

ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

of the COURTS

ANALYSIS of the

1987 TIME STUDY

113788

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Illinois Administrative Office
of the Courts

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

CR-Sent
1-30-89

113788
RE!

NCJRS

OCT 13 1988

ACQUISITIONS

Prepared by:

National Council on Crime & Delinquency
6409 Odana Road
Madison, WI 53719
(608) 274-8882

August 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	
I. Introduction	1
II. Methodology	5
A. Time Study Parameters	5
1. Sample Size	6
2. Time Period Studied	8
3. Functions Studied	8
4. Policy Standards	8
5. Time Recording	9
B. Data Analysis	9
III. Results	10
A. Supervision and Intake	10
B. Investigations	29
C. Sentencing	36
IV. Conclusion	42
A. Workload Computation	42
B. Discussion and Recommendations	42

Appendix

APPENDIX

- Appendix A: Time Study Data Collection Forms (3 pages)
- Appendix B: Supervision: Mean, Mode, Median, Maximum Value, Minimum Value and Standard Deviation for Each Case Type by Agency size (2 pages)
- Appendix C: Supervision: Time Required by Case Type and Agency size (4 pages - one case type per page)
- Appendix D: Supervision: Time Required by Case Type, Agency Size and County (8 pages - two pages for each case type)
- Appendix E: Supervision: Time per Month as the Number of Client Face-to-Face Contacts Increase in Each Case Type (2 Pages)
- Appendix F: Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated among Each Person Code (1 page)
- Appendix G: Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Among Each Method Code (1 page)
- Appendix H: Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Between Client Face-to-Face Activity and All Other Time (1 page)
- Appendix I: Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Among Each Place Code (1 page)
- Appendix J: Investigation: Mean, Mode, Median, Maximum Value, Minimum Value and Standard Deviation for Each Investigation Type by Agency Size (1 page)
- Appendix K: Investigation: Time Required for Each Investigation Type by Agency Size (1 page)
- Appendix L: Investigation: Time Required for Each Investigation Type by Agency Size and County (3 pages)
- Appendix M: Investigation: Time Allocated Among Each Person Code (1 page)
- Appendix N: Investigation: Time Allocated Among Each Method Code (1 page)
- Appendix O: Investigation: Time Allocated Between Client Face-to-Face Activity and All Other Time (1 page)
- Appendix P: Investigation: Time Allocated Among Each Place Code (1 page)
- Appendix Q: Sentencing: Mean, Mode, Median, Maximum Value, Minimum Value, and Standard Deviation for Full PSI's by Agency Size (1 page)
- Appendix R: Sentencing: Time Required per Sentencing for Full PSI's by Agency Size and County (2 pages)

Appendix S: Sentencing: Time Allocated Among Each Person Code (1 page)

Appendix T: Sentencing: Time Allocated Among Each Method Code (1 page)

Appendix U: Sentencing: Time Distributed Between Client Face-to-Face
Activity and All Other Time (1 page)

Appendix V: Sentencing: Time Allocated Among Each Place Code (1 page)

TABLE OF TABLES

<u>TABLE #</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Supervision: Summary of Total Time Required by Case Type and Agency Size	14
2	Supervision: Time Comparisons for Cases Not meeting Standards and Cases With Standards Met or Exceeded	17
3	Supervision: Time Per Month as the Number of Client Face-to-Face Contacts Increase	18
4	Supervision: Time Differences in the Intake Process With and Without a PSI	21
5	Supervision: Time Per Client Face-to-Face Contact by Place and Agency Size	22
6	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated to Each Function Code	24
7	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated to Each Function Code for Intakes by Agency Size	25
8	Supervision: Time Required for Each Function Code Occurrence	26
9	Supervision: Distribution of Each Case Type Among the Risk and Needs Score Ranges	28
10	Investigations: Summary of Total Time Required by Investigation Types and Agency Size	30
11	Investigation: Time Per Client Face-to-Face Contact by Place and Agency Size	33
12	Investigation: Time Per Month Allocated to Each Function Code	34
13	Investigation: Time Required for Each Function Code Occurrence	35
14	Sentencing: Time Required for Full PSI Follow-up Activity	39
15	Sentencing: Time Allocated to Each Function Code	40
16	Sentencing: Time Required for Each Function Code Occurrence	41

Executive Summary

The primary focus of the 1987 Illinois probation time study was to determine workload allocations for each classification and investigation category. The study also provided significant ancillary information which describes the nature of how the responsibilities are carried out. Such things as the length of time per client face-to-face contact (27 minutes for supervision and 47 minutes for investigations) and distribution of time among function and place codes, provide administrators with the capability of making qualitative assessments concerning this service delivery.

The major results of the study are summarized in the table below. The table provides a downstate total as well as the results for small, medium and large departments and Cook County.

Time Study Summary

	Mean Total Time Hours				
	Agency Size			Downstate	Cook
Case Type	Small (N)	Medium (N)	Large (N)	Total (N)	County (N)
Maximum	1.6 (150)	1.9 (173)	1.9 (118)	1.8 (441)	.7 (55)
Medium	.8 (135)	.9 (257)	.9 (210)	.9 (602)	.5 (139)
Minimum	.4 (163)	.3 (322)	.3 (318)	.3 (803)	.3 (175)
Intake	2.8 (127)	2.2 (162)	2.0 (190)	2.3 (479)	1.6 (100)
Investigation Type					
Full PSI- Pre Plea	7.7 (49)	8.5 (54)	6.4 (124)	7.2 (227)	3.6 (53)
Full PTI	-	-	-	-	3.6 (41)
Sentencing					
PSI - Pre Plea	1.0 (35)	1.1 (41)	1.8 (90)	1.4 (166)	-

The following recommendations are made for the Division's consideration. They should be considered preliminary recommendations which the analysts would like to review with the Division, as there may be other policy considerations which are not evident to us at this time.

1. Workload values should be established for the downstate counties separate from Cook County.

The tests for significance consistently showed Cook County to be different from the rest of the state in all categories except minimum. While there were also some downstate differences, there were no consistent patterns throughout the study. Creation of separate workload values for small medium and large jurisdictions creates an administrative complexity which is not warranted by the data. In addition to the routine calculation issues involved in having several workload values, the Division would have to determine precise criteria for each agency size and make provision for departments to change categories as they added or reduced staff.

2. The time study results should be reviewed for relationships among categories and in relationship to other Division policies to establish workload values.

While it can be tempting to adopt time study results without modifications, they should be reviewed carefully to assure internal consistency with other policies. For example, if part of the rationale for establishing the downstate workload value at 1.8 or 1.9 hours is that small jurisdictions included some supervision time in their intake process, then the intake results cannot be adopted without adjustment for the higher times in small departments. The factors computed into the 120 hours of time available should also be reviewed to assure that overlap does not exist between deductions on the time available and additional responsibilities which may now receive workload value.

3. Create a workload category for the intake process.

A workload value should be established for intakes; however, it is difficult to estimate what this should be without a uniform policy about what minimally constitutes the intake process. Most agencies using workload systems have a "new admission" (essentially intake) classification which accounts for the activities necessary to activate

a case and get started with supervision. This appears to be missing from the current Illinois system and allocating a time value for the intake process (after its defined) would rectify that.

4. If the Division decides to allocate time for the sentencing process, it should be incorporated into the investigation times, rather than creating a new category for sentencings.

I. INTRODUCTION

Corrections has long attempted to determine the optimum, ideal or maximum number of cases that should be assigned to each probation or parole officer. Early efforts to establish maximum caseload sizes recognized staff as a finite resource, but met with limited success because the arbitrary designation of an optimal caseload size failed to provide supporting justification for the numbers. Such efforts tended not to differentiate between offenders with varying service needs and provided little documentation to assist administrators in developing and defending budget requests.

As early as the 1950's, probation and parole agencies began to explore alternative ways of allocating resources and a few references to time and motion studies began to appear in correctional research literature. However, time studies were new to correctional researchers, technologies were limited and the objectives of these studies were often ill-defined. As a result, most of these early studies focused on how officer time was divided among many different job functions. The studies failed to provide administrators with information needed to project staffing requirements and workload levels based on increasing caseloads and time requirements for service delivery to each case.

By the mid-1970's, state legislature and county board questioning of probation and parole staffing needs increased in intensity. Few agencies had the type of time measures required for budget development and staff deployment. Technicians responded with adaptations of "longitudinal" time study designs, in which all activities which related to a single case within a specified time frame were timed and recorded. With the offender, rather than the officer, as the principal focus of analysis, the average amount of time spent per month on each offender could easily be computed.

This method of time study represented a significant departure from prior practice and provided the measures needed for workload budgeting and staff deployment. These time studies occurred primarily in agencies which were also using structured classification scales to place offenders in different classifications based on risk of additional illegal activity and need for agency services. Each classification category also had objective service standards which specified the agency policies for providing higher levels of service to offenders who represented higher levels of risk and/or need for services. Thus the time study methodology allowed for computing different time values based on service requirements for offenders in different classifications.

Data could also be compared among various geographical regions and agency divisions. Other activities such as the time required to complete major investigations could also be computed and incorporated in the budget requests and staff deployment.

During the late 1970's the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) developed a program to assist probation and parole agencies in the adoption of a management package which incorporated the best practices currently available. This program included the classification of offenders based on risk of additional illegal activity and need for services, together with systematic case planning for supervision within agency policy standards. The NIC program also incorporated a workload system which allowed staffing and budgets based on time requirements for offenders at various classification levels and an information system approach which incorporated workload and classification data into regular management reports. The program promoted by NIC was based on a similar system which had been developed and used effectively in the state of Wisconsin since the mid-1970's.

The NIC model formed the basis for the classification and workload system currently used by the state of Illinois. During 1981 the Illinois Probation Division conducted a pilot of the classification process and a workload system in twelve county probation departments. The 1983 Illinois legislature enacted legislation allowing the Probation Division to establish uniform supervision standards throughout the state. Statewide training began in earnest during February 1984 and all probation agencies began using uniform risk and needs scales to classify current caseloads and all new admissions beginning April 1, 1984. Uniform service standards were also implemented statewide for each classification level.

The major impetus for this system in Illinois was the need to establish a system whereby the Probation Division could determine workload needs for each county department and allocate funding for probation reimbursement accordingly. The need for statewide consistency is apparent in such a system. Probation Division field coordinators were assigned responsibility for regular annual audits of each department to assure compliance with classification procedures and established service standards. The Division also provided ongoing assistance to departments as questions and problems developed.

To facilitate a timely implementation and in consideration of limited resources in 1984, the Probation Division adopted offender risk and needs scales which had been validated by the state of Wisconsin, rather than begin a

massive development effort in Illinois. The Division also adopted the Wisconsin cut off scores for three classification levels (Maximum, Medium and Minimum) together with the Wisconsin supervision standards and time allocations for each classification level. These decisions enabled the Division and department staff to concentrate resources in the operational areas of how the scales were used, their timely completion and consistent reporting of classification data from each department.

In 1987 the system had been in place for three years, with operational consistency well established. Funding became available and the Probation Division contracted with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to conduct a validation of the risk and needs scales on Illinois probationers and also complete a time study which would reflect Illinois policies and practices to establish workload values for each classification level and each major investigation.

During the three years experience with the Wisconsin risk scales, Illinois staff had raised questions regarding the scale usage on their population. The validation study will address the predictiveness of the current scale for the Illinois population and assess modifications that could be made to improve its predictive ability. The validation is a comprehensive study which includes an evaluation of urban/rural differences, implications of changing cut off scores for each classification level, addition or deletion of certain items from the scale, item weighing changes and predictive ability for selected offense groups. The needs scale validation will include an analysis of relationships among items and changing time requirements as client needs increase. Recommendations will be made for any needs scale modifications, although the needs scale is not designed to be predictive of outcome, in the same sense as the risk scale. Agencies participating in the study include representation from small, medium and large counties as well as Cook County. These agencies are providing comprehensive data on several hundred cases, including background characteristics, offense information and outcome data for a two year follow-up period from the date of sentencing.

In addition to utilizing valid scales to correctly place offenders in the appropriate classification category, using workload figures which accurately reflect the time required to provide service in accordance with agency policy standards is critical to a credible workload system. Workload systems provide the quantitative measures which translate supervision standards into budget

and staff deployment formulas. When the time values are inaccurate, the budgeting systems based on those figures are also inaccurate.

