



Community Corrections Staffing Model

2022 Report to the Legislature

As required by ESSB 5092 Sec 222(3)

April 28, 2023

Publication Number 400-SR003

Cheryl Strange, Secretary
cheryl.strange@doc.wa.gov

Mac Pevey, Assistant Secretary, Community Corrections Division
mac.pevey@doc.wa.gov

Contents

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	4
Background.....	5
Ongoing COVID-19 Impacts	6
Governor Proclamation 20-35.....	6
Contact Standards and Supervision Activities.....	6
Jail Bed Availability	7
Workload study tasks	7
Table 1: Study Participant Characteristics by Position Type.....	10
Table 2: Frequency, Time and Completion Rates of Activities by Category	11
Table 3: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with a Given Person Type	12
Table 4: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with a Given Method	13
Table 5: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with a Given Location	14
Table 6: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with Database Systems.....	15
Table 7: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with Perceived Challenges.....	16
Table 8: Frequency and Average Total Time of CCD-Related Activities by Offender Risk Level	17

Community Corrections Staffing Model

2022 Report to the Legislature

Foreword

In the 2021 legislative session, the Legislature supported and funded a workload study for the Department of Corrections, Community Corrections Division (CCD). The proviso included the following requirements:

- *\$450,000 of the general fund—state appropriation for fiscal year 2022 is provided solely for conducting a community corrections caseload study. The department of corrections shall contract with an independent third party to provide a comprehensive review of the community corrections staffing model and develop an updated staffing model for use by the department of corrections. The updated model must include additional time and flexibility for community corrections officers to focus on case management, engagement, and interventions. The department of corrections shall submit a report, including a summary of the review and update, to the governor and appropriate committees of the legislature by July 1, 2022.*

Since this time, the agency has solicited for and acquired a contracted vendor, Westat, to conduct this study. The study will measure the time and resources required to carry out the daily responsibilities and activities associated with the management of supervised individuals.

The legislative expectation was to have the study completed and a legislative report completed by July 1, 2022. However, due to the complexity of the work of CCD as well as ongoing COVID restrictions and modifications to the work, a request was made to extend the workload study assessment period and legislative report out. The extension request was granted through December 2022. It is important to note that this request was not made as a result of inadequacy of Westat. They have performed in an excellent manner and done their due diligence to assure the work of CCD and intersecting agencies was assessed in a fair and complete manner.

Since the extension of the Westat contract, in November 2022, they joined the department leadership from Community Corrections in addition to other cross-divisional stakeholders to include Budget, Hearings, Records and representatives from the Washington Federation of State Employees to present the results of their study as well as a preview of the revised workload model. What we discovered in the review of the model is the complexity of community corrections work, coupled with the number of cross divisional intersects associated with the management of supervised individuals. Further, with the recent return to full operations coming out of the pandemic, it has created opportunity for Westat and the department to further refine the first version of the model in order to assure all the work of community corrections and business related cross divisional partners was represented.

This Department of Corrections report to the Legislature is directed by ESSB 5092 Sec 222(3) and contains information about the Community Corrections Staffing Model development.

In returning to full operational status from the pandemic, Westat has been able to review all the work performed by Community Corrections Division staff as opposed to the small sample from the original study. The department has been able to provide additional data and operational policy information to better inform this study.

Further, in March 2023, the department officially launched the Individualized Community Oriented Accountability Collaborative Help (iCoach) supervision model. Although we were aware of the potential impacts to the work of community corrections, we have since been able to quantify the work through a more reliable lens, creating the need to adjust the original workload model.

The department meets weekly with Westat to assure a comprehensive understanding of the new model and elements included therein.

Executive Summary

The last workload study conducted within CCD was in 2004. The work has evolved significantly since then given evidence-based practices and focus on cognitive change, swift and certain responses to violations, supervision compliance credits and comprehensive case management practices to name a few. In collaboration with the Washington State Federation of State Employees (WFSE), the department initiated a workload study at the Legislature's direction. The workload study is critical in ensuring we have sound methodology to be resourced appropriately in the future. The study provides context and quantifies the work of CCD as well as the work done by other divisions that intersect with the operations of CCD.

