Rather, cases vary in complexity, and different types of cases require different levels of attention from DJOs. To account for this variation in case types, specific workload values are developed. By weighting these cases in a DJO needs model, a more accurate assessment can be made of the amount of time required to supervise and manage the caseload, and caseload *can* be translated into manageable workloads.

This report details the Missouri Juvenile Officer Workload Assessment Study methodology and presents the workload assessment model for DJO need. The findings from the present study can be used to assist OSCA in determining the need for multi-county circuit DJO resources as well as to determine where those resources could be located to effectively distribute the necessary DJO FTE (full time equivalent) positions.

Methodology

The NCSC worked with the Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload Work Group, consisting of judges, Chief Probation Officers, probation officers and representatives from the Office of the State Court Administrator. The members of this Work Group are listed on page i of this report.

The NCSC worked with the Work Group to develop the critical components of the workload study. This Work Group provided guidance and oversight during the life of the workload assessment project. Specifically, the Work Group provided advice and commentary on the overall study design, the identification of case types, the duration of the time study, the approach, and reviewed the draft workload values prior to the completion of the project.

The core of the workload assessment model is a time study wherein DJOs kept track of the amount of time they spent on the various case types by activity and on non-case-specific responsibilities such as work-related community speaking, meetings and committee work. The combination of the case-specific time study data and the new cases placed with the probation departments creates the workload standards or “individual case weights” for each case type category. The workload values represent the average annual amount of time a DJO is expected to work on each case (in minutes or hours) for each case type category. By applying the workload values to the average daily population (ADP), a measure of case-specific workload can be computed. Case-specific workload divided by the amount of time available per DJO for case-specific work provides an estimate of DJO resources required to manage the caseload. This approach, which involves few complicated procedures, is sufficiently rigorous to provide a model for measuring resource demands and evaluating resource allocations. The model is straightforward and the basic methodological steps are listed below. The remainder of this report section describes in detail the steps that were used to build the Missouri juvenile probation officer workload assessment model.

Time Study

The NCSC staff utilized a time study to measure the time DJOs spent processing all phases of the 23 case types on which they work. Training on the purpose of the workload study, how to record time and how to use the data collection instrument was provided to DJOs in webinar format. Ten training sessions were provided over a period

of two weeks during the month of April. Additionally, written instructions were made available to all DJOs. Finally, the NCSC maintained a Help Desk that was available during working hours Monday through Friday of each week during the time study. DJOs could call or email the Help Desk with questions regarding how to record time or to report errors that needed to be fixed.

During the four-week period of April 15 through May 10, 2013 251 of 261⁵ potential probation staff participated in the time study. In terms of FTE, 197.5 of the 212.5 FTE participated in the time study (92.9%).⁶ The DJO staff recorded their time on a paper-based time tracking form, and then transferred this information to a secure web-based data entry program maintained by the NCSC. Once submitted, the data were automatically entered into NCSC's secure database.

Data Elements

NCSC project staff met with the Work Group on a number of occasions including both video-conference and in-person formats between December 17, 2012 through October 3, 2013. During the initial meetings, the Work Group and consultants determined the case type categories activities to be included in the study, as well as determine such details as the duration and timing of the study. Once the time study began, meetings were used to provide status updates and, when available, to present draft findings of data and results of focus group meetings.

Case Types and Activities

Selecting the number of case types and case events to be used in a weighted workload study involves a trade-off between having enough information to ensure the accuracy of the workload standards and minimizing the data collection burden on the participating DJOs. The more case types and events that are included in a weighted workload study, the more burdensome it can be to the participants. However, determining the appropriate types of cases to be weighted is particularly important because the workload standards must eventually be attached to readily available case

⁵ In some locations, staff other than case-carrying line staff recorded time for activities they performed that are technically DJO duties. Every person that had the potential to enter data was provided with data entry credentials.

⁶ During the focus groups, it was determined that some DJOs did not participate in the time study because they work solely on diversion cases. This could account for the small number of FTE that did not participate in the time study.

data to determine workload. Figure 2 presents the case types and activities for which data were collected in this study (a full explanation of these can be found in Appendix A).

**Figure 2: Missouri Juvenile Probation Weighted Workload Study
Case Types and Activities**

Workload Study Case Types & Activities
Diversion
Diversion activities
Status Offenses
Screening (informal/formal)
Informal processing
Formal processing
Truancy court
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels
Informal supervision
Delinquency (Law) Cases
Screening (informal/formal)
Informal processing
Informal supervision
Formal processing
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels
Treatment (drug, other) court
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases
Screening (informal/formal)
Informal processing
Formal processing
Formal supervision/placement
Protection orders
Treatment court
Informal supervision
Alternatives to Detention
Alternatives (all types)
Termination of Parental Rights Cases
Screening
Court-related activity

Non-Case Specific Activities

Activities that do not relate to a *specific* case but must be done by DJOs are defined as general administrative/other activities. The key distinction between case-related and non-case specific activities is whether the activity can be tied to a specific case. Figure 3 lists the general administrative/other activities measured in this study.