The most credible method of establishing workload values is for an agency to conduct a time study with their own officers and their own offenders. This allows both the objective policy standards and the more subjective agency philosophies and practices to influence the results. For example two agencies with the same objective service standard (i.e. two client face-to-face contacts per month) can produce very different time study results. If one agency assumes a basic surveillance approach during the contacts and the other agency takes a counseling-problem solving approach, the time requirement to meet the objective face to face contact standard will be different. The philosophies and practices of an agency reflect conscious management decisions to some degree. For example, hiring practices and the content of performance evaluation criteria can reflect conscious policy decisions. However, philosophy and practice also reflect unconscious transitions, which are responses to conditions evolving over time. Slowly increasing caseload with the incremental addition of new officer responsibilities often results in a practice of a more surveillance supervision philosophy, while the official position may continue to reflect a value for extensive case planning and counseling to resolve problems. As accommodations are made to meet the increasing workload the actual practice of supervision evolves to include those activities which are deemed to be most critical.

During initial implementation in Illinois, the Wisconsin workload time values were adopted for each classification level. Their values reflected the policies, philosophies and practices which were in place in Wisconsin at the time. While they provided a beginning point for quickly implementing a workload system, it can be expected that the results obtained in the 1987 time study in Illinois will be different from the Wisconsin results.

This report summarizes the analysis of the 1987 Illinois probation time study, while a subsequent report will address the validation study. The next section of this report outlines the methodology used for the time study.

II. METHODOLOGY

The basic methodology used for the study is a longitudinal prescriptive design. This design requires that officers track all time invested in supervising a case for a specified length of time and track investigations, intakes and sentencing from assignment to completion. The time study is prescriptive in that the Division has predetermined minimum policy standards which must be met or exceeded in order to conclude that supervision functions were performed acceptably and investigations thoroughly conducted. As is the case with other agencies using this workload approach, the Probation Division defined their minimum standards for supervision in terms of number of client face-to-face contacts required for a specified time (i.e., one month, quarterly, etc). Investigation standards are defined by "content", with each type of investigation having a prescribed format. By excluding cases and investigations which do not meet the policy standards, the analysis is able to provide comprehensive measures of time required to meet or exceed standards for each case investigation. The intake and sentencing studies were subject to the policy guidelines in place in each department.

There are obvious limits to the length of time a time study can run. Most supervision studies can be completed within a two month time frame. Investigations sometimes run for a slightly longer time frame because the investigation data must be tracked to completion. It is stretching the patience of staff to extend a time study beyond three months and past studies indicate this is also unnecessary.

The nature of an officer's job and the design of the studies dictate that participating officers must record their own time. While self reporting can result in some misrepresentation of activities, experience dictates that this can be minimized with a thorough training process, with adequate sample sizes, and with inclusion of as broad a base of staff representation as possible. Staff must be made aware of the time study goals and the implications of over- or under-recording activities. In the interest of maintaining accuracy in recording, staff need to be assured that data will not be used to evaluate individual performance, but will be aggregated and presented as unit or agencywide data.

A. Time Study Parameters

Prior to beginning the design of the actual time study, the Probation Division selected departments which were representative of small, medium and

larger Illinois jurisdictions. These agencies were selected because of their geographical representation, the numbers of officers on staff and the high level of quality with which they had implemented the classification process. Their participation assured that the time study would include a cross section of the various agencies in Illinois. Greater numbers of small agencies participated to assure that an adequate sample of cases and investigations could be obtained to represent these departments. The following agencies participated in the time study:

Small: Clark, Henry, Morgan, Ogle, Henderson/Hancock, Warren, Fulton, Knox, McDonough.

Medium: Jackson, Vermillion, Rock Island, and McHenry.

Large: St. Clair, Lake and Dupage.

In addition to these agencies, Cook County also participated and was treated as a single agency, rather than being grouped with the large departments for analysis.

Representatives from these departments met with NCCD staff to design the specifics of the time study. After this design session the Probation Division finalized the data collection forms (provided in Appendix A) completed the time study coding instructions and conducted face-to-face training sessions for participating department staff. Together with department supervisors, the Probation Division also monitored the time study for quality control and to assure that questions were resolved promptly.

The time study design actually included three different longitudinal studies to address the following responsibilities:

Supervision/Intake

Investigations

Sentencing

1. Sample Size

The number of officers and cases included in each of the above studies varied substantially. The agency designed a sample selection process which allowed for each officer to record data on a limited number of supervision cases and complete a limited number of investigations. It was important to include enough cases and investigations to achieve a reasonable sample size, but avoid overloading the officers so that they would not have sufficient time to perform up to standards on the sample cases. In most studies it is

recommended that the agency attempt a sample size of 100-150 cases or investigations per major statistical breakdown required. In some instances this is not possible or reasonable and agencies must make their best judgments based on the data available.

Each of the officers participating in the supervision study recorded time study data on 10 to 15 clients assigned to their caseloads. In addition, they recorded data on up to 10 intakes and 10 investigations received during the first 30 days after the time study began. All sentencings which were completed prior to June 12, 1987 were included in the data. Sample sizes for the investigation, sentencing and intake studies were largely driven by the number of referrals received during the time frame. In smaller agencies, this generally resulted in fewer than 10 per officer. Actual sample sizes utilized in each of the time studies varied somewhat from initial estimates. In some instances incomplete coding, supervision of clients which did not meet minimum agency standards, and fewer referrals and investigations being requested than originally estimated all contributed to sample sizes being somewhat lower than planned. In the supervision study, potential problems caused by limited samples are offset, for the most part, by the two month duration of the study. Each month of the study results in a separate client month for analysis, thus each person potentially represents two months of data. Where applicable, the number of client months meeting or exceeding standards and other sample sizes are presented below:

Supervision/Intake	
Maximum	496 months
Medium	795 months
Minimum	978 months
Intake	580 intakes
Investigation	
Full PSI/Pre-Plea	280 investigations
Partial PSI/Pre-Plea	17 investigations
Full PTI	41 investigations
Sentencing	
Full PSI	166 sentencings

Breakdowns of the above distributions among the various agency size groupings and individual departments are provided in the Results section of this report and in the appendix. There were no partial PTI's in the investigation study. In the sentencing study there were 2 partial PSI's and 9 sentencings which were not identified by investigation type. These numbers were considered too insignificant to be included in the analysis. The 978 months represented in

the minimum supervision classification represent a computation converting the data from a two month study to a three month supervision cycle. This is discussed later in this section in relation to policy standards.

2. Time Period Studied

The time study commenced on April 1, 1987 and ended for supervision on May 31, 1987. All investigations, intakes and sentencings which were in progress on 5-31-87 were given until June 12 to reach completion. Any of these cases which were not completed by 6-12-87 were discarded from the study and not submitted to NCCD for analysis.

3. Functions Studied

During the design of the time study, staff established specific function codes which categorized the activities for each of the studies. These function codes are listed in the data collection forms provided in Appendix A. The codes were designed to be broad enough to capture all the supervision, intake, sentencing or investigation related activities. The function codes were different for each of the studies.

4. Policy Standards

In addition to coding activities by the nature of the function being performed, officers also coded each activity with respect to the person contacted, the method of contact, and place of contact. This provided a wealth of information describing the nature of agency activities and also provided the coding structure enabled the analysts to exclude cases from the workload computation which did not meet the pre established policy standards. For informational purposes, Table 2 in the results section provides a comparison of maximum and medium cases for which standards are met and those for which standards are not met. For purposes of establishing a workload system, only those months reflecting that the agency's face-to-face contact standard had been met or exceeded should be considered.

The face-to-face contact standards established by the Illinois Probation Division are as follows:

- Maximum: Two client fact-to-face contacts per month
- Medium: One client face-to-face contact per month
- Minimum: One client face-to-face contact every three months
- Intake: No face-to-face contact standard

With respect to the investigations included in the investigation study, if the data collection forms were submitted for analysis, we proceeded under the assumption that the reports themselves had been reviewed by the supervi-

III. RESULTS

This section presents the results of the 1987 time study completed by the Illinois Probation Division. Results for each of the three studies (supervision/intake, investigations and sentencing) are discussed separately with a brief narrative in relation to the tables. Appendices are referenced for additional detailed information.

A. Supervision/Intake

The supervision time study included each of the three major classifications (maximum, medium and minimum) and the intake function. The fourth agency classification, administrative was not included in the time study. Administrative cases primarily involve monitoring and paper tracking and it was decided to focus the departmental staff resources to study the classifications which require greater time investments.

Table 1 summarizes the mean total time required per month to supervise maximum, medium and minimum cases at or above the supervision standards established by Division policy. The data is provided for small, medium, large and Cook counties. Time required to supervise maximum cases at or above the minimum supervision standard of 1 client face-to-face contact per month requires a high of 115 minutes (1.9 hours) in medium agencies (N = 173) and 114 minutes (1.9 hours) in large agencies (N = 118) to a low of 44 minutes (.7 hours) in Cook County (N = 55). Small agencies (N = 150) required 94 minutes (1.6 hours). The t test was conducted to determine if the reported differences were significantly different at the .05 level. The differences reported for Cook County and small departments are significantly different, however, the differences between medium and large departments are not.

There are a total of 795 medium cases meeting standards statewide. Supervision time for these cases ranged from a high of 57 minutes (.9 hours) in medium departments (N = 257) to a low of 32 minutes (.5 hours) in Cook County (N = 193). Large departments (N = 210) required 52 minutes (.9 hours) while small agencies (N = 135) spent 49 minutes (.8 hours) per case. The t test for significance indicates no difference between small and large departments. The other differences are all significant at the .05 level; however, the test compared mean differences in minutes per case. When these means are rounded to hours for workload purposes, only the differences between Cook County and the remainder of the state would retain a statistically significant difference.

There are 978 minimum case months which were used to calculate the workload value for minimum cases. As discussed in the previous section, this sample size was derived from doubling the time required for minimum months with no face-to-face contact, adding that value to the time required for the months with a client face-to-face contact and dividing by three (months) to establish a monthly value for the workload system. This essentially creates the three month supervision cycle (1 face-to-face client contact every three months) from two months of time study data. Overall the mean time required is 19 minutes (.3 hours; N = 978) per month. The small agencies (N = 163) were slightly higher at 22 minutes (.4 hours). The t tests indicate the means for large departments and Cook are significantly different from small and medium agencies; however, when the values are rounded to hours, the significance disappears.

In the minimum classification, the mean time for case months having no client face-to-face contact was 12 minutes (.2 hours) and the mean time for the months having a client face-to-face contact was 33 minutes (.5 hours). The 12 minutes required to supervise these cases during the months with no client face-to-face could be considered roughly equivalent to the time needed to provide services to an administrative case. The Division is currently allocating 15 minutes (.25 hours) for these cases. The time study data indicates this is a reasonable policy. The extra 3 minutes per case over the no contact minimums, would allow for some extra work that can be expected to develop on some administrative cases which have no face-to-face standard requirement.

The intake portion of this time study allowed each agency to track the time required for the intake process from assignment to completion. This process currently receives no workload value for the division; however; the data clearly indicates time is invested in this process. Statewide there were 579 intakes included in the study, each requiring a mean of 131 minute (2.2 hours). There were considerable time differences among the agency groups, all of which were significantly different (.05 level) except those noted between medium and large departments. Small departments (N = 127) required the most time (170 minutes; 2.8 hours) and Cook (N = 100) required the least (99 minutes; 1.6 hours). Medium departments (N = 162) required 129 minutes (2.2 hours) and large departments (N = 190) required 123 minutes (2.2 hours). The differences noted are likely a function of different departmental operations, with the larger departments being more likely to have separate

intake units which process admissions prior to transferring the cases to supervision officers. In small jurisdictions the supervision officer is more likely to handle the intake function and in doing so, may also begin the supervision function for these cases. This would appear to be supported by the somewhat lower times for supervising maximum and medium cases in the small agencies and the intake time which is 41 minutes higher than the next highest agency size (medium agencies). This is also supported by Table 7, (discussed in detail later in this section) which indicates that small agencies allocate substantially more time to the supervision function code, during intake, than the other agencies.

Appendix B (2 pages) provides the mean mode, median, maximum value, minimum value and standard deviation for cases meeting or exceeding standards in each of the casetypes. The data is provided for each agency size within classification. When developing workload systems the mean value is generally considered the most desirable because of its greater sensitivity to the extreme cases. On a day to day basis, officers will continue to find individual cases within each category which require exceptionally more or less time than the average. With larger sample sizes, utilizing the mean from the time study will provide greater assurance that these exceptional situations are incorporated into the workload computation.