Based on the results of the workload study, Westat will deliver a model and resource allocation tools capable of estimating resource requirements for current and future workloads under an enhanced supervision model, and various hypothetical scenarios of different workload requirements to include the addition of iCoach (Individualized Community Oriented Accountability Collaborative Help) supervision. Furthermore, the results will help CCD, and other divisions, determine appropriate staffing across the state to meet the work demands and operational need.

Background

CCD has not conducted a workload study since 2004. In 2021 the department received funding to conduct a comprehensive review of the CCD staffing model. As indicated above a Request for Proposal (RFP) was distributed and several contract proposals were reviewed. The selected vendor is Westat, who has extensive experience conducting staffing and workload studies in various states.

The scope of the workload study was for Westat to conduct a comprehensive review of the existing model and develop an updated staffing model and resource allocation tools for use by the department. Some of the requirements include:

- The updated staffing model must provide additional time and flexibility for officers to focus on case management, engagement, and intervention and account for other changes that will be implemented under the iCoach (Individualized Community Oriented Accountability Collaborative Help) Model.
- The updated model must also account for, and allocate resources to, other units that perform activities in support of the supervision of individuals in the community.
- Prepare a summary of the results of the workload study and updated staffing model and resource allocation tools.

The project targeted the following objectives:

- Define the work processes and activities
- Identify the workload study locations
- Establish a study pilot site
- Train workload study participants
- Meet with the department executives and specified external stakeholders
- Develop the resource allocation model tools and provide training and a user manual for the tools
- Present findings to executives and specified external stakeholders
- Provide the department with a final report that details the study's scope, approach, methodology, work process categories, results, and findings

Through the workload study, we hope to answer the following research questions:

- What are the most common tasks/activities performed by supervision officers (case and non-case related), supervisors, and support staff?
- How much time is associated with these tasks/activities?
- Are there significant regional and section variations in terms of time associated with key tasks and challenges to satisfactory completion?
- Are there identifiable tasks in which officers, supervisors, and/or support staff report sacrificing quality for timeliness?
- Are the current staffing levels sufficient given changes in practice since the prior study (WADOC, 2004) or the present implementation of the iCoach model?

This Department of Corrections report to the Legislature is directed by ESSB 5092 Sec 222(3) and contains information about the Community Corrections Staffing Model development.

CCD supports the department's mission of improving public safety by positively changing lives by helping improve lives today for better communities tomorrow. The method by which the department supervises individuals in the community has continued to evolve over time – lean budgets, public policy changes, rigorous research, advancement of the social sciences and critical incidents in the community have shaped what community-based corrections looks like today. The CCD staffing model review will assure we have the future resources to continue to perform our jobs in a safe and professional manner.

Ongoing COVID-19 Impacts

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, the department has been working closely with the Department of Health (DOH), the Office of Financial Management (OFM), State Human Resources Division, the State Emergency Management Division and other state agencies in developing plans to maintain the health and safety of departmental employees, those under supervision and our communities.

In March 2020, in response to directives from the Governor and the Secretary, CCD made some significant changes in how we monitor and supervise individuals in the community. These temporary changes in supervision had a direct and immediate impact to the department's response to supervision in the community.

In March 2022, the Community Corrections Division returned to full operations coming out of the pandemic. We have continued to experience limited contracted local jail capacity to book violators, and in some areas there is no jail capacity, making it difficult to assess activities related to arrest, search and transport. It was during this time that as we were ramping up operations, the study began, with the workload study parameters having already been set, along with select focus groups and workload study participants having been identified. We have since been able to analyze the duties we were unable to assess due to COVID and are making practical adjustments to the model in consultation with Westat.

Governor Proclamation 20-35

On March 30, 2020, Governor Inslee issued Proclamation [20-35](#), allowing for early implementation of SHB 2417. This proclamation waived and suspended strict compliance with [RCW 9.94A.737\(2\)\(b\)](#), requiring the arrest and imprisonment of low-level community custody offenders to increase space in jails and correctional institutions and allow for more adequate social distancing.