Figure 3: Non-Case Specific Activities

General research/ keeping current

Community activities, Speaking engagements, public speaking

Committees, meetings & related work

Non-case related administration

Time study project

Other non case related activities

Determining Deputy Juvenile Officer Availability

In every workload study, three factors contribute to the calculation of resource need: case numbers (ADP), workload values and the juvenile officer year value. The relationship of these elements is expressed as follows:

*Workload = Average Daily Population * Workload Values*

Resource Need = Workload ÷ Deputy Juvenile Officer Year Value

The juvenile officer year value represents the amount of time in a year probation officers have to complete their work. Arriving at this value entails calculating how many days per year are available for juvenile officers to perform work (the juvenile *officer work-year*) and then determining how many business hours each day are available for case-related work as opposed to non-case-related work (the juvenile *officer day*). Multiplying these two measures together results in *the juvenile officer year value*, which is an estimate of the amount of time (in hours) the “average” juvenile officer has to address their casework during the year.

a. The juvenile officer work-year. Calculating the “average” juvenile officer work-year requires determining the number of days per year that juvenile officers have to perform case-related matters. Obtaining this number involved working with the Advisory Committee to deduct time for weekends, holidays, vacation, short-term illness and education days. After deducting these constants from 365 days, it was determined that *juvenile officers in Missouri have, on average, 222.6 days available each year to perform judicial activities* (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Calculating the Juvenile Officer Work-Year

PO Year	Days
Total Days per Year	365
Subtract Non-Working Days:	
Weekends	- 104
Holidays	- 13
Vacation, sick & other leave	- 20.9
Education/Training	- 4.5
Total Working Days per Year	222.6

b. The juvenile officer day. The juvenile officer day is separated into two parts: the amount of time devoted to (1) case-specific and (2) non-case-specific activities. The Missouri juvenile officer needs model is built on a standard juvenile officer workday of 8 hours per day. Data collected during the time study established the average amount of time associated with non-case-specific activities (1.58 hours per day) and the average amount of time associated with work-related travel (.51 hours per day).

c. The juvenile officer year value. Multiplying the juvenile officer year by the number of hours in a day available for case-related work (8 hours minus non-case related time and travel time) yields the amount of time available per year for probation officers to work, which is

Figure 5: Average Juvenile Officer Year Value Calculations

Total Hours per Day	9.0
---------------------	-----

Subtract		
Lunch break	-	1.0
Travel time	-	.51
Other non-case related time	-	1.58
Total Case-Related Hours per Day	-	5.91

Missouri Deputy Juvenile Officer Time Study and Workload Values

A time study measures case complexity in terms of the average amount of DJO time actually spent managing different types of cases, from the initial referral or placement to termination. The essential element in a time study is collecting time data on *all* DJO activities. For this study, DJOs in the multi-county circuits in Missouri recorded all time spent on various case types on a daily time log and then entered their time on a web-based data collection instrument. Deputy juvenile officers' activities included time spent on case-specific work, non-case specific work, and travel time.

Workload Values

As discussed earlier, time study data was collected from all DJOs statewide during the four-week period of April 15 through May 10, 2013. To calculate preliminary workload values, the average amount of DJO time required to handle a particular case for a year, the four-week time data was annualized and divided by the average number of cases in each case type for 2013.

The workload values by case type provide a picture of current DJO practice in Missouri. For example, as shown in Figure 6, DJOs in Missouri recorded the annual value of 1,065,321 minutes associated with delinquency screening. To develop the case weight, we divided the annual time by twelve to get an even monthly value, then divided the monthly minutes by the average number of delinquency screenings in the multi-county circuits (3213,166 minutes/820 cases). The resultant workload value of 114 minutes means that, on average, it takes a DJO 114 minutes to complete a delinquency screening in Missouri. By aggregating all of the time recorded for each case type and dividing that time by the total average monthly number of cases, we are able to smooth the anomalies across the case type to incorporate both the unusually long cases and the unusually short cases into the average. For probation weighted workload studies, it is

easier to think of the time associated with supervision cases⁷ as a monthly workload values. Because supervision is generally thought of in terms of monthly activity, workload values can be looked at as monthly values.

Figure 6: Example of Case Weight Calculation for Referral Intakes

Annualized Minutes Recorded for Delinquency Screening		Monthly Minutes for Delinquency Screening	Average Delinquency Screenings Monthly		Monthly Workload Value
1,065,321	÷	88,777	778	=	114 minutes/case

The utility of a weighted caseload system is now easy to illustrate. For example, while the *number* of delinquency cases formally processed in a month (n=148) and the *number* of child and family welfare cases informally processed in a month (n=140) are similar, the workload values for these two case types are significantly different (formal processing of delinquency cases takes 19.79 hours per case compared to informally processing a child and family welfare case, which takes 7.15 hours per case). Therefore, the monthly workload associated with the child and family welfare cases (140 cases * 7.15 hours = 1,001 hours) is approximately one-third of the workload associated with formal processing on a delinquency case (148 cases * 19.79 hours = 2,929 hours). Because of the difference in the workload values, more time is required for the formal processing activities on a delinquency cases than for the informal processing of the child and family welfare cases. Clearly, caseload is not the same thing as workload. Figure 7 presents a table that includes the draft and final workload values for Missouri juvenile probation case types. Section VI of this report describes the process for arriving at the final workload values.

⁷ Those cases that do not have ongoing supervision, such as referral intakes, emergency intakes, etc. do not lend themselves to monthly case weights, since the work associated with these cases is not ongoing as is the case with supervised probation.