Appendix C (4 pages) provides the detail times (travel, waiting and activity) for each agency size within each casetype included in the study. One case type is provided on each page. These, and similarly constructed tables throughout the study provide the mean times in minutes and also indicate the percentage of total time those values represent. With the exception of minimum cases, for which no substantial travel time was reported anywhere, medium size departments reported the highest travel time. Cook County had substantially less travel time; however, their waiting times tended to be higher.

The Division requested that summary tables provide the time study data for each participating county as well as the groupings by agency size. Appendix D (8 pages) outlines the time requirements for each county within agency size and case type. Due to the large number of counties, each case type is outlined on two pages, with the small counties listed on the first and medium, large and Cook counties on the second page. The time study samples were selected in such a way that we would get sufficient samples for each of the agency size groupings. The sample sizes at many of the county levels are

too small to be statistically meaningful and the county differences noted should be approached cautiously, as the differences may not have held up with larger samples.

TABLE 1

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

SUMMARY OF TOTAL TIME REQUIRED BY
CASE TYPE AND AGENCY SIZE

Case Type*	Mean Time in Minutes and Hours				
	Agency Size			Cook (N)	Total (N)
Small (N)	Medium (N)	Large (N)			
Maximum	94 min. 1.6 hr. (150)	115 min. 1.9 hr. (173)	114 min. 1.9 hr. (118)	44 min. .7 hr. (55)	100 min. 1.7 hr. (496)
Medium	49 min. .8 hr. (135)	57 min. .9 hr. (257)	52 min. .9 hr. (210)	32 min. .5 hr. (193)	48 min. .8 hr. (795)
Minimum	22 min. .4 hr. (163)	20 min. .3 hr. (322)	17 min. .3 hr. (318)	17 min. .3 hr. (175)	19 min. .3 hr. (978)
Intake**	170 min. 2.8 hr. (127)	129 min. 2.2 hr. (162)	123 min. 2.0 hr. (190)	99 min. 1.6 hr. (100)	131 min. 2.2 hr. (579)

*Seven data forms did not indicate the case type and these are excluded from all tables.

**One Intake was not identified by agency size and is excluded from this table.

Table 2 Compares the time required for maximum and medium classifications when standards are not met with the time requirements when standards are met or exceeded. In each classification, the time requirements are lower when standards are not met. Data is provide statewide and of the 858 maximum case months included in the sample, the supervision standard was not met in 362 (42 percent) of the cases. During these months, officers invested .8 hours in each case. For the 496 cases meeting or exceeding standards, the time requirement was 1.7 hours. If all cases were averaged together the mean time would be 1.3 hours (N = 853), .4 hours less than the time needed to allow officers sufficient time to meet the policy standards. While Illinois may not use this statewide figure in their workload formula, the table does illustrate the importance of utilizing data from cases meeting or exceeding standards when developing workload measure.

Within the medium classification level, of the 971 case months in the original sample, standards were not met on 176 cases (18 percent) and the time required during these months was a mean of .3 hours. When standards were met or exceeded (N = 795) the time requirement increased to .8 hours.

It is important to recognize that standards are not met on cases for a variety of reasons, many of which are beyond the officer's control. Clients, may miss scheduled appointments, they may be arrested or abscond from supervision. Table 2 provides no information regarding the issues which contributed to standards not being met. It would be erroneous to conclude that the officers were not handling these cases appropriately without reviewing each case individually to evaluate the circumstances for not meeting standards.

Table 2 excludes data for minimum cases and intakes because these cases do not have a "not met" category. All minimums and intakes were included in the analysis.

Table 3 summarizes the mean total times for each case type as the number of client face to face contacts increases. Of the 362 maximum cases not meeting standards, 104 had no face-to-face contact and 258 had one contact. The 176 medium cases not meeting standards had no client face-to-face contact. In the minimum category, while the sample sizes are misleading because of the calculation methodology (discussed previously) the table does indicate that very few minimum cases had more than one face-to-face contact. Of the 580 intakes, 214 (37 percent) had one face-to-face contact, 193 (33 percent) had two and 164 intakes (28 percent) had three or more contacts. The remaining 9 intakes reported no clients face-to-face contact.

Appendix E (2 pages) provides the detail times (travel, waiting and activity) for each case type by number of client face-to-face contacts.

TABLE 2

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

TIME COMPARISONS FOR CASES NOT MEETING
STANDARDS AND CASES WITH STANDARDS MET OR EXCEEDEDPREPARED BY-
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASE TYPE	SUPERVISION STANDARD	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	NOT MET							
	TOTAL N	362						
	AVERAGES			8	3	39	50	.8
	% OF TIME			0.16	0.07	.78		
	MET OR EXCEEDED							
	TOTAL N	496						
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	AVERAGES			17	6	78	100	1.7
	% OF TIME			0.17	0.06	.78		
	TOTAL N	858						
	AVERAGES			13	5	61	79	1.3
	% OF TIME			0.17	0.06	.78		
	MEDIUM	NOT MET						
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	TOTAL N	176						
	AVERAGES			2	1	17	20	0.3
	% OF TIME			0.08	0.07	.84		
	MET OR EXCEEDED							
	TOTAL N	795						
	AVERAGES				5	3	40	48
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	% OF TIME			0.11	0.06	.83		
	TOTAL N	971						
	AVERAGES			5	2	36	43	.7
	% OF TIME			0.11	0.06	.83		

TABLE 3

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

TIME PER MONTH AS THE NUMBER OF CLIENT
FACE TO FACE CONTACTS INCREASE

Classification/ Agency Size	Mean Total Time in Hours				
	Number of Client Face to Face Contacts [#]				Total (N)
	Zero (N)	One (N)	Two (N)	Three+ (N)	
Maximum	.6 (104)	.9 (258)	1.4 (368)	2.5 (128)	1.3 (858)
Medium	.3 (176)	.7 (626)	1.3 (136)	1.7 (33)	.7 (971)
Minimum	.2 (652)	.5 (297)	.9 (23)	1.3 (6)	.3 (978)
Intake	.8 (9)	1.8 (214)	2.2 (193)	2.7 (164)	2.2 (580)

[#]For Intakes, the number of contacts is from beginning to completion of the Intake process.

Pre-sentence investigations are not completed on all probationers prior to being placed on probation. Table 4 compares the time required to complete the intake process when a PSI is available to the time required when a PSI is not available for agencies in each of the size breakdowns. Because the intake procedures vary in the different agencies, the most meaningful comparisons are within the size groupings. The most dramatic difference is within small agencies where the intake process took nearly two hours longer without a PSI and 72 percent of the intakes studied did not have a PSI. In the remaining agencies the intakes also took longer without a PSI; however, the differences were less dramatic. In medium sized departments the intake took .3 hours longer and 63 percent of the intakes were without a PSI. In large jurisdictions, 71 percent of the intakes were without a PSI and they required .2 hours more time. Forty six percent of the Cook County intakes were without a PSI and each one required .1 hours more time than when a PSI was available. As a practical matter, it is not generally feasible to have to have two different workload values for intake (with and without a PSI). Provided the proportion of cases with a PSI remains relatively stable with that which occurred during the time study, the overall time value for both types of intakes will provide a reasonable average of the time required.

The data collection forms provided a coding structure which required the officers to record each activity in terms of the person contacted together with the method and place of contact. The function or nature of the activity was also coded. Although not critical to a workload system, analysis of this coding structure provides considerable information which describes the nature of the supervision and intake functions.

Appendix F provides the distribution of total time per month among the person codes for each case type. The highest percentage of time in each classification is spent with the offender being the focus of the contact. For maximums and mediums this is approximately 70 percent of total time. For minimums this drops to 59 percent and to 54 percent for intakes. In these two classifications the "none" person code was used more frequently, indicating that officers spend a higher proportion of time working alone on these cases, probably reviewing files and processing paperwork. No victim contact was reported in any of the categories.

Appendix G outlines the distribution of time among the method codes. Approximately 68-69 percent of the total time per month is spent in face-to-face contact with someone when supervising maximum and medium cases. This is

reduced to 40 percent and 54 percent when supervising minimums and intakes, respectively. Appendix H outlines the time invested in client face-to-face contact each month. By comparing with Appendix G, it becomes evident that the majority of face-to-face contact is with the offender.

While these appendices present the time per month, Table 5 outlines the time required for each client face-to-face contact in the various agency size categories and provides a comparison of time requirements depending upon the location or place of contact. Statewide there were 4000 client face-to-face contacts which occurred during the study, each of which took an average of 27 minutes. Of these 4000 contacts, 3067 (77 percent) occurred in the office and took a mean of 24 minutes per contact. Four hundred fifty-two (11 percent) client face-to-face contacts occurred in the home and required 45 minutes per contact (including travel and waiting time). The remaining 481 (12 percent) client face-to-face contacts occurred in jail, court or some "other" location and required 34, 35 and 29 minutes, respectively. The medium sized departments had the highest proportion of home face-to-face contacts, probably accounting for the higher travel times observed earlier in Appendix C. Appendix I summarizes the time per month as it is distributed among each of the place codes. As expected, the majority of time is spent in the office.

TABLE 4

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

TIME DIFFERENCES IN THE INTAKE PROCESS
WITH AND WITHOUT A PSI

Agency Size	Mean Total Time in Hours			
	With PSI (N)	Without PSI (N)	Not Indicated (N)	Total (N)
Small	1.4 (30)	3.3 (92)	3.0 (5)	2.8 (127)
Medium	1.9 (16)	2.2 (102)	2.2 (44)	2.2 (162)
Large	1.9 (44)	2.1 (134)	1.9 (12)	2.0 (190)
Cook	1.5 (19)	1.6 (46)	1.8 (35)	1.6 (100)
Total	1.7 (109)	2.4 (374)	2.1 (96)	2.2 (579)*

*One Intake was not identified by agency size

TABLE 5

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

TIME PER CLIENT FACE TO FACE CONTACT
BY PLACE AND AGENCY SIZE

Agency Size	Mean Total Time in Minutes*					
	Office (N)	Home (N)	Jail (N)	Court (N)	Other (N)	Total (N)
Small	25 (775)	41 (72)	33 (55)	29 (24)	28 (63)	27 (989)
Medium	24 (891)	44 (258)	32 (46)	31 (47)	30 (56)	29 (1298)
Large	25 (842)	48 (121)	44 (18)	45 (50)	28 (26)	29 (1057)
Cook	21 (559)	7 (1)	(0)	33 (88)	28 (8)	22 (656)
Total	24 (3067)	45 (452)	34 (119)	35 (209)	29 (153)	27 (4000)

*Time includes travel, waiting and activity

Table 6 summarizes the monthly time investment among each of the function codes. Supervision/intake interviewing consumed the highest proportion of time in all classifications. Paperwork/correspondence took 14 and 16 percent of total time per month for maximum and medium cases. This doubled for minimums and intakes, reflecting the lower level of face-to-face contact and the higher levels of monitoring and processing paperwork. Table 7 provides the time distribution among function codes for intakes conducted in each of the agency size categories. Table 7 suggest that intakes take longer in smaller departments because of the increased time spent beginning the supervision function. The time invested in intake paperwork, while somewhat lower in Cook, is not appreciably different in the remaining jurisdictions.

While Tables 6 and 7 distribute the monthly function time among all cases meeting or exceeding standards, Table 8 outlines the time required for each occurrence of a function during the time study. There were 7515 instances in which officers used the supervision/intake interviewing function code and whenever it was used 18 minutes of time was invested (3 minutes travel and 15 minutes activity time). Paperwork correspondence (N = 4944) required 9 minutes, with case staffings (N = 503) each requiring 11 minutes. The time invested in court hearings is also broken down by agency size because this was the function code which had the most waiting time and the greatest differences based on agency size. Overall, court hearings occurred 283 times and each hearing required 1 minute travel, 17 minutes waiting and 15 minutes for the actual activity for a total of 33 minutes. The total time differences between large departments (37 minutes; N = 68) and Cook County (38 minutes; N = 99) did not differ appreciably; however, large departments spent 25 minutes waiting and 10 minutes in the hearing itself, while Cook County spent 16 minutes waiting and 22 minutes in the hearing. Both small and medium agencies required 26 minutes for each court hearing with 11 and 14 minutes waiting and 12 and 10 minutes in the hearing, respectively. Travel time was 2 or 3 minutes in all agencies except Cook, where it was negligible.