Contact Standards and Supervision Activities

CCD has focused supervision efforts on those cases deemed highest risk or posing a substantial threat to community safety. Field contacts were only conducted for a specified list of high-risk individuals within designated supervision categories and for investigations. All other field work was significantly reduced and/or suspended.

The department temporarily suspended: all warrant sweeps and apprehension activities that were not deemed a significant public safety risk; responses to law enforcement to meet for a transfer of custody following a law enforcement-initiated arrest; and hospital watches at the request of law enforcement.

This Department of Corrections report to the Legislature is directed by ESSB 5092 Sec 222(3) and contains information about the Community Corrections Staffing Model development.

Jail Bed Availability

The COVID-19 pandemic further reduced already-limited access to county jail beds for detaining supervised individuals sanctioned to confinement. Jail facilities were also implementing their own modified operations to address staffing shortages and maintain adequate social distancing within their populations.

Westat began their assessment of the work of CCD during the time we remained in modified operations due to COVID. As the study progressed, we slowly increased the work in the community and towards the end of the study, CCD was back to full operations. Westat considered COVID restrictions and was able to modify their processes to meet current, and project future, work of our staff.

Westat is currently finalizing the staffing model. This will be shared with the Office of Financial Management and the Legislature following an internal agency review and prior to the agency's supplemental budget submission.

Workload study tasks

The tasks outlined by Westat to review were specific and comprehensive to the work of CCD and those divisions that intersect with the work of CCD. These tasks include:

Task 1: Form Advisory Subcommittees

- Form multiple subcommittees comprised of a cross-section of representation from across the state for each occupational area (i.e., officers, supervisors, support staff)
- Multiple functions throughout the project
- 7-10 individuals per subcommittee (for most)
- Rural areas will be adequately represented
- Representation should be diverse in terms of experience levels within their respective occupation

Task 2: Outline Workload Process

- All advisory subcommittees will participate in an initial meeting
- Question and answer session with participants
- Overview of current and pending agency initiatives that may be relevant to present and future workload consideration

Task 3: Map Business Processes and Conduct Task Analysis

- Each advisory subcommittee will engage in a business process mapping session specific to their occupational needs and goals
- Business Process Modeling Notation (BPMN) diagrams may be used to capture the workflow processes of supervision officers, supervisors, and support staff
- Information will inform development of time study instruments

This Department of Corrections report to the Legislature is directed by ESSB 5092 Sec 222(3) and contains information about the Community Corrections Staffing Model development.

Task 4: Develop Time and Motion Study Instruments

- Advisory subcommittees will help finalize the categorical tasks and activities that will be included in the study instruments

Task 5: Sample of Time and Motion Web Application Form

- Use a stratified random sample by program area, unit or specialization, and/or location to select participants
- Number of participants will be proportional to their representation of the overall population
- We may also randomly select cases from an officer's caseload

Task 6: Pilot Time and Motion Study Web Application

- Conduct a pilot study in consultation with the respective advisory subcommittees
- Identify logistical problems that can be remedied prior to full scale study
- The ultimate aim is to reduce the burden on study participants as best as possible for them to document the details of performed activities as conveniently and quickly as possible

Task 7: Administer Virtual Training Sessions

- Training will walk participants through the process of completing the time study, including how to access the web application
- Study participants will be provided a reference manual with technical information about how to use the application and descriptions of all items in the application
- Informed consent will be documented at this stage

Task 8: Conduct Time and Motion Study

- Main functions of the application are to collect:
 - Direct individual contact activities (to be matched with clients)
 - Support/collaborative activities
 - Management activities
 - Aggregate counts of time spent specifically with the different risk levels of Supervised Individuals, as well as for specialized caseloads as defined by CCD
 - Method, location, persons involved, outcome, and challenges
 - The expectation was a 4-week data collection period.