Figure 7: Final Missouri Juvenile Officer Workload Values

Case Category	DRAFT Monthly Workload Value (Hours per Case)	FINAL Monthly Workload Value (Hours per Case)
Diversion		
Diversion programs used in lieu of referral	5.10	5.10
Status Offenses		
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	1.30
Informal processing	3.74	3.74
Formal processing	4.10	4.10
Truancy court	6.56	6.56
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	NA	1.88
Formal supervision: Low Risk	4.34	
Formal supervision: Moderate Risk	1.29	
Formal supervision: High Risk	.79	
Formal supervision: Intensive	7.66	
Informal supervision	2.06	2.06
Delinquency (Law) Cases		
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	1.90
Informal processing	3.92	3.92
Informal supervision	0.95	0.95
Formal processing	19.79	19.79
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels		3.41
Formal supervision: Low Risk	3.94	
Formal supervision: Moderate Risk	2.94	
Formal supervision: High Risk	2.91	
Formal supervision: Intensive	5.41	
Treatment (drug, other) court	1.41	1.41
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases		
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	1.62
Informal processing	7.15	7.15
Formal processing	15.30	15.30
Formal supervision/placement	0.61	0.61
Protection orders	0.66	0.66
Treatment court	2.90	2.90
Informal supervision	1.19	1.19
Alternatives to Detention		
Alternatives (all types)	1.21	1.21
Termination of Parental Rights Cases		
Screening	3.03	3.03
Court-related activity	2.26	2.26

Qualitative Assessment of Workload Values

Focus Groups

The NCSC consultants held two focus group sessions with probation staff of all levels from across the state. The purpose of the focus groups was to obtain feedback from participants regarding the draft findings from the time-and-motion study and discuss whether the data collection period was typical of their work. The focus group sessions were held on August 29, 2013. Participants were invited by the OSCA workload study liaisons. Each focus group had twelve participants and lasted for a period of 90 minutes.

The preliminary workload values derived from the time study yielded some findings that raised some questions by the NCSC team and some Advisory Committee members. Specifically, the workload values for formal supervision of both status and delinquency cases were inversely related to risk level (see DRAFT Monthly Workload Value in Figure 7). That is, the workload value associated with low risk cases was higher than the workload value for high risk cases, which is the opposite of what would typically be expected. The focus group participants reviewed and discussed each of the workload values and they provided helpful feedback and insight into the findings.

Participants in both focus groups were not surprised to see that deputy juvenile officers recorded more time associated with lower risk youth than with their higher risk counterparts. Focus group participants reasoned that the youth in the low risk categories, for both status and delinquency offenses, tend to have greater needs, which require more time and services. Several participants reported that they do not necessarily follow the supervision standards, which dictate more contact with higher risk youth. Both focus groups, independently, recommended combining the workload values in the formal supervision categories, with separate case weights for status offenses and delinquency cases.

Another apparent inconsistency in the workload values that the focus group participants were asked to comment on is the amount of time associated with informal supervision for youths for a status offense, which is over 2 hours per month. Again, the focus group participants shed light on this number, maintaining that many youth in this category have high needs, but no other services available, so they work hard to provide services to keep the youth from getting further enmeshed in the justice system. Additionally, deputy juvenile officers often find that youth who are under their care and

supervision for status offenses also address a host of other problems that are related to status offenses. Aside from the recommendation to collapse formal supervision for status offenses and formal supervision for delinquency cases, the focus group participants affirmed the workload values that were derived from the time study. In some cases, they thought the workload values might even be somewhat low, though no concrete reasons were provided to defend an increase.

Qualitative Adjustments and Discussion

NCSC consultants met with the Advisory Committee to review and discuss the focus group input. The Committee discussed each workload value and considered the feedback offered by the focus group participants. After carefully considering all of the input, the Committee made two changes to the draft workload values: they collapsed the status offense and delinquency formal supervision categories from four separate values each (low risk, moderate risk, high risk and intensive) to one workload value each, as shown in Figure 7 (see DRAFT column and FINAL column for changes).

To better understand the work associated with each of the case type categories for which workload values were derived, a brief explanation of the work conducted in each category is provided in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Explanation of Case Processing Activities Within Case Type Categories

Diversion	All activities related to diversion cases for which a will be a referral is not made. This category is narrowly defined and work associated with this category is more likely to be direct interaction with a youth than ongoing service referral and supervision.
Screening: Status Offense, Delinquency and Child & Family Welfare (informal/formal)	Includes all work associated with screening cases, including determination of legal sufficiency of a status/law/Child & Family Welfare referral receipt, investigations, screening for detention and documentation. The difference in work associated with the three types of cases is in the nature of and detail associated with the investigation.
Informal Processing: Status Offense, Delinquency and Child & Family Welfare	Informal processing is distinguished from formal processing in that the juvenile probation officer is the direct provider of services, such as informal adjustments or “counsel and warn,” or some minimal supervision (outside services are not provided). Deputy juvenile officers also prepare/complete risk/needs assessments on youth in this category. Cases are disposed within 30 days of receipt. Additional time associated with CA/N cases is the result of working with family members, and not just the individual youth.
Formal Processing: Status Offense, Delinquency and	Formal processing involves the preparation of a petition to the court. In this category, deputy juvenile officers prepare risk/needs