TABLE 6
ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

TIME PER MONTH ALLOCATED TO EACH FUNCTION CODE

CASE TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	SUPVSN INTAKE	PAPERWORK CORRESP	COURT HEARING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM										
TOTAL N	496		75	14	6	3	2	0	100	1.7
AVERAGES % OF TIME			.75	0.14	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.00		
MEDIUM										
TOTAL N	795		33	8	5	1	2	0	48	.8
AVERAGES % OF TIME			.69	0.16	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.00		
MINIMUM										
TOTAL N	978		11	6	1	0	1	0	19	0.3
AVERAGES % OF TIME			.58	0.32	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.00		
INTAKE										
TOTAL N	580		79	38	1	3	8	0	131	2.2
AVERAGES % OF TIME			.61	0.29	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.00		

TABLE 7

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WITIME PER MONTH ALLOCATED TO EACH FUNCTION
CODE FOR INTAKES BY AGENCY SIZE

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	SUPVSN INTAKE	PAPERWORK CORRESP	COURT HEARING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	127									
	AVERAGES			106	46	0	1	17	0	170	2.8
	% OF TIME			.63	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	162									
	AVERAGES			71	43	2	4	9	0	129	2.2
	% OF TIME			.55	0.33	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	190									
	AVERAGES			77	38	0	4	3	0	123	2.0
	% OF TIME			.63	0.31	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	100									
	AVERAGES			63	22	2	5	6	0	99	1.6
	% OF TIME			.64	0.22	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.00		
	UNKNOWN										
	TOTAL N	1									
	AVERAGES			85	30	0	11	12	0	138	2.3
	% OF TIME			.62	0.22	0.00	0.08	0.09	0.00		
TOTAL N		580									
AVERAGES				79	38	1	3	8	0	131	2.2
% OF TIME				.61	0.29	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.00		

TABLE 8

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

TIME REQUIRED FOR EACH FUNCTION CODE OCCURRENCE

Function (N)	Mean Time in Minutes			
	Travel	Waiting	Activity	Total
Supervision/Interview (7515)	3	*	15	18
Paperwork/Correspondence (4944)	*	*	9	9
Court Hearing (283)	1	17	15	33
Small (38)	3	11	12	26
Medium (78)	2	14	10	26
Large (68)	2	25	10	37
Cook (99)	*	16	22	38
Case Staffing (503)	*	*	11	11
Other (872)	1	1	8	10

*Less than .5 minutes

In addition to the time study data collection form, officers provided the most recent needs scale for each of the supervision cases. While an analysis of the relationship among needs scale items will be included in the subsequent report relating to the risk and needs scale validation, preliminary data relating time and scale scores is provided in Table 9. This table provides a matrix of risk scores by needs scores for the maximum, medium and minimum cases which met or exceeded supervision standards. Each matrix indicates the number of case months falling into a particular cell and the mean time (minutes) which were required to supervise those cases. The score ranges on each matrix reflect the Division's current cut-off scores. These may be modified after the validation study.

A risk scale is designed to be predictive of offender outcome; however, a needs scale is valid if it reflects increasing time investment as needs increase. Regardless of risk scores, as needs increase the time investment can be expected to increase as well. Because standards are the driving force behind time investment, Table 9 has a separate matrix for each classification. By reviewing the column totals on each matrix, it can be seen that the time requirements generally increase as the needs scores go up. This suggests that the needs scale is functioning as expected.

The matrices also indicate the degree of override which is present in cases meeting standards. Of the 496 cases identified as maximum, 32 cases (6 percent) had overrides up from medium and 2 cases were overrides from minimum level risk and needs scores. Of the 795 medium case months 60 cases (8 percent) were overridden down from maximum and 80 cases (10 percent) were overridden up from minimum. Of the 978 minimum case months 17 cases (2 percent) were reduced from maximum and 40 (4 percent) were reduced from medium.

The validation study will provide additional information on both the risk and the needs scales.

TABLE 9

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

DISTRIBUTION OF EACH CASE TYPE AMONG
THE RISK AND NEEDS SCORE RANGES

MAXIMUM

RISK	MEAN	NEEDS			ROW TOTAL
		COUNT	30 +	15-29	
15 +	127.28	76	278	105	459
8 - 14	67.33	3	19	11	33
0 - 7	.00	0	2	2	4
COLUMN TOTAL	125.00	79	299	118	496

MEDIUM

RISK	MEAN	NEEDS			ROW TOTAL
		COUNT	30 +	15-29	
15 +	98.29	7	15	32	54
8 - 14	94.83	6	179	423	608
0 - 7	.00	0	53	80	133
COLUMN TOTAL	96.69	13	247	535	795

MINIMUM

RISK	MEAN	NEEDS			ROW TOTAL
		COUNT	30 +	15-29	
15 +	47.50	2	0	15	17
8 - 14	.00	0	4	25	29
0 - 7	.00	0	11	920	931
COLUMN TOTAL	47.50	2	15	961	978

B. Investigations

Table 10 summarizes the total time in hours for each of the three types of investigations which occurred during the time study. The time values represent the time required to complete the investigations from assignment to when it was submitted to the court. There were 280 full PSI-Pre Plea investigations in the study. Forty nine investigations came from small departments and required 7.7 hours, 54 came from medium jurisdictions and required 8.5 hours, while the 124 investigations from large departments required 6.4 hours. The 53 Cook County full PSI-Pre Plea's required 3.6 hours, exactly the same amount of time as their 41 full PTI investigations. The t test for significance indicates that the time for medium department PSI's is significantly different from small and medium jurisdictions (.05 level). There was no difference between small and medium departments. Cook County PSI time is significantly different from the rest of the State.

The small sample sizes in small and medium departments increase the variability in their figures. Appendix J provides the mean, mode, median, maximum value, minimum value and standard deviation for each investigations in the small, medium and large departments, the standard deviation decrease and the differences between the mean and median scores decrease as the sample sizes increase from small to large jurisdictions. Essentially larger samples are less influenced by extreme values and the mean becomes a better representation of what may be occurring. When Cook County PSI's are excluded from the sample the remainder of the state has 227 PSI's and the mean time becomes 7.2 hours per PSI. This figure would present a more credible value for PSI's than using the individual figures for each agency size. The time value of 3.6 hours for Cook County PSI's and PTI's should be handled as a separate workload category, apart from the rest of the state.

Partial PSI's occurred so infrequently (N = 17) that the time study provides little useful information to establish a workload value for that category.

Appendix K (1 page) provides the detail times (travel, waiting and activity) for each investigation type, broken down by agency size. Relative to the length of time required to complete an investigation, both the travel and waiting times are negligible for all investigations. Appendix L (2 pages) outlines the time requirements for PSI completion by agency size and county. Because Partial PSI's occurred so infrequently and all PTI's came from Cook, these investigations are not outlined in this appendix.

TABLE 10

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

SUMMARY OF TOTAL TIME REQUIRED BY
INVESTIGATION TYPE AND AGENCY SIZE

Investigation Type*	Mean Time in Minutes and Hours				
	Small (N)	Medium (N)	Large (N)	Cook (N)	Total (N)
Full PSI - Pre Plea	7.7 (49)	8.5 (54)	6.4 (124)	3.6 (53)	6.5 (280)
Partial PSI	3.0 (8)	(0)	5.3 (8)	1.3 (1)	4.0 (17)
Full PTI	(0)	(0)	(0)	3.6 (41)	3.6 (41)

*There were no partial PTI's in the study. Seven investigations were not identified by investigation type and one Full PTI was miscoded to a county other than Cook. These investigations have been omitted from all tables.

As was the case in supervision, officers coded their investigation activities by person contacted, together with method and place of contact. Function codes were also used to describe the nature of each activity. Appendix M distributes the time among each of the person codes. As expected, officers spent more time working alone in investigations than in supervision and the collateral contact times are also higher. Twenty percent of PSI time (80 minutes) is spent with the offender as the focus of the contact and 33 percent (73 minutes) of PTI time is with the offender. Appendix N distributes the time among the method codes. Twenty-one percent of PSI time and 40 percent of PTI time is spent in face-to-face activity. Although the times are lower than in supervision, Appendix O indicates that the majority of face-to-face time is spent with the offender.

While the previous appendices distribute the time per month among all investigations, Table 11 reports the time required for each client face-to-face contact by place of contact and agency size. Due to the investigative nature of the interviews, the overall time per face-to-face contact was considerably higher than contacts in the supervision study. The 468 investigation contacts required on overall time of 47 minutes, compared to the 27 minutes in supervision (Table 5). The Majority of investigation client face-to-face contacts occurred in the office (N = 284; 61 percent) and required a mean time of 47 minutes. The longest interviews occurred in small jurisdictions (74 minutes; N = 62) followed by Cook County (57 minutes; N = 26). Cook County conducted the highest percentage of their contacts in court (N = 74; 58 percent), spending an average of 47 minutes per contact.

Appendix P distributes the total time per investigation among each of the place codes. Seventy-three percent (287 minutes) of the full PSI time occurred in the office. Sixty-three percent of the PTI time (138 minute was spent in the office, but as expected from the previous table, a high percentage of time (27 percent) was spent in court.

Table 12 allocates the investigation time among each of the function codes. Understandably, the highest percentage of time was allocated to report writing, followed by information gathering and interviewing. Table 13 looks at required for each use of a function code during the study. The travel and waiting times are low, 1 - 5 minutes, across all functions. The most frequently occurring function code was information gathering which required 17 minutes during PSI's (N = 1879) and 16 minutes during PTI's in Cook County (N = 131). The interviewing code was used 564 times during PSI's and required 35

minutes and 50 times during PTI's where it required 57 minutes. Interviews, as outlined here, are contacts with the client or collateral, and may be conducted as face-to-face contacts or by telephone. Thus, the time are different from those outlined on Table 11, which referred only to client face-to-face contacts.

TABLE 11

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

TIME PER CLIENT FACE TO FACE CONTACT
BY PLACE AND AGENCY SIZE

Agency Size	Mean Total Time in Minutes*					
	Office (N)	Home (N)	Jail (N)	Court (N)	Other (N)	Total (N)
Small	74 (62)	(0)	58 (20)	17 (3)	(0)	68 (85)
Medium	39 (57)	45 (3)	51 (11)	5 (1)	9 (1)	40 (73)
Large	36 (139)	39 (3)	46 (37)	15 (2)	18 (2)	38 (183)
Cook	57 (26)	(0)	63 (17)	47 (74)	33 (10)	50 (127)
Total	47 (284)	42 (6)	53 (85)	45 (80)	29 (13)	47 (468)

*Time includes travel, waiting and activity

TABLE 12

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

TIME PER MONTH ALLOCATED TO EACH FUNCTION CODE

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	INTERVIEWING	INFORMATION GATHERING	REPORT WRITING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI										
TOTAL N	280									
AVERAGES			71	111	182	5	22	1	392	6.5
% OF TIME			0.18	0.28	0.46	0.01	0.06	0.00		
PART PSI										
TOTAL N	17									
AVERAGES			52	78	68	12	29	1	239	4.0
% OF TIME			0.22	0.32	0.28	0.05	0.12	0.00		
FULL PTI										
TOTAL N	41									
AVERAGES			69	50	86	5	8	0	218	3.6
% OF TIME			0.32	0.23	0.40	0.02	0.04	0.00		

TABLE 13

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

TIME REQUIRED FOR EACH
FUNCTION CODE OCCURRENCE

Function (N)	Mean Time in Minutes			
	Travel	Waiting	Activity	Total
Full PSI				
Interviewing (564)	1	1	33	35
Information Gathering (1879)	#	1	16	17
Report Writing (851)	1	#	59	60
Case Staffing (87)	#	1	16	17
Other (498)	2	2	9	13
Full PTI (Cook)				
Interviewing (50)	0	3	54	57
Information Gathering (131)	0	3	13	16
Report Writing (97)	0	0	37	37
Case Staffing (24)	#	1	8	9
Other (32)	0	5	5	10

#Less than .5 minutes

C. Sentencing

The time study design included a study of the time required to complete the sentencing and any related follow-up after the investigations were submitted to the court. As with intakes, this study reflects the practices of the individual jurisdictions and is not driven by Division policies which require a specific level of involvement. In Cook County, sentencing matters are handled by a special court unit which did not participate in the study, thus the following tables only provide information for small, medium and large departments. The sentencing study also tracked follow-up activity only on the investigations which required some level of activity. It cannot be concluded, from the data available to the analysts, that all investigations required the time indicated in the study. It may be possible that a number of investigations required no significant follow-up. Therefore, the time presented for this study may not be directly additive to the investigation time, to yield a total time for completion of an investigation from assignment through the sentencing process.