Task 9: Conduct Adequacy of Time Survey

- Survey will commence within a week after the time and motion study (approximately by mid-April 2022)
- All officers, supervisors, and support staff who participated in the time and motion study will be invited to complete the survey
- Staff will be asked to rate the extent to which they believe they have time to satisfactorily

This Department of Corrections report to the Legislature is directed by ESSB 5092 Sec 222(3) and contains information about the Community Corrections Staffing Model development.

complete each category of activities, in addition to open-response items

- This allows us to understand larger systematic issues or barriers to the organization, as well as provide greater confidence to any patterns observed from the time and motion study

Task 10: Analyze Results, Develop Report



Task 11: Present Study Findings, Finalize Models

The attached tables 1-8 will describe in brief the activities that were studied and a high-level overview of the results

Table 1: Study Participant Characteristics by Position Type

Position Type	N (%)	Female (%)	Avg. Age	Avg. Years w/DOC	Section						
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
					% shown						
CCO	39	52(35)	43.7	10.3	17	18	13	14	16	11	11
CRU	4	2(13)	48.6	15.3	13	20	13	27	27	--	--
CVL	1	5(100)	50.4	6.6	--	20	40	--	20	20	--
Hearings	4	8(53)	51.2	16.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LRA	2	2(25)	39.9	11.5	24	--	25	13	25	13	--
Records	16	48(77)	47.5	8.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Supervisors	15	21(36)	49.9	17.8	16	12	14	14	17	12	16
Support	17	64(99)	51.2	10.7	15	14	11	14	20	20	6
Overall Sample	377	202(53.6)	47.1	11.6	13	13	11	11	14	10	8

Note. 77 respondents (20.4%) did not specify any affiliation with a specific Section. CCO = Community Corrections Officer. LRA = Less Restrictive Alternative Supervision. CVL = Community Victim Liaison. CRU = Community Response Unit.

Table 2: Frequency, Time and Completion Rates of Activities by Category

	N	%	Complete Rate	Average Minutes Per Activity				
				Wait	Travel	Data	Perform	Total
Administrative/Clerical	25,065	51.6	84.3	1.2	0.4	13.3	25.2	40.1
Casework	11,571	23.8	81.1	2.9	6.4	11.2	25.0	45.6
Auxiliary	6,697	13.8	77.5	1.1	1.7	14.0	78.1	94.9
Managerial	1,956	4.0	77.0	1.2	1.8	6.9	38.7	48.7
Hearings Related	1,379	2.8	81.3	7.9	15.1	11.0	30.9	64.8
Assessment	739	1.5	82.7	1.6	0.0	14.6	34.2	50.4
Duty Officer	677	1.4	86.1	19.3	0.2	10.8	44.1	74.5
Professional Development	492	1.0	84.0	3.4	21.4	7.6	158.7	191.1

Total Activities = 48,576

Notes: “Complete Rate” defined as the percentage of activities rated as fully completed at time of documentation in the web application. “Wait” time is defined as amount of time waiting on others for an activity to begin, waiting on a decision to be made before being allowed to leave location where activity occurred, etc. “Data” time is defined as amount of time spent entering data into a database system for an activity. “Perform” time is defined as amount of time actually spent conducting the activity, excluding travel, waiting and data entry time.

Table 3: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with a Given Person Type

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Avg. Mins</i>
Other DOC Staff	20,407	42.0	56.6
Offender/Client	9,412	19.4	55.1
Law Enforcement	2,150	4.4	96.2
Collateral Contact	1,861	3.8	86.3
Community Social Service/Treatment Provider	1,130	2.3	76.5
Court Personnel	1,073	2.2	94.4
Community Members/Public	937	1.9	111.5
Other State Agency Staff	545	1.1	109.7
Employer	526	1.1	115.6
Other Person	481	1.0	75.5
Victim	276	0.6	80.4
Union Member	114	0.2	70.6
ISRB/Parole Board	113	0.2	93.7
Polygraph Examiner	98	0.2	44.9
Jail Staff	85	0.2	62.1
Witness	54	0.1	150.6
Educational/Vocational School Official	32	0.1	140.8
Not Applicable to Activity	20,661	42.6	51.0

Total Activities = 48,576

Notes: “Avg. Mins” is defined as the average number of minutes per activity involving the person type.