Child & Family Welfare	assessments, social summaries and conduct pre-hearing conferences with the youth and family. Activities that increase time for delinquency cases include time associated with preparing the case for court, such as preparing witnesses for testimony, victim notification, negotiation of restitution and other legal work. Activities that increase time for CA/N cases include holding multiple family team meetings and working with multiple youth in a particular family.
Informal Supervision: Status Offense, Delinquency and Child & Family Welfare	Informal supervision includes the oversight of youth in each case type category who has not been formally processed through the court system. For these cases, the juvenile probation officer is often the sole provider of services and supervision, so time associated with this work can be greater than when the youth is being formally supervised, especially for status offense and CA/N cases. For status offense cases in this category, deputy juvenile officers often spend many hours in the initial oversight of these cases to front-load services that address the youth's needs to prevent further involvement with the juvenile justice system.
Formal Supervision: Status Offense, Delinquency and Child & Family Welfare	Formal supervision includes all work associated with the supervision, including all assessed risk levels, of a youth who has been officially placed on supervision. Delinquency cases have a relatively higher workload value than status and CA/N cases because juvenile officers must address both the delinquent risk and needs of the youth, while also providing and overseeing the provision of services; the supervision of status offenders addresses needs more than risk. As for the supervision of CA/N cases, the workload is relatively low because the cases stay "on the books" for a long time, and the supervision element is often limited to periodic status monitoring of milestones. Also, CA/N cases also involve more than one child per family, allowing for the consolidation of work when working with a family with multiple youth. Additionally, for CA/N cases, there is additional supervision support from other agencies that somewhat reduces the supervision time by probation officers.
Specialty Courts: Truancy Court, Drug Court, CA/N Treatment Court	Time associated with specialty courts includes, case updates and staffing with the treatment court team, time spent in court and time outside court working with the individual youth as well as case file updates.
Protection Orders	Work in this category includes completing court ordered protection assessments pertaining to child protection order, guardianship, placement, adult protection order, or dissolution with children.
Alternatives to Detention	This category includes all time associated with the oversight and supervision of youth placed in programs in lieu of detention, such as electronic home monitoring and day reporting centers.
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	This category relates to the screening of cases for termination of parental rights, including investigations and legal sufficiency.
Termination of Parental Rights: Court-Related Activity	This category relates to the attending court hearings for cases being reviewed for the termination of parental rights.

Juvenile Probation Officer Workload Calculation and Resource Needs

Once the DJO year value and the case weights have been established, the calculation of DJOs needed to manage the workload of the Missouri juvenile probation system is completed. Juvenile officer case related demand is calculated by dividing the DJO workload (the annual number of hours of work required based on caseload and workload values) by the DJO year value. Finally, we subtract the average annual time required for non-case specific work and work-related travel from the DJO's annual work time availability. The resulting number represents the DJO case-related full time equivalents (FTE) needed to manage the work of the probation system in Missouri. Figure 9 displays the steps taken to compute DJO demand.

Figure 9: Calculation of Total Needs

Step 1	For Each Case Type: <i>Case Weight x New Cases = Workload</i>
Step 2	For Each Case Type: <i>Sum individual case type workloads to obtain the total workload for each Unit (total minutes of work expected)</i>
Step 3	For Each Circuit: <i>Divide the total workload by the DJO year value (case related minutes) to obtain DJO resource needs</i>
Step 4	For Each Circuit: <i>Subtract the non-case specific and work related travel time from the DJO annual work time availability</i>

Applying the workload values to the average daily population of cases in each category along with the time requirements associated with non-case specific work and travel produces the overall DJO case-related workload for each county.

Juvenile Officer FTE Needs Estimated by the Model

Based on the average number of cases in FY 2013 (referred to as the average daily population, or ADP), the DJO workload assessment model estimates that a total of 243.51 DJO FTEs are needed to fully staff the 35 multi-county circuit juvenile probation

departments. When considering only those circuits for which there is a positive staffing need, these circuits are understaffed by 40.27 FTE. It is important to note that this needs assessment study focused only on DJO work, and as such only reflects DJO FTE needs.

Figure 10: Missouri Statewide Deputy Juvenile Officer Resource Needs Model for Multi-County Circuits

Case Category	Monthly Workload Value (Hours per Case)		Average Monthly Cases		Monthly Workload Hours		Annual Workload Hours
Diversion							
Diversion	5.10	x	100	=	510	x12	6,120
Status Offenses:							
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	x	587	=	763	x12	9,157
Informal processing	3.74	x	290	=	1085	x12	3,015
Informal supervision	2.06	x	993	=	2046	x12	24,547
Formal processing	4.10	x	72	=	295	x12	3,542
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	1.88	x	340	=	639	x12	7,670
Juvenile Court or other Specialty Court	6.56	x	0	=	0	x12	-
Delinquency (Law) Cases:							
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	x	690	=	1311	x12	15,732
Informal processing	3.92	x	353	=	1384	x12	16,605
Informal supervision	0.95	x	1531	=	1454	x12	7,453
Formal processing	19.79	x	124	=	2454	x12	29,448
Formal supervision: All Risk Levels	3.41	x	1036	=	3533	x12	42,393
Juvenile Treatment Court	1.41	x	1	=	1	x12	17
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:							
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	x	695	=	1126	x12	3,511
Informal processing	7.15	x	119	=	851	x12	10,210
Informal supervision	1.19	x	265	=	315	x12	3,784
Formal processing	15.30	x	296	=	4529	x12	54,346
Formal supervision and out-of-home placement	0.61	x	5623	=	3430	x12	41,160
Protection orders	0.66	x	375	=	248	x12	2,970
Family Treatment Court	2.90	x	28	=	81	x12	974
Other							
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	3.03	x	38	=	115	x12	1,382
Termination of Parental Rights: Court-related activity	2.26	x	115	=	260	x12	3,119
Alternatives to Detention (all types)	1.21	x	220	=	266	x12	3,194
Annual Case-Specific Workload (workload value x ADP)							20,351
Probation Officer Average Annual Availability in Hours (22.6 days)							1,781
Full Year (365 days)							
Weekends (104 days per year)							
State Holidays (13 days per year)							
Training (4.5 days per year)							
Vacation/Sick Leave (20.9 days per year)							
(Subtract) Annual Travel Hours per Officer (1.51 hours per day)							114
(Subtract) Annual Non-Case-Specific Time per Officer (1.58 hours per day)							352
Annual Case-Specific Work Availability in Hours							1,316
Juvenile Probation Officer Demand							243.43
Juvenile Probation Officer Current FTE							12.50
Additional or Subtracted FTE Need							30.93
Positive Staffing Need Only							40.27