Table 14 presents the time required to follow full PSI's through the sentencing process in small, medium and large departments. (There were 2 partial PSI's and 9 sentencings which were not identified by investigation type. Data on these 11 investigations was omitted from all tables.) Overall there were 166 PSI sentencings, each of which required a mean time of 1.4 hours (86 minutes). In small jurisdictions (N = 35) the sentencing required 1.0 hours while it required 1.1 hours in medium department (N = 41) and 1.8 hours in large departments (N = 90). The t test indicates that only the difference observed in large departments is significant (.05 level).

Appendix Q provides the mean, mode, median, maximum value, minimum value and standard deviation for each agency size and the statewide total. Appendix R (2 pages) provides the time requirements for each department, with the small departments listed on the first page, followed by medium and large departments on the second.

Appendix S distributes the total times among each person code in the study. There are some clear differences in where the time is allocated among each agency group. Small departments spent 12 percent of their time with the offender as the focus of the activity and large departments spent 3 percent of their time with the offender; however, with medium size agencies this was 84 percent. Small departments allocated 60 percent of their time to the "other"

person code, large departments allocated 20 percent, while medium agencies allocated only 7 percent. Three fourths of the large department time was spent with the officer working alone, while in small departments this was 25 percent and in medium sized agencies it was only 9 percent.

Appendix T distributes the time among each function code and Appendix U provides the amount of client face-to-face contact per sentencing. Small agencies spent 72 percent of their time (44 minutes) in face-to-face contact with someone, however only 7 minutes of this time was with the offender. The same pattern holds true in large departments where only 2 minutes of the 21 minutes face-to-face time was spent with the offender. In large departments, however, the majority of face-to-face time is with the offender (19 of 23 minutes). Appendix V distributes the time among the place codes where the activity occurred. Clearly, most time (84 - 98 percent) is spent in court.

During the sentencing study the majority of face-to-face contacts (N = 181) occurred with someone other than the offender. Of these 181 contacts, 160 occurred in court and required a mean of 17 minutes. There were 46 client face-to-face contacts in the study, 36 of which were in court and required 31 minutes each. Negligible time was spent with the victims, with only 2 face-to-face and two telephone contacts reported.

Table 15 distributes the sentencing time among each of the function codes. The majority of time was spent in court hearings, although large departments were somewhat lower than smaller and medium. Large departments allocated slightly less than one fourth of their time to the "other" function code. While this table distributes the functional time among all sentencings, Table 16 provides the time required whenever officers used a particular function code. Supplemental activities required 11 minutes per occurrence and "other" functions (N = 87), which occurred primarily in large departments, required 26 minutes per occurrence. The overall time required for the 333 court hearings is 23 minutes (1 minute travel, 18 minutes waiting and 16 minutes activity). The longest court hearings (57 minutes), occurred in medium agencies (N = 44). Of this time, 21 minutes was spent waiting. Sentencing hearings in large departments (N = 209) required 30 minutes, of which 22 minutes was spent waiting and only 8 minutes was spent in the activity itself. Small jurisdictions required the least waiting time per hearing (6 minutes) and spent 16 minutes in the hearing itself. Together with 1 minute of travel in small departments, each hearing took a total of 23 minutes (N = 80).

The next section of this report outlines a methodology for using time study data within a workload system, summarizes the results of the study and provides preliminary recommendations.

TABLE 14

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

TIME REQUIRED FOR FULL PSI FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITY

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL							
	TOTAL N	35						
	AVERAGES			1	14	45	61	1.0
	% OF TIME			0.02	0.23	.75		
	MEDIUM							
	TOTAL N	41						
	AVERAGES			0	24	41	65	1.1
	% OF TIME			0.00	0.36	.63		
	LARGE							
	TOTAL N	90						
AVERAGES			1	74	32	106	1.8	
% OF TIME			0.01	.70	0.30			
TOTAL N	166							
AVERAGES			1	49	37	86	1.4	
% OF TIME			0.01	.57	0.43			

TABLE 15

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

TIME ALLOCATED TO EACH FUNCTION CODE

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	*** SUPPLEMENT	COURT HEARING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL							
	TOTAL N	35						
	AVERAGES		7	52	1	0	61	1.0
	% OF TIME		0.12	.86	0.02	0.00		
	MEDIUM							
	TOTAL N	41						
	AVERAGES		2	61	2	1	65	1.1
	% OF TIME		0.02	.94	0.03	0.01		
	LARGE							
	TOTAL N	90						
	AVERAGES		11	69	24	2	106	1.8
	% OF TIME		0.10	.65	0.23	0.02		
TOTAL N		166						
AVERAGES			8	64	14	1	86	1.4
% OF TIME			0.09	.74	0.16	0.01		

TABLE 16

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

TIME REQUIRED FOR EACH FUNCTION CODE OCCURRENCE

Function (N)	Mean Time in Minutes			
	Travel	Waiting	Activity	Total
Supplemental Activity (124)	*	1	10	11
Court Hearing (333)	*	18	14	32
Small (80)	1	6	16	23
Medium (44)	*	21	36	57
Large (209)	*	22	8	30
Other (87)**	*	22	4	26

*Less than .5 minutes

**81 of the 87 "Other" functions occurred in Large jurisdictions

IV. Conclusion

The Illinois probation time study provided extensive information describing the length of time required to provide probation and investigative services together with ancillary information which contributes to a better understanding of how these services are provided. This ancillary information on such things as length of time per contact, location of contact and distribution of time among various supervision and investigative functions provides administrators with the capability of assessing if the nature of services is consistent with administrative philosophy and intent.

A. Workload Computation

The central purpose of conducting this time study was to evaluate the time requirements per case or investigation to determine if adjustments should be made in the current funding formula. Workload systems require two basic components: (1) an accurate measure of time required to fulfill policy expectations; and (2) an accurate measure of the time available per month for each officer.

The time study provides the basis for determining the first component. Simply put, the number of cases in each classification or investigation category per month, multiplied by their respective time requirements, yields the total work hours required that month if offenders are to be supervised in accordance with policy standards and investigations are to be completed.

Illinois calculated the time available per officer at 120 hours per month when the workload system was first implemented in 1984. This figure was derived by deducting vacation, sick leave, holidays, administrative time, training, and community development from the salaried time per month. The figure of 120 hours is consistent with other agencies throughout the county. It is anticipated that the time available will remain unchanged as the factors which were considered in 1984 have remained relatively constant.

With the calculation of time required per case and monthly statistics on the number of cases and investigations per category, the agency is able to determine the total hours required to do the work. Division by the number of hours available per officer yields the number of officers needed to fulfill the responsibilities and provides a measure of the degree to which a department or unit is over or understaffed.

B. Discussion and Recommendations

The following table summarizes the results of each component of the time

study. With the exception of Cook County maximums, the supervision sample sizes for cases meeting standards is generally consistent with the minimum expectations when the study was designed. The sample sizes for investigations was somewhat lower than anticipated, but this sample was dependent upon referrals received from court. This summary table provides a downstate total for small, medium and large jurisdictions, together with overall results for each agency size and Cook County.

Time Study Summary

	Mean Total Time Hours				
	Agency Size			Downstate	Cook
Case Type	Small (N)	Medium (N)	Large (N)	Total (N)	County (N)
Maximum	1.6 (150)	1.9 (173)	1.9 (118)	1.8 (441)	.7 (55)
Medium	.8 (135)	.9 (257)	.9 (210)	.9 (602)	.5 (139)
Minimum	.4 (163)	.3 (322)	.3 (318)	.3 (803)	.3 (175)
Intake	2.8 (127)	2.2 (162)	2.0 (190)	2.3 (479)	1.6 (100)
Investigation Type					
Full PSI- Pre Plea	7.7 (49)	8.5 (54)	6.4 (124)	7.2 (227)	3.6 (53)
Full PTI	-	-	-	-	3.6 (41)
Sentencing					
PSI - Pre Plea	1.0 (35)	1.1 (41)	1.8 (90)	1.4 (166)	-

The following discussion outlines the analysts interpretation of the time study results for each of the major areas:

Downstate Maximum: The small department value is pulling down the statewide average. The intake times are higher for the small counties, suggesting that some initial supervision activities are occurring there. Consider establishing the downstate value at 1.9 hours, which represents the times for both medium and large jurisdictions.

Cook County Maximum: The sample size is about one half of what was anticipated in the design. (Of an original 147 case sample, 31 cases had no contact and 61 had one face-to-face). Because Cook County is exempted from home contact requirements, the time is expected to be lower than in the remaining departments. However, the time study results would be more credible with a larger sample.

Downstate Medium: The downstate average of .9 hours appears reasonable.

Cook County Mediums: The sample size is adequate and .5 hours appears reasonable.

All Minimums: Use the statewide average of .3 hours.

Intake; The data demonstrates that considerable time is invested in the intake process. The downstate average is inflated by the small departments. If the logic outlined for maximums is adopted, the overall downstate time is too high to use as a workload value. Without greater consistency to define what constitutes the intake process it is difficult to assess the meaningfulness of the data, other than to say the sample sizes are large enough to provide an accurate picture of what is currently going on.

Downstate PSI's: The statewide average is being pulled down by the lower times for large departments. However in the sentencing time study, large departments required substantially more time. It's not clear if streamlined operations in large departments substantially reduce time or if some activities are being handled as part of the sentencing process. The smaller sample sizes for small and medium agencies also decrease the reliability of those figures, even though they are considerably higher than large departments. The best overall figure appears to be the 7.2 hours.

Cook County PTI/PSI: While the sample sizes for each of the two investigation types are small, the times are the same suggesting the reports are similar, but may be completed at different stages of the sentencing process. If this is true, they can be viewed as a single investigation and the samples combined, giving greater credibility to the 3.6 hours.

Sentencing: The time study values reflect only those cases which required some sentencing activity. The figures are probably inflated; if one were to apply them to all investigations.

The following recommendations are made for the Division's consideration. They should be considered preliminary recommendations which the analysts would like to review with the Division, as there may be other policy considerations which are not evident to us at this time.

1. Workload values should be established for the downstate counties separate from Cook County.

The tests for significance consistently showed Cook County to be different from the rest of the state in all categories except minimum. While there were also some downstate differences, there were no consistent patterns throughout the study. Creation of separate workload values for small medium and large jurisdictions creates an administrative complexity which is not warranted by the data. In addition to the routine calculation issues involved in having several workload values, the Division would have to determine precise criteria for each agency size and make provision for departments to change categories as they added or reduced staff.

2. The time study results should be reviewed for relationships among categories and in relationship to other Division policies to establish workload values.

While it can be tempting to adopt time study results without modifications, they should be reviewed carefully to assure internal consistency with other policies. For example, if part of the rationale for establishing the downstate workload value at 1.8 or 1.9 hours is that small jurisdictions included some supervision time in their intake process, then the intake results cannot be adopted without adjustment for the higher times in small departments. The factors computed into the 120 hours of time available should also be reviewed to assure that overlap does not exist between deductions on the time available and additional responsibilities which may now receive workload value.

3. Create a workload category for the intake process.

A workload value should be established for intakes; however, it is difficult to estimate what this should be without a uniform policy about what minimally constitutes the intake process. Most agencies using workload systems have a "new admission" (essentially intake) classification which accounts for the activities necessary to activate

a case and get started with supervision. This appears to be missing from the current Illinois system and allocating a time value for the intake process (after its defined) would rectify that.

4. If the Division decides to allocate time for the sentencing process, it should be incorporated into the investigation times, rather than creating a new category for sentencings.