Table 4: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with a Given Method

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Avg. Mins</i>
Computer Software	25,651	52.8	44.4
Email	18,391	37.9	51.2
In-Person	13,242	27.3	63.2
Phone Call	7,538	9.3	70.6
Hard Copy Document	4,664	9.6	49.6
Text Message	1,513	3.1	110.7
Video Conference	1,103	2.3	89.1
Fax/Printer/Scanner	879	1.8	70.6
Other Method	668	1.4	73.6
Postal Mail	471	1.0	82.2
Instant Message	455	0.9	113.8
Website	189	0.4	37.1
Audio Recorder	46	0.1	89.9
Not Applicable to Activity	6,441	13.3	85.4

Total Activities = 48,576

Table 5: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with a Given Location

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Avg. Mins</i>
Primary DOC Field Office	23,808	49.0	42.7
Residence (Offender or Staff)	10,245	21.1	46.2
Offender Workplace/Employer	5,385	11.1	47.7
Other DOC Field Office/Location	3,533	7.3	49.1
Prison/Jail/Secure Facility	1,089	2.2	91.5
Other Location	976	2.0	129.6
Law Enforcement Agency Office	431	0.9	135.1
Service Provider Office/Facility	99	0.2	133.1
Courthouse	97	0.2	96.7
Community Service Work Site	62	0.1	247.7
Attorney’s Office	27	0.1	120.7
Not Applicable to Activity	4,622	9.5	105.7

Total Activities = 48,576

Table 6: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with Database Systems

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Avg. Mins</i>
OMNI	29,225	62.2	45.3
OnBase	8,373	17.8	60.1
JABS	4,098	8.7	74.1
Shared Drive	3,292	7.0	60.9
OMNIXX	3,023	6.4	28.2
DOCNET	2,879	6.1	76.7
SharePoint	2,420	5.2	84.2
JBRS	1,769	3.8	78.5
Online Jail Roster Website	1,299	2.8	87.4
Other Database System	1,210	2.6	61.2
Law Enforcement Database	832	1.8	126.0
ICOTS	805	1.7	75.5
JIS	578	1.2	83.3
LINX	255	0.5	115.6
Ingress	225	0.5	93.6
Odyssey	216	0.5	55.8
Attenti	188	0.4	17.1
CE Field	155	0.3	31.8
Social Media	81	0.2	132.1
Accountable 2 You	40	0.1	29.1
Electronic Court Records	17	<0.1	185.0
WOMS	15	<0.1	37.5
Not Applicable to Activity	14,572	31.0	67.2

Total Activities = 48,576

Table 7: Frequency and Average Total Time of Activities Associated with Perceived Challenges

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Avg. Mins</i>
Competing Responsibilities	6,213	12.8	59.9
Miscellaneous Interruptions	5,873	12.1	62.4
Inadequate Staffing	4,569	9.4	52.5
Excessive Caseload	3,011	6.2	44.9
Burnout	2,402	5.0	56.5
Documentation	2,291	4.7	68.8
Technology	1,904	3.9	69.9
Other Challenge/Barrier	993	2.0	73.9
Wait Time	824	1.7	106.7
Unable to Get Needed Information	530	1.1	90.4
Co-Worker Issues	457	0.9	95.3
Travel Distance	360	0.7	151.4
Complex/Unclear Policy	355	0.7	101.1
Offender Uncooperative	338	0.7	99.4
Limited Experience/Mastery of Skills	315	0.6	74.8
Inadequate Training	285	0.6	69.2
Crisis/Emergency Situation	228	0.5	95.6
Lack of Programming/Resources	181	0.4	78.1
“Rusty” Skills	101	0.2	81.7
Language/Cultural Issues	55	0.1	108.8
Witness/Victim Uncooperative	29	<0.1	138.47
No Challenge/Barrier Identified	34,127	70.4	48.0

Total Activities = 48,576

Table 8: Frequency and Average Total Time of CCD-Related Activities by Offender Risk Level

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Avg. Mins</i>
Low Felony Risk	3,832	16.4	27.5
Moderate Felony Risk	1,579	6.7	30.9
High Drug Felony Risk	2,057	8.8	32.9
High Property Felony Risk	2,441	10.4	29.1
High Violent Felony Risk	4,920	21.0	41.3
High Violent Property & Drug Felony Risk	5,877	25.1	38.2
Not Yet Classified/Unclassified	2,709	11.6	35.1

Total Activities = 23,415