Qualitative Factors Affecting the Determination of Resources

Qualitative factors also can affect DJO resource needs, and these should be considered when determining a state's resource needs. There can be *local* differences that result in some case types taking longer in some counties within a single state; and this is especially true in a state like Missouri, where statewide standard for processing and supervision are not closely followed. The size of a county can also have an impact on case management responsibilities, especially as it relates to "windshield time" requirements associated with home visits. Additionally, when satellite offices must be staffed, it might be necessary to maintain a full time DJO and/or secretary in one office even if the caseload demands do not require it. Another qualitative factor to consider is more highly populated counties might have the benefit of specialization within case types, allowing some economies of scale.⁸

This model should be only one factor in the consideration of resource needs. The issues identified above and any other issues that are particularly relevant to Missouri should be considered when using this model to determine resource needs.

Keeping the Workload Assessment Model Current and Future Use of the Model

This report presents the findings from the workload analysis performed by the NCSC for Missouri deputy juvenile officers in the multi-county circuits. In the absence of any significant changes in case management, organizational structure or legislation in the Missouri juvenile court system, the workload values developed during the course of this study should be accurate for several years. However, periodic updating, like that conducted here, is necessary to ensure that the workload values continue to accurately represent DJO workload. Increased efficiency, statutory or procedural changes, or implementation of various case management initiatives over time may result in significant changes in case processing.

The workload assessment model provides a tool that can be used effectively in juvenile probation officer resource management. The 2013 average daily population case data were used to validate the model, and indicate the DJO resource needs for that

⁸ Specialization could also *increase* the amount of time an officer spends on certain kinds of cases. For example, if a circuit designated an officer to supervise a specialty court caseload, the special demands of this case type could be greater than the case weight indicated for regular probation supervision.

year of cases. The workload values should be applied updated caseload numbers for successive years to determine DJO needs in the future.

Recommendations

The NCSC team presents the following recommendations, which are intended to improve and strengthen the use and implementation of the workload values and the workload assessment model.

Recommendation 1: OSCA should establish appropriate rounding levels to determine FTE staffing needs. In any workload assessment needs model, the data indicate the need for portions of staff. While it is quite obvious that a staff need of .01 FTE would not rise to the level of needing to hire one additional full-time person, it is not so obvious when that need is .75 or even .85 of an FTE. For this reason, OSCA should establish rounding rules that can be used in conjunction with the needs assessment model so that the model can be consistently used and interpreted in years to come.

Recommendation 2: OSCA should develop a consistent mechanism through which juvenile probation departments can identify, track and count diversion cases. The creation of a workload value for diversion cases is new in 2013. Given the system's desire to intervene early in an at-risk youth's life to prevent further involvement with the juvenile court and/or delinquency system, there is a commitment to engage in such activities, and so the time should be addressed in a workload assessment model. At this time, there is no clearly established mechanism through which to capture and count these cases, however. Therefore, it is recommended that OSCA clearly define the types of cases that should be included in this category *and* establish a system by which to count these cases.

Recommendation 2A: OSCA should consider adjusting the workload value for diversion cases after the identification and counting of these cases becomes institutionalized. The current workload value established for diversion cases was based on a very small number of cases in only two circuits. As the identification and counting of these cases becomes institutionalized, it is almost certain that more cases, in which a wide variety of activities are engaged, will fall into this category. When this happens, the types of cases and the activities engaged in

should be re-assessed and the workload value should be re-established (and likely reduced).

Recommendation 3: The use of one risk assessment tool for all categories of cases (status, law, CA/N) should be reconsidered. The current standards indicate that supervision activity should be based on the level of risk the youth poses, based on the use of a risk assessment tool. Thus, if a youth is assessed to pose a high risk of re-offense, it is expected that the probation officer will direct more time and oversight to that case, compared to a youth who scores moderate or low risk. This system of differential contact standards is rooted in the literature regarding evidence-based practices for community supervision. In practice, both the time study data and the focus group discussions highlighted the fact that supervision practices are largely driven by need rather than by risk. Specifically regarding status offenders, whose *delinquency* risk is likely to be low, deputy juvenile officers often target a youth's needs for service provision, which is what drives the workload.