A P P E N D I X

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

Maximum
CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

AGENCY SIZE	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	MAX	MIN	S.D.	***	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL CASES
SMALL TIME SPENT	94	70	76	380	26	63		14086	234.8	150
MEDIUM TIME SPENT	115	43	102	307	23	64		19862	331.0	173
LARGE TIME SPENT	114	60	95	577	10	81		13413	223.5	118
COOK TIME SPENT	44	30	37	201	11	32		2444	40.7	55
Total MAXIMUM TIME SPEN	100	70	82	577	10	69		49805	830.1	496

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

Medium
CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

AGENCY SIZE	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	MAX	MIN	S.D.	***	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL CASES
SMALL TIME SPENT	49	17	41	167	8	33		6596	109.9	135
MEDIUM TIME SPENT	57	25	41	295	12	41		14612	243.5	257
LARGE TIME SPENT	52	35	43	309	6	39		11021	183.7	210
COOK TIME SPENT	32	15	20	323	4	38		6238	104.0	193
Total MEDIUM TIME SPEN	48	15	37	323	4	39		38467	641.1	795

Minimum
CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

AGENCY SIZE	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	MAX	MIN	S.D.	***	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL CASES
SMALL TIME SPENT	22	5	16	116	2	20		3537	58.9	163
MEDIUM TIME SPENT	20	5	15	176	1	21		6588	109.8	322
LARGE TIME SPENT	17	5	10	113	1	18		5299	88.3	318
COOK TIME SPENT	17	5	10	102	1	18		2913	48.5	175
Total MINIMUM TIME SPEN	19	5	12	176	1	20		18337	305.6	978

Intake
CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

AGENCY SIZE	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	MAX	MIN	S.D.	***	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL CASES
SMALL TIME SPENT	170	101	160	494	22	86		21530	358.8	127
MEDIUM TIME SPENT	129	50	114	626	10	83		20956	349.3	162
LARGE TIME SPENT	123	115	118	285	25	42		23291	388.2	190
COOK TIME SPENT	99	78	91	225	13	47		9856	164.3	100
		22	138	138	138	M		138	2.3	1
								75771	1263	580

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL							
	TOTAL N	150						
	AVERAGES			12	3	79	94	1.6
	% OF TIME			0.13	0.03	.84		
	MEDIUM							
	TOTAL N	173						
	AVERAGES			28	5	82	115	1.9
	% OF TIME			0.24	0.05	.71		
	LARGE							
	TOTAL N	118						
	AVERAGES			15	9	89	114	1.9
	% OF TIME			0.13	0.08	.79		
	COOK							
	TOTAL N	55						
	AVERAGES			1	5	39	44	.7
	% OF TIME			0.01	0.12	.87		
TOTAL N		496						
AVERAGES				17	6	78	100	1.7
% OF TIME				0.17	0.06	.78		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL							
	TOTAL N	135						
	AVERAGES			4	2	43	49	.8
	% OF TIME			0.09	0.04	.87		
	MEDIUM							
	TOTAL N	257						
	AVERAGES			12	2	44	57	.9
	% OF TIME			0.20	0.03	.77		
	LARGE							
	TOTAL N	210						
	AVERAGES			4	4	45	52	.9
	% OF TIME			0.07	0.07	.86		
	COOK							
	TOTAL N	193						
	AVERAGES			0	4	29	32	.5
	% OF TIME			0.00	0.11	.89		
TOTAL N		795						
AVERAGES				5	3	40	48	.8
% OF TIME				0.11	0.06	.83		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	163		1	0	21	22	0.4
	% OF TIME			0.04	0.02	.94		
	MEDIUM							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	322		1	1	18	20	0.3
% OF TIME			0.06	0.04	.89			
LARGE	TOTAL N AVERAGES	318		0	0	16	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			0.01	0.03	.96		
	COOK							
TOTAL N AVERAGES	TOTAL N AVERAGES	175		1	1	15	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			0.03	0.07	.89		
TOTAL N AVERAGES	TOTAL N AVERAGES	978		1	1	17	19	0.3
	% OF TIME			0.04	0.04	.92		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL							
	TOTAL N	127						
	AVERAGES			1	0	168	170	2.8
	% OF TIME			0.01	0.00	.99		
	MEDIUM							
	TOTAL N	162						
	AVERAGES			8	2	120	129	2.2
	% OF TIME			0.06	0.01	.93		
	LARGE							
	TOTAL N	190						
	AVERAGES			3	2	117	123	2.0
	% OF TIME			0.03	0.02	.96		
	COOK							
	TOTAL N	100						
	AVERAGES			0	4	94	99	1.6
	% OF TIME			0.00	0.04	.96		
	UNKNOWN							
	TOTAL N	1						
	AVERAGES			0	10	128	138	2.3
	% OF TIME			0.00	0.07	.93		
TOTAL N		580						
AVERAGES				4	2	125	131	2.2
% OF TIME				0.03	0.02	.96		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL	CLARK							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	7		10 0.14	1 0.01	64 .85	75	1.2
		MORGAN							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	24		13 0.18	5 0.07	57 .76	75	1.2
		OGLE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	29		7 0.06	4 0.04	108 .90	120	2.0
		HENRY							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	28		9 0.09	3 0.03	99 .89	111	1.9
		FULTON							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	19		19 0.24	1 0.02	59 .75	79	1.3
		KNOX							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	18		9 0.10	6 0.06	75 .84	89	1.5
		MCDONOUGH							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	6		6 0.15	0 0.00	31 .85	37	.6
		WARREN							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	3		4 0.05	0 0.00	74 .95	78	1.3
		HANCOCK\H							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	10		39 0.34	1 0.00	74 .66	113	1.9
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	150		12 0.13	3 0.03	79 .84	94	1.6

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	
Maximum	MEDIUM	ROCK ISLA								
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	67		27	4	87	118	2.0	
		% OF TIME			0.23	0.03	.74			
		McHENRY								
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	42		20	8	73	101	1.7	
		% OF TIME			0.20	0.08	.72			
	VERMILLIO									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	44		40	2	75	117	1.9		
	% OF TIME			0.34	0.02	.64				
	JACKSON									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	20		21	11	95	127	2.1		
	% OF TIME			0.16	0.09	.75				
TOTAL N AVERAGES			173		28	5	82	115	1.9	
% OF TIME					0.24	0.05	.71			
LARGE	ST CLAIR									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	35		8	0	47	55	.9		
	% OF TIME			0.14	0.01	.86				
	LAKE									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	14		23	4	94	122	2.0		
	% OF TIME			0.19	0.03	.77				
DuPAGE										
TOTAL N AVERAGES	69		18	14	110	142	2.4			
% OF TIME			0.12	0.10	.78					
TOTAL N AVERAGES			118		15	9	89	114	1.9	
% OF TIME					0.13	0.08	.79			
COOK	COOK	TOTAL N AVERAGES	55		1	5	39	44	.7	
		% OF TIME			0.01	0.12	.87			
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	55		1	5	39	44	.7	
		% OF TIME			0.01	0.12	.87			
TOTAL N AVERAGES			496		17	6	78	100	1.7	
% OF TIME					0.17	0.06	.78			

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL	CLARK							
		TOTAL N	5		0	0	30	30	0.5
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		% OF TIME							
		MORGAN							
		TOTAL N	19		4	4	41	49	.8
		AVERAGES			0.09	0.08	.82		
		% OF TIME							
		OGLE							
		TOTAL N	32		3	1	45	48	.8
		AVERAGES			0.05	0.02	.93		
		% OF TIME							
		HENRY							
		TOTAL N	24		1	0	58	59	1.0
		AVERAGES			0.01	0.00	.99		
		% OF TIME							
		FULTON							
		TOTAL N	14		11	6	36	53	.9
		AVERAGES			0.20	0.11	.68		
		% OF TIME							
		KNOX							
		TOTAL N	17		4	0	40	45	.7
		AVERAGES			0.09	0.00	.91		
		% OF TIME							
		McDONOUGH							
		TOTAL N	8		0	4	19	23	0.4
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.19	.81		
		% OF TIME							
		WARREN							
		TOTAL N	8		0	0	22	22	0.4
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		% OF TIME							
		HANCOCK\H							
		TOTAL N	8		23	6	60	89	1.5
		AVERAGES			0.26	0.06	.68		
		% OF TIME							
		TOTAL N	135		4	2	43	49	.8
		AVERAGES			0.09	0.04	.87		
		% OF TIME							

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
Medium	MEDIUM	ROCK ISLA							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	78		14 0.21	3 0.05	50 .74	68	1.1
		McHENRY							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	67		9 0.20	1 0.02	35 .78	44	.7
		VERMILLIO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	74		10 0.20	1 0.01	40 .79	51	.8
	JACKSON								
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	38		13 0.19	2 0.03	53 .77	68	1.1	
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	257		12 0.20	2 0.03	44 .77	57	.9	
	LARGE	ST CLAIR							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	41		4 0.13	1 0.02	28 .85	34	.6
		LAKE							
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		40		8 0.12	1 0.02	57 .86	67	1.1	
DUPAGE									
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		129		2 0.04	5 0.10	47 .86	54	.9	
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	210		4 0.07	4 0.07	45 .86	52	.9		
COOK	COOK	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	193		0 0.00	4 0.11	29 .89	32	.5
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	193		0 0.00	4 0.11	29 .89	32	.5
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	795		5 0.11	3 0.06	40 .83	48	.8

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL	CLARK							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	8		0 0.00	0 0.00	12 1.00	12	0.2
		MORGAN							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	24		0 0.00	0 0.00	18 1.00	18	0.3
		OGLE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	30		0 0.01	0 0.00	16. .99	17	0.3
		HENRY							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	19		0 0.01	0 0.00	41 .99	41	.7
		FULTON							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	23		1 0.04	1 0.05	20 .91	22	0.4
		KNOX							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	23		0 0.00	0 0.00	21 1.00	21	0.4
		MCDONOUGH							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	12		0 0.00	0 0.00	10 1.00	10	0.2
		WARREN							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	11		0 0.00	0 0.00	13 1.00	13	0.2
		HANCOCK\H							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	11		8 0.21	4 0.10	28 .69	40	.7
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	163		1 0.04	0 0.02	21 .94	22	0.4

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	*** TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
Minimum	MEDIUM	ROCK ISLA						
		TOTAL N	72					
		AVERAGES		4	0	26	30	.5
		% OF TIME		0.13	0.02	.85		
		McHENRY						
		TOTAL N	109					
	AVERAGES		1	2	15	18	0.3	
	% OF TIME		0.05	0.11	.84			
	VERMILLIO							
	TOTAL N	58						
	AVERAGES		0	0	22	22	0.4	
	% OF TIME		0.00	0.00	1.00			
JACKSON								
TOTAL N	83							
AVERAGES		0	0	14	15	0.2		
% OF TIME		0.03	0.02	.94				
TOTAL N	322							
AVERAGES		1	1	18	20	0.3		
% OF TIME		0.06	0.04	.89				
LARGE	ST CLAIR	TOTAL N	70					
		AVERAGES		0	0	11	11	0.2
		% OF TIME		0.00	0.00	1.00		
	LAKE	TOTAL N	75					
		AVERAGES		0	0	9	9	0.2
		% OF TIME		0.00	0.00	1.00		
DUPAGE	TOTAL N	173						
	AVERAGES		0	1	21	22	0.4	
	% OF TIME		0.02	0.04	.94			
TOTAL N	318							
AVERAGES		0	0	16	17	0.3		
% OF TIME		0.01	0.03	.96				
COOK	COOK	TOTAL N	175					
		AVERAGES		1	1	15	17	0.3
	% OF TIME		0.03	0.07	.89			
	TOTAL N	175						
AVERAGES		1	1	15	17	0.3		
% OF TIME		0.03	0.07	.89				
TOTAL N	978							
AVERAGES		1	1	17	19	0.3		
% OF TIME		0.04	0.04	.92				

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL	CLARK							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	1		0 0.00	0 0.00	107 1.00	107	1.8
		MORGAN							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	20		1 0.01	0 0.00	90 .99	91	1.5
		OGLE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	15		8 0.07	0 0.00	116 .93	125	2.1
		HENRY							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	27		0 0.00	0 0.00	265 1.00	266	4.4
		FULTON							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	21		1 0.00	2 0.01	196 .99	199	3.3
		KNOX							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	11		0 0.00	0 0.00	81 1.00	81	1.4
		McDONOUGH							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	6		0 0.00	0 0.00	97 1.00	97	1.6
		WARREN							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	9		0 0.00	1 0.00	205 1.00	206	3.4
		HANCOCK\H							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	17		1 0.00	0 0.00	179 1.00	180	3.0
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	127		1 0.01	0 0.00	168 .99	170	2.8

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
Intake	MEDIUM	ROCK ISLA							
		TOTAL N	28						
		AVERAGES			15	3	200	218	3.6
		% OF TIME			0.07	0.01	.92		
		MCHENRY							
		TOTAL N	53						
	AVERAGES			7	1	94	102	1.7	
	% OF TIME			0.07	0.01	.92			
	VERMILLIO								
	TOTAL N	41							
	AVERAGES			0	0	122	122	2.0	
	% OF TIME			0.00	0.00	1.00			
JACKSON									
TOTAL N	40								
AVERAGES			11	5	96	111	1.8		
% OF TIME			0.10	0.04	.86				
TOTAL N	162								
AVERAGES			8	2	120	129	2.2		
% OF TIME			0.06	0.01	.93				
LARGE	ST CLAIR	TOTAL N	30						
		AVERAGES			16	3	92	111	1.8
	% OF TIME			0.14	0.03	.83			
	LAKE								
	TOTAL N	34							
	AVERAGES			3	5	124	132	2.2	
% OF TIME			0.02	0.04	.94				
DuPAGE									
TOTAL N	126								
AVERAGES			1	1	121	123	2.1		
% OF TIME			0.01	0.01	.99				
TOTAL N	190								
AVERAGES			3	2	117	123	2.0		
% OF TIME			0.03	0.02	.96				
COOK	COOK	TOTAL N	100						
		AVERAGES			0	4	94	99	1.6
% OF TIME			0.00	0.04	.96				
TOTAL N	100								
AVERAGES			0	4	94	99	1.6		
% OF TIME			0.00	0.04	.96				
UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	TOTAL N	1						
		AVERAGES			0	10	128	138	2.3
% OF TIME			0.00	0.07	.93				
TOTAL N	1								
AVERAGES			0	10	128	138	2.3		
% OF TIME			0.00	0.07	.93				
TOTAL N	580								
AVERAGES			4	2	125	131	2.2		
% OF TIME			0.03	0.02	.96				

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

CASE TYPE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	ZERO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	104		6 0.15	6 0.16	24 .68	36	.6
	ONE							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	258		9 0.16	2 0.04	44 .80	55	.9
	TWO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	368		16 0.19	3 0.04	65 .77	84	1.4
	THREE +							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	128		21 0.14	13 0.08	115 .78	149	2.5
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		858		13 0.17	5 0.06	61 .78	79	1.3
MEDIUM	ZERO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	176		2 0.08	1 0.07	17 .84	20	0.3
	ONE							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	626		4 0.10	1 0.03	34 .87	40	.7
	TWO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	136		12 0.16	7 0.10	56 .74	75	1.3
	THREE +							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	33		8 0.08	8 0.08	88 .84	104	1.7
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		971		5 0.11	2 0.06	36 .83	43	.7

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

CASE TYPE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	ZERO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	652		0 0.04	1 0.05	11 .91	12	0.2
	ONE							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	297		1 0.04	0 0.01	29 .95	30	.5
	TWO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	23		2 0.05	7 0.13	43 .83	52	.9
	THREE +							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	6		0 0.00	10 0.13	69 .87	79	1.3
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		978		1 0.04	1 0.04	17 .92	19	0.3
INTAKE	ZERO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	9		0 0.00	0 0.00	50 1.00	50	.8
	ONE							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	214		2 0.02	2 0.02	102 .97	105	1.8
	TWO							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	193		3 0.03	3 0.02	128 .95	134	2.2
	THREE +							
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	164		6 0.04	2 0.01	156 .95	164	2.7
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		580		4 0.03	2 0.02	125 .96	131	2.2

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM									
TOTAL N	496		70	0	13	17	0	100	1.7
AVERAGES			.70	0.00	0.13	0.17	0.00		
% OF TIME									
MEDIUM									
TOTAL N	795		34	0	5	8	0	48	.8
AVERAGES			.71	0.00	0.11	0.17	0.00		
% OF TIME									
MINIMUM									
TOTAL N	978		11	0	1	6	0	19	0.3
AVERAGES			.59	0.00	0.08	0.33	0.00		
% OF TIME									
INTAKE									
TOTAL N	580		70	0	14	46	0	131	2.2
AVERAGES			.54	0.00	0.11	0.35	0.00		
% OF TIME									

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM									
TOTAL N	496								
AVERAGES			69	10	2	20	0	100	1.7
% OF TIME			.69	0.10	0.02	0.20	0.00		
MEDIUM									
TOTAL N	795								
AVERAGES			33	4	1	11	0	48	.8
% OF TIME			.68	0.07	0.02	0.22	0.00		
MINIMUM									
TOTAL N	978								
AVERAGES			8	2	3	6	0	19	0.3
% OF TIME			0.40	0.12	0.17	0.31	0.00		
INTAKE									
TOTAL N	580								
AVERAGES			71	6	5	48	0	131	2.2
% OF TIME			.54	0.05	0.04	0.37	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM						
TOTAL N	496					
AVERAGES			64	36	100	1.7
% OF TIME			.64	0.36		
MEDIUM						
TOTAL N	795					
AVERAGES			31	18	48	.8
% OF TIME			.63	0.37		
MINIMUM						
TOTAL N	978					
AVERAGES			7	12	19	0.3
% OF TIME			0.37	.63		
INTAKE						
TOTAL N	580					
AVERAGES			66	65	131	2.2
% OF TIME			.50	0.50		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM										
TOTAL N	496									
AVERAGES			55	25	2	7	11	0	100	1.7
% OF TIME			.55	0.25	0.02	0.07	0.11	0.00		
MEDIUM										
TOTAL N	795									
AVERAGES			31	7	0	5	4	0	48	.8
% OF TIME			.65	0.15	0.01	0.11	0.09	0.00		
MINIMUM										
TOTAL N	978									
AVERAGES			16	1	0	1	1	0	19	0.3
% OF TIME			.85	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.06	0.00		
INTAKE										
TOTAL N	580									
AVERAGES			106	5	5	4	12	0	131	2.2
% OF TIME			.81	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.09	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	MAX	MIN	S.D.	***	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL CASES
FULL PSI	SMALL TIME SPENT	464	122	363	1669	122	321		22720	378.7	49
	MEDIUM TIME SPENT	512	288	470	1327	140	246		27674	461.2	54
	LARGE TIME SPENT	386	210	364	1094	140	167		47838	797.3	124
TIME SPENT	COOK TIME SPENT	216	127	198	662	78	107		11460	191.0	53
		392	210	343	1669	78	231		109692	1828	280
PART PSI	SMALL TIME SPENT	181	123	157	303	123	60		1450	24.2	8
	LARGE TIME SPENT	317	177	294	521	177	121		2539	42.3	8
TIME SPENT	COOK TIME SPENT	75	75	75	75	75	M		75	1.3	1
		239	75	207	521	75	120		4064	67.7	17
FULL PTI	COOK TIME SPENT	218	180	201	551	92	89		8948	149.1	41
	TIME SPENT	218	180	201	551	92	89		8948	149.1	41

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	
FULL PSI	SMALL								
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	49		10 0.02	2 0.00	452 .97	464	7.7	
	MEDIUM								
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	54		2 0.00	3 0.01	507 .99	512	8.5	
	LARGE								
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	124		13 0.03	10 0.03	363 .94	386	6.4	
	COOK								
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	53		1 0.01	25 0.12	190 .88	216	3.6	
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	280		8 0.02	10 0.03	374 .95	392	6.5	
	PART PSI	SMALL							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	8		1 0.01	0 0.00	180 .99	181	3.0
		LARGE							
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		8		8 0.03	33 0.10	276 .87	317	5.3	
COOK									
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		1		0 0.00	0 0.00	75 1.00	75	1.3	
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	17		4 0.02	16 0.07	219 .92	239	4.0		
FULL PTI	COOK								
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	41		0 0.00	15 0.07	203 .93	218	3.6	
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	41		0 0.00	15 0.07	203 .93	218	3.6	

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	*** TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL	MORGAN						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	4	1 0.00	12 0.02	690 .98	704	11.7
		OGLE						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	7	0 0.00	0 0.00	224 1.00	224	3.7
		HENRY						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	6	2 0.00	4 0.00	980 .99	986	16.4
		FULTON						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	13	2 0.00	0 0.00	434 1.00	436	7.3
		KNOX						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	10	2 0.01	1 0.00	316 .99	319	5.3
		McDONOUGH						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	2	0 0.00	0 0.00	191 1.00	191	3.2
		WARREN						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	5	76 0.21	0 0.00	290 .79	366	6.1
		HANCOCK\H						
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	2	25 0.04	5 0.01	651 .96	681	11.3
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	49	10 0.02	2 0.00	452 .97	464	7.7

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	COUNTY	TOTAL CASES	*** TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
Full PSI	MEDIUM	ROCK ISLA	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	22	2 0.00	4 0.01	526 .99	532 8.9
		MCHENRY	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	2	22 0.04	0 0.00	575 .96	597 9.9
		VERMILLIO	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	25	0 0.00	1 0.00	417 1.00	418 7.0
		JACKSON	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	5	5 0.01	12 0.01	346 .98	863 14.4
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	54	2 0.00	3 0.01	507 .99	512 8.5	
		LARGE	ST CLAIR	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	19	46 0.14	1 0.00	274 .85
	LAKE	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	36	14 0.04	8 0.02	318 .94	340 5.7	
	DUPAGE	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	69	4 0.01	13 0.03	411 .96	428 7.1	
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	124	13 0.03	10 0.03	363 .94	386 6.4		
	COOK	COOK	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	53	1 0.01	25 0.12	190 .88	216 3.6
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	53	1 0.01	25 0.12	190 .88	216 3.6		
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	280	8 0.02	10 0.03	374 .95	392 6.5		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI									
TOTAL N	280								
AVERAGES			80	5	47	259	0	392	6.5
% OF TIME			0.20	0.01	0.12	.66	0.00		
PART PSI									
TOTAL N	17								
AVERAGES			37	2	54	146	0	239	4.0
% OF TIME			0.15	0.01	0.23	.61	0.00		
FULL PTI									
TOTAL N	41								
AVERAGES			73	0	29	116	0	218	3.6
% OF TIME			0.33	0.00	0.13	.53	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI									
TOTAL N	280								
AVERAGES			83	24	16	268	1	392	6.5
% OF TIME			0.21	0.06	0.04	.68	0.00		
PART PSI									
TOTAL N	17								
AVERAGES			61	29	10	136	2	239	4.0
% OF TIME			0.26	0.12	0.04	.57	0.01		
FULL PTI									
TOTAL N	41								
AVERAGES			86	12	5	115	0	218	3.6
% OF TIME			0.40	0.05	0.02	.53	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI						
TOTAL N	280					
AVERAGES			64	328	392	6.5
% OF TIME			0.16	.84		
PART PSI						
TOTAL N	17					
AVERAGES			35	204	239	4.0
% OF TIME			0.15	.85		
FULL PTI						
TOTAL N	41					
AVERAGES			71	147	218	3.6
% OF TIME			0.33	.67		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI										
TOTAL N	280									
AVERAGES			287	2	18	16	65	4		
% OF TIME			.73	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.17	0.01	392	6.5
PART PSI										
TOTAL N	17									
AVERAGES			165	1	14	9	50	0		
% OF TIME			.69	0.00	0.06	0.04	0.21	0.00	239	4.0
FULL PTI										
TOTAL N	41									
AVERAGES			138	0	7	60	14	0		
% OF TIME			.63	0.00	0.03	0.27	0.06	0.00	218	3.6

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	MEAN	MODE	MEDIAN	MAX	MIN	S.D.	***	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL CASES
FULL PSI	SMALL TIME SPENT	61	32	52	161	10	37		2120	35.3	35
	MEDIUM TIME SPENT	65	40	40	285	10	56		2678	44.6	41
	LARGE TIME SPENT	106	15	85	363	3	87		9547	159.1	90
TIME SPENT		86	40	66	363	3	75		14345	239.1	166