The current risk assessment tool does not appear to adequately assess a youth's needs and does not distinguish between status and law offenders. To better arm deputy juvenile officers with data to determine appropriate service provision, OSCA should consider adopting one or more risk assessment tools that can distinguish between status and law offenders and that contains an adequate assessment of needs.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Missouri Juvenile Probation Officer Workload Study Case Types and Activities

CASE TYPE: Diversion

All activities will be captured under the *Diversion* category. This information is not currently captured by JIS. As a result, if referrals are successfully reduced, the possibility exists for a specious reduction in the need for additional FTE.

CASE TYPE: Status (JX) & Law (JY)

ACTIVITIES:

Screening

Determining legal sufficiency of a status/law referral within 30 days of receipt [Standard].
Includes investigations
Detention screening as needed.
Automated case documentation [JIS & other].

Informal Processing

Notice to parties.
Informal adjustment conference w/ parent, or counsel and warn, with all associated assessments
Develop and explain informal adjustment agreement. Copies as required.
Disposition within 30 days of finding of sufficiency [Standard]. May include supervision and other sanctions, and/or services only.
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

Informal Supervision

Minimum of one face-to-face contact per month for duration of supervision, normally 6 mos.; extendable to 1 yr. [Standard].
Courtesy supervision.
Collateral contacts as needed.
Provide or facilitate services.
Violations.
Progress reports.
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos]

Formal Processing

Assignment and monitoring of alternative to detention programming.
Notice to parties.
Pre-hearing conference.
Risk and needs assessments.
Prepare petition.
Prepare social summary with dispositional recommendations based on assessments and other information.
Adjudication and dispositional hearings.
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

Formal Supervision

Low supervision = one contact per mo w/parent and collaterals as needed [Standard].
Moderate supervision = two contacts per mo; one w/parent and collaterals as needed [Standard].

High supervision = four contacts per mo; one w/parent and collaterals as needed [Standard].
Intensive [no current standard].
Hearings as needed.
Collateral contacts as needed.
Provide or facilitate services.
Progress reports.

Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

CASE TYPE: Child & Family Welfare
ACTIVITES:

Screening

Determining legal sufficiency of a CA/N referral within 30 days of receipt [Standard].
Includes investigations
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

Informal Processing

Notice to parties.
Informal adjustment conference w/ parent, or counsel and warn.
Develop and explain informal adjustment agreement.
Disposition within 30 days of finding of sufficiency. May include supervision and/or services only [Standard].
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

Informal Supervision

Minimum of one face-to-face contact per month for duration of supervision, normally 6 mos.; extendable to 1 yr. [Standard].
Courtesy supervision.
Collateral contacts as needed.
Provide or facilitate services.
Progress reports.
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

Formal Processing

Prepare protective custody documentation.
Prepare petition.
Notice to parties.
Family support team meetings.
Protective custody hearing.
Prepare social summary with dispositional recommendations based on assessments and other information.
Adjudication and dispositional hearings.
Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos]

Formal Supervision/ Placement

Milestone hearings as needed
Collateral contacts as needed
Monthly family support team meetings
Provide or facilitate services
Progress reports.

Monitor placement.

Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

Protection Orders

Complete court ordered protection assessments pertaining to child protection order, guardianship, placement, adult protection order, or dissolution with children.

Automated case documentation and data integrity [JIS & Cognos].

CASE TYPE: Termination of Parental Rights

All case related activities associated with TPR cases

Appendix B:
Missouri Juvenile Probation Officer Resource Need Model by Circuit
(Begins on next page)

CASE TYPE	Monthly Workload Values (Hours)	Annual Workload Values (Hours)	Circuit 1	Circuit 2	Circuit 3	Circuit 4	Circuit 5	Circuit 8	Circuit 9	Circuit 10	Circuit 12	Circuit 13
Diversion	5.10	61.20	0				84					
Status Offenses:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	15.60	6	13	4	11	24	6	14	11	17	49
Informal processing	3.74	44.88	7	6	1	6	8	4	3	5	6	27
Informal supervision	2.06	24.72	61	18	7	33	23	9	25	46	57	41
Formal processing	4.10	49.20	1	1	0	0	4	1	4	1	1	13
Formal supervision: All risk levels	1.88	22.56	8	3	3	2	16	1	33	9	0	17
Truancy court or other specialty court	6.56	78.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delinquency (Law) Cases:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	22.80	2	9	7	6	33	13	5	13	14	63
Informal processing	3.92	47.04	2	4	3	3	20	9	2	6	1	42
Informal supervision	0.95	11.40	36	11	18	13	54	23	34	69	99	47
Formal processing	19.79	237.48	1	2	1	2	7	1	2	4	1	15
Formal supervision: All risk levels	3.41	40.92	5	10	15	8	63	8	17	37	39	101
Juvenile treatment court	1.41	16.92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	19.44	6	10	15	21	7	3	5	10	13	42
Informal processing	7.15	85.80	4	1	1	4	0	3	1	1	2	10
Informal supervision	1.19	14.28	47	1	5	17	0	0	18	11	9	1
Formal processing	15.30	183.60	3	5	5	9	4	1	4	8	5	28
Formal sup and out-of-home placement	0.61	7.32	72	102	103	74	46	12	95	137	130	395
Protection orders	0.66	7.92	2	6	11	4	12	9	3	15	10	31
Family treatment court	2.90	34.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Other Cases												
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	3.03	36.36	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Termination of Parental Rights: Court related activity	2.26	27.12	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	3	10
Alternatives to Detention (all types)	1.21	14.52	0	1	1	2	4	1	10	1	3	39
Annual Case Specific Work & Average Caseload (WLV & ADP)			362	458	018	806	4,937	2,787	5,919	6,657	7,984	26,569
JPO Annual Availability: 22.6 days * 8 hours per day			781	781	781	781	781	781	781	781	781	781
Annual work-related travel hours per year per officer (5.1 hours per day)			14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Annual non-case specific time (1.58 hours per day)			52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
Annual Availability Hours for Case Specific Work			316	316	316	316	316	316	316	316	316	316
Circuit FTE			2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Staffing Demand			2.08	2.39	2.05	2.41	2.35	2.12	2.50	2.58	2.07	2.20
Additional or Subtracted FTE Need			2.08	1.61	2.05	2.41	2.65	2.12	2.50	2.17	2.03	2.20
Positive Staffing Need Only			2.08		2.05	2.41		2.12	2.50			2.20

CASE TYPE	Monthly Workload Values (Hours)	Annual Workload Values (Hours)	Circuit 14	Circuit 15	Circuit 17	Circuit 18	Circuit 20	Circuit 24	Circuit 25	Circuit 26	Circuit 27	Circuit 28
Diversion	5.10	61.20										
Status Offenses:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	15.60	14	7	27	23	13	22	33	17	17	11
Informal processing	3.74	44.88	6	3	16	9	3	18	24	4	16	7
Informal supervision	2.06	24.72	70	8	121	51	30	23	5	6	25	9
Formal processing	4.10	49.20	1	1	4	1	0	1	2	2	1	1
Formal supervision: All risk levels	1.88	22.56	4	3	41	0	3	0	7	5	6	8
Truancy court or other specialty court	6.56	78.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delinquency (Law) Cases:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	22.80	11	16	35	27	24	46	27	27	12	20
Informal processing	3.92	47.04	6	9	21	10	8	29	17	7	9	13
Informal supervision	0.95	11.40	109	27	155	51	86	40	24	12	29	19
Formal processing	19.79	237.48	1	2	10	2	4	7	3	4	1	2
Formal supervision: All risk levels	3.41	40.92	48	17	71	1	32	89	36	51	2	22
Juvenile treatment court	1.41	16.92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	19.44	12	3	20	3	12	10	88	17	25	28
Informal processing	7.15	85.80	2	0	2	0	0	0	10	2	20	3
Informal supervision	1.19	14.28	4	0	8	1	0	0	0	3	50	0
Formal processing	15.30	183.60	3	3	16	1	12	10	16	11	6	4
Formal sup and out-of-home placement	0.61	7.32	148	144	290	75	23	327	199	379	133	73
Protection orders	0.66	7.92	3	7	12	8	18	14	27	24	5	15
Family treatment court	2.90	34.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Cases												
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	3.03	36.36	1	0	2	1	2	6	3	1	2	1
Termination of Parental Rights: Court related activity	2.26	27.12	1	0	3	3	17	14	7	4	3	1
Alternatives to Detention (all types)	1.21	14.52	15	8	19	11	2	13	3	4	0	0
Annual Case Specific Work Average Caseload (WLV/ADP)			20,736	20,660	20,345	20,402	20,620	20,264	20,366	20,655	20,318	20,850
JPO Annual Availability: 22.6 days * 8 hours per day			1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781
Annual work-related travel hours per year per officer (5.1 hours per day)			14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Annual non-case specific time (1.58 hours per day)			52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
Annual Availability Hours for Case Specific Work			1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715	1,715
Circuit FTE			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Staffing Demand			1.64	1.54	1.46	1.11	1.55	1.60	1.01	1.10	1.32	1.45
Additional or Subtracted FTE Need			1.64	1.46	1.46	1.14	1.45	1.60	1.16	1.10	1.32	1.45
Positive Staffing Need Only			1.64	1.46	1.46	1.14	1.45	1.60	1.16	1.10	1.32	1.45

CASE TYPE	Monthly Workload Values (Hours)	Annual Workload Values (Hours)	Circuit 30	Circuit 32	Circuit 33	Circuit 34	Circuit 35	Circuit 36	Circuit 37	Circuit 38	Circuit 39	Circuit 40
Diversion	5.10	61.20		16								
Status Offenses:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	15.60	14	28	33	13	15	10	24	19	8	5
Informal processing	3.74	44.88	6	19	8	4	2	5	24	7	2	1
Informal supervision	2.06	24.72	5	101	20	33	4	7	15	17	4	0
Formal processing	4.10	49.20	0	0	12	0	3	2	1	3	0	2
Formal supervision: All risk levels	1.88	22.56	0	0	91	1	15	20	0	11	2	0
Truancy court or other specialty court	6.56	78.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delinquency (Law) Cases:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	22.80	32	28	24	18	24	21	13	45	15	4
Informal processing	3.92	47.04	20	19	9	7	2	8	8	19	5	1
Informal supervision	0.95	11.40	39	120	33	35	11	22	33	43	16	0
Formal processing	19.79	237.48	3	5	7	3	7	4	4	4	3	1
Formal supervision: All risk levels	3.41	40.92	23	35	35	33	27	25	30	22	18	4
Juvenile treatment court	1.41	16.92	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:												
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	19.44	38	33	11	9	66	18	20	24	28	34
Informal processing	7.15	85.80	14	9	0	0	3	2	9	1	0	13
Informal supervision	1.19	14.28	17	36	1	7	12	6	3	0	0	0
Formal processing	15.30	183.60	6	4	10	7	14	13	5	15	21	18
Formal sup and out-of-home placement	0.61	7.32	158	66	117	225	177	210	87	311	312	384
Protection orders	0.66	7.92	12	15	9	7	5	4	14	7	11	16
Family treatment court	2.90	34.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	12
Other Cases												
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	3.03	36.36	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	1
Termination of Parental Rights: Court related activity	2.26	27.12	4	2	1	0	3	7	2	11	1	3
Alternatives to Detention (all types)	1.21	14.52	17	12	14	2	0	1	10	6	1	0
Annual Case Specific Work (Average Caseload (WLV) ADP)			3,307	3,867	1,675	714	1,018	1,022	1,306	1,783	1,452	1,315
JPO Annual Availability: 22.6 days * 8 hours per day			1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781
Annual work-related travel hours per year per officer (5.1 hours per day)			14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Annual non-case specific time (1.58 hours per day)			52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
Annual Availability Hours for Case Specific Work			316	316	316	316	316	316	316	316	316	316
Circuit FTE			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
Staffing Demand			0.07	0.54	0.87	0.86	0.74	0.86	0.31	0.96	0.19	0.08
Additional or Subtracted FTE Need			0.07	0.54	0.87	0.14	1.26	0.86	0.31	0.96	0.81	0.58
Positive Staffing Need Only			0.07	0.54	0.87			0.86	0.31	0.96		0.58

CASE TYPE	Monthly Workload Values (Hours)	Annual Workload Values (Hours)	Circuit 41	Circuit 42	Circuit 43	Circuit 44	Circuit 45	Total
Diversion	5.10	61.20						100
Status Offenses:								
Screening (informal/formal)	1.30	15.60	8	16	20	7	28	587
Informal processing	3.74	44.88	7	10	10	2	4	290
Informal supervision	2.06	24.72	23	42	30	7	17	993
Formal processing	4.10	49.20	1	2	5	0	1	72
Formal supervision: All risk levels	1.88	22.56	5	3	16	0	7	340
Truancy court or other specialty court	6.56	78.72	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delinquency (Law) Cases:								
Screening (informal/formal)	1.90	22.80	9	8	15	8	16	690
Informal processing	3.92	47.04	8	6	8	4	8	353
Informal supervision	0.95	11.40	45	47	43	29	59	1531
Formal processing	19.79	237.48	2	1	4	1	3	124
Formal supervision: All risk levels	3.41	40.92	29	1	42	14	26	1036
Juvenile treatment court	1.41	16.92	0	0	0	0	0	1
Child & Family Welfare (CA/N) Cases:								
Screening (informal/formal)	1.62	19.44	11	18	4	8	23	695
Informal processing	7.15	85.80	2	0	0	0	0	119
Informal supervision	1.19	14.28	8	0	0	0	0	265
Formal processing	15.30	183.60	4	6	3	7	9	296
Formal supervision and out-of-home placement	0.61	7.32	120	120	131	142	106	5623
Protection orders	0.66	7.92	1	11	5	10	12	375
Family treatment court	2.90	34.80	0	0	0	7	0	28
Other Cases								
Termination of Parental Rights: Screening	3.03	36.36	0	1	0	1	1	38
Termination of Parental Rights: Court related activity	2.26	27.12	2	3	0	2	3	115
Alternatives to Detention (all types)	1.21	14.52	3	1	3	8	5	220
Annual Case Specific Workload Average Caseload (WLV/ADP)			116,144	116,731	117,657	118,893	117,595	117,203,351
JPO Annual Availability: 22.6 days * 8 hours per day			117,781	117,781	117,781	117,781	117,781	1781
Annual work-related travel hours per year per officer (5.1 hours per day)			117,14	117,14	117,14	117,14	117,14	114
Annual non-case specific time (1.58 hours per day)			117,52	117,52	117,52	117,52	117,52	352
Annual Availability Hours for Case Specific Work			117,316	117,316	117,316	117,316	117,316	1316
Circuit FTE			117,00	117,00	117,00	117,00	117,00	212.50
Staffing Demand			117,67	117,36	117,82	117,72	117,77	243.43
Additional or Subtracted FTE Need			117,67	117,64	117,82	117,72	117,77	30.93
Positive Staffing Need Only			117,67		117,82	117,72	117,77	40.27

Bibliography

Bemus, Brian, Gary Arling and Peter Quigley. (1983) *Workload Measures for Probation and Parole*, Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections

Burrell, William (2006) *Caseload Standards for Probation and Parole, Perspectives*, Lexington, KY.

DiMechele, Matthew T., Brian K. Payne, and Adam K. Matz. (2011) *Community Supervision Workload Considerations for Public Safety*, August 2011, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Washington, D.C.

Douglas, John. (2007) *Examination of NCSC Workload Assessment Projects and Methodology: 1996-2006*, March 2007, National Center for State Courts, Denver, Colorado.