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION AGENCY SIZE COUNTY	TOTAL ***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL	TOTAL
TYPE	CASES				MINUTES	HOURS
FULL PSI						
SMALL						
OGLE						
TOTAL N	6					
AVERAGES		0	7	42	49	.8
% OF TIME		0.00	0.15	.85		
HENRY						
TOTAL N	1					
AVERAGES		0	26	101	127	2.1
% OF TIME		0.00	0.20	.80		
FULTON						
TOTAL N	7					
AVERAGES		0	14	48	62	1.0
% OF TIME		0.00	0.23	.77		
KNOX						
TOTAL N	11					
AVERAGES		0	13	26	39	.6
% OF TIME		0.00	0.33	.67		
McDONOUGH						
TOTAL N	3					
AVERAGES		0	28	51	77	1.3
% OF TIME		0.00	0.33	.67		
WARREN						
TOTAL N	4					
AVERAGES		0	9	59	69	1.1
% OF TIME		0.00	0.14	.86		
HANCOCK\H						
TOTAL N	3					
AVERAGES		14	23	72	109	1.8
% OF TIME		0.13	0.21	.66		
TOTAL N	35					
AVERAGES		1	14	45	61	1.0
% OF TIME		0.02	0.23	.75		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	35								
	AVERAGES			8	2	36	15	0		
	% OF TIME			0.12	0.03	.60	0.25	0.00	61	1.0
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	41								
AVERAGES				55	0	5	6	0		
% OF TIME				.84	0.00	0.07	0.09	0.00	65	1.1
LARGE										
TOTAL N		90								
AVERAGES				3	0	21	80	1		
% OF TIME				0.03	0.00	0.20	.76	0.01	106	1.8
TOTAL N		166								
AVERAGES				17	0	20	48	1		
% OF TIME				0.20	0.00	0.24	.56	0.01	86	1.4

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	35		44	0	0	16	0	61	1.0
	AVERAGES			.72	0.01	0.00	0.27	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	41		23	0	0	42	0	65	1.1
	AVERAGES			0.36	0.00	0.00	.64	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	90		21	4	0	80	1	106	1.8
	AVERAGES			0.20	0.03	0.00	.75	0.01		
	% OF TIME									
TOTAL N		166		26	2	0	57	1	86	1.4
AVERAGES				0.31	0.02	0.00	.66	0.01		
% OF TIME										

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL						
	TOTAL N	35					
	AVERAGES			7	53	61	1.0
	% OF TIME			0.12	.88		
	MEDIUM						
	TOTAL N	41					
	AVERAGES			19	47	65	1.1
	% OF TIME			0.29	.71		
	LARGE						
TOTAL N	90						
AVERAGES			2	104	106	1.8	
% OF TIME			0.02	.98			
TOTAL N		166					
AVERAGES				8	79	86	1.4
% OF TIME				0.09	.91		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SENTENCING

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	35									
	AVERAGES			8	0	0	51	2	0	61	1.0
	% OF TIME			0.13	0.00	0.00	.84	0.03	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	41									
	AVERAGES			2	0	0	64	0	0	65	1.1
	% OF TIME			0.02	0.00	0.00	.98	0.00	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	90									
	AVERAGES			10	1	1	92	1	1	106	1.8
	% OF TIME			0.09	0.01	0.01	.87	0.01	0.01		
TOTAL N		166									
AVERAGES				8	1	0	76	1	1	86	1.4
% OF TIME				0.09	0.01	0.00	.88	0.01	0.01		

NCJRS

OCT 13 1988

ACQUISITIONS

ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

of the COURTS

1987 TIME STUDY

Supplemental Materials

11378
102

Prepared by:

National Council on Crime & Delinquency
6409 Odana Road
Madison, WI 53719
(608) 274-8882

August 1987

Illinois Courts 1987 Time Study

Supplemental Materials

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUPPLE-</u> <u>MENT #</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	Description of Contents	1
1	Supervision: Time Per Month as the Number of Client Face-to-Face Contacts Increases in Each Case Type by Agency Size (Reference Table 3 and Appendix E	2
2	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Among Each <u>Person Code</u> by Case Type and Agency Size - one case type per page (Reference Appendix F)	14
3	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Among <u>Each Method Code</u> by Case Type and Agency Size - one case type per page (Reference Appendix G)	18
4	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Between <u>Client Face-to-Face Activity</u> and all other time by Case Type and Agency Size - one case type per page (Reference Appendix H)	22
5	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Among Each <u>Place Code</u> by Case Type and Agency Size - one case type per page (Reference Appendix I)	26
6	Supervision: Time Per Month Allocated Among Each <u>Function Code</u> by Case Type and Agency Size - one case type per page (Reference Table 6)	30
7	Investigation: Time Per Investigation Allocated Among Each <u>Person Code</u> by Investigation Type and Agency Size (Reference Appendix M)	34
8	Investigation: Time Per Investigation Allocated Among Each <u>Method Code</u> by Investigation Type and Agency Size (Reference Appendix N)	36
9	Investigation: Time Per Investigation Allocated Between <u>Client Face-to-Face Activity</u> and All Other Time by Investigation Type and Agency Size (Reference Appendix O)	38

<u>SUPPLE-</u> <u>MENT #</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
10	Investigation: Time Allocated Among Each <u>Place Code</u> by Investigation Type and Agency Size (Reference Appendix P)	40
11	Investigation: Time Allocated Among Each <u>Function Code</u> by Investigation Type and Agency Size (Reference Table 12)	42

Illinois Courts 1987 Time Study

Supplemental Materials

DESCRIPTION OF CONTENTS

The enclosed supplemental materials are provided for the Division's reference. While they may be helpful in responding to some specific questions which arise, they are not considered significant enough to warrant inclusion in the time study report itself.

The materials are essentially un-edited computer runs which provide additional detail (at the agency size level) for tables and Appendices which are included in the report. The table of contents makes reference to the summary table or Appendix for each supplement section.

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	3						
		AVERAGES			5	1	19	25	0.4
		% OF TIME			0.19	0.03	.78		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	27						
		AVERAGES			4	1	48	53	.9
		% OF TIME			0.07	0.03	.91		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N	107						
		AVERAGES			11	2	64	77	1.3
		% OF TIME			0.15	0.03	.83		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	43						
		AVERAGES			15	5	116	135	2.3
		% OF TIME			0.11	0.04	.85		
		TOTAL N	180						
		AVERAGES			11	3	73	87	1.4
		% OF TIME			0.12	0.03	.84		
	MEDIUM	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	25						
		AVERAGES			11	3	30	44	.7
		% OF TIME			0.24	0.07	.69		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	89						
		AVERAGES			15	3	44	62	1.0

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		% OF TIME			0.24	0.04	.71		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	122		27	3	69	100	1.7
		% OF TIME			0.27	0.03	.70		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	51		29	11	111	151	2.5
		% OF TIME			0.19	0.07	.73		
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	287		22	4	66	92	1.5
		% OF TIME			0.24	0.05	.71		
3	LARGE	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	45		7	6	27	39	.7
		% OF TIME			0.17	0.15	.68		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	81		10	2	60	72	1.2
		% OF TIME			0.13	0.03	.84		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	90		14	4	75	93	1.6
		% OF TIME			0.15	0.04	.81		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	28		19 0.11	25 0.14	135 .75	179	3.0
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	244		12 0.14	6 0.07	68 .79	86	1.4
	COOK	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	31		0 0.00	9 0.34	17 .66	26	0.4
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	61		0 0.01	2 0.09	21 .90	23	0.4
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	49		0 0.01	4 0.09	37 .91	41	.7
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	6		3 0.03	19 0.25	54 .71	76	1.3
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	147		0 0.01	5 0.15	27 .84	32	.5
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	858		13 0.17	5 0.06	61 .78	79	1.3

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	11		0 0.00	0 0.00	13 1.00	13	0.2
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	95		3 0.07	1 0.03	36 .89	41	.7
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	27		9 0.14	3 0.04	51 .82	63	1.0
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	13		6 0.07	4 0.05	70 .88	79	1.3
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	146		4 0.09	2 0.04	40 .87	46	.8
	MEDIUM	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	50		4 0.17	1 0.05	19 .78	25	0.4
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	188		9	1	37	47	.8

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		% OF TIME			0.19	0.01	.80		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	60		20	4	57	80	1.3
		% OF TIME			0.25	0.04	.71		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	9		11	15	90	116	1.9
		% OF TIME			0.09	0.13	.78		
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	307		10	2	40	52	.9
		% OF TIME			0.20	0.03	.77		
	LARGE	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	40		1	2	19	23	0.4
		% OF TIME			0.05	0.10	.85		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	170		3	2	39	44	.7
		% OF TIME			0.06	0.03	.90		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	30		7	14	56	76	1.3
		% OF TIME			0.09	0.18	.73		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY-
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	10						
		AVERAGES			10	9	110	129	2.2
		% OF TIME			0.08	0.07	.85		
	TOTAL N		250						
	AVERAGES				3	3	41	48	.8
	% OF TIME				0.07	0.07	.86		
	COOK	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	75						
		AVERAGES			1	1	15	17	0.3
		% OF TIME			0.03	0.08	.88		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	173						
		AVERAGES			0	2	25	27	0.5
		% OF TIME			0.00	0.08	.92		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N	19						
		AVERAGES			0	17	58	76	1.3
		% OF TIME			0.00	0.23	.77		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	1						
		AVERAGES			0	0	78	78	1.3
		% OF TIME			0.00	0.00	1.00		
	TOTAL N		268						
	AVERAGES				0	3	25	28	0.5
	% OF TIME				0.01	0.11	.89		
TOTAL N			971						
AVERAGES					5	2	36	43	.7
% OF TIME					0.11	0.06	.83		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	86						
		AVERAGES			1	0	10	11	0.2
		% OF TIME			0.07	0.00	.93		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	63						
		AVERAGES			1	0	30	31	.5
		% OF TIME			0.02	0.01	.97		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N	12						
		AVERAGES			2	0	41	43	.7
		% OF TIME			0.04	0.01	.95		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	2						
		AVERAGES			0	24	38	62	1.0
		% OF TIME			0.00	0.38	.62		
		TOTAL N	163						
		AVERAGES			1	0	21	22	0.4
		% OF TIME			0.04	0.02	.94		
	MEDIUM	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	202						
		AVERAGES			1	1	11	13	0.2
		% OF TIME			0.06	0.10	.85		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	115						
		AVERAGES			2	0	27	29	0.5

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		% OF TIME			0.07	0.00	.92		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	3		8	0	85	93	1.6
		% OF TIME			0.08	0.00	.92		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	2		0	7	123	130	2.2
		% OF TIME			0.00	0.05	.95		
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	322		1	1	18	20	0.3
		% OF TIME			0.06	0.04	.89		
	LARGE	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	234		0	0	10	10	0.2
		% OF TIME			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	78		1	0	33	34	.6
		% OF TIME			0.02	0.01	.97		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES	5		2	22	37	61	1.0
		% OF TIME			0.03	0.36	.61		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	1		0	0	40	40	.7
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		% OF TIME							
	TOTAL N		318		0	0	16	17	0.3
	AVERAGES				0.01	0.03	.96		
	% OF TIME								
	COOK	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	130		1	1	12	14	0.2
		AVERAGES			0.05	0.08	.87		
		% OF TIME							
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	41		0	1	24	25	0.4
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.03	.97		
		% OF TIME							
		TWO							
		TOTAL N	3		0	13	17	30	.5
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.42	.58		
		% OF TIME							
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	1		0	0	49	49	.8
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		% OF TIME							
	TOTAL N		175		1	1	15	17	0.3
	AVERAGES				0.03	0.07	.89		
	% OF TIME								
TOTAL N			978		1	1	17	19	0.3
AVERAGES					0.04	0.04	.92		
% OF TIME									

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL	ONE							
		TOTAL N	23						
		AVERAGES			1	0	150	151	2.5
		% OF TIME			0.01	0.00	.99		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N	59						
	AVERAGES			1	0	154	156	2.6	
	% OF TIME			0.01	0.00	.99			
	THREE +								
	TOTAL N	45							
	AVERAGES			2	1	195	197	3.3	
	% OF TIME			0.01	0.00	.99			
TOTAL N	127								
AVERAGES			1	0	168	170	2.8		
% OF TIME			0.01	0.00	.99				
MEDIUM	ZERO								
	TOTAL N	4							
	AVERAGES			0	0	50	50	.8	
	% OF TIME			0.00	0.00	1.00			
	ONE								
	TOTAL N	63							
AVERAGES			4	1	84	89	1.5		
% OF TIME			0.05	0.01	.94				
TWO									
TOTAL N	58								
AVERAGES			5	1	115	121	2.0		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
		% OF TIME			0.04	0.01	.95		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	37		18	4	196	219	3.6
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	162		0.08	0.02	.90		
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			8	2	120	129	2.2
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			0.06	0.01	.93		
	LARGE	ZERO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	3		0	0	55	55	.9
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		ONE							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	85		1	2	114	117	2.0
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			0.01	0.02	.97		
		TWO							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	52		6	2	127	136	2.3
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			0.04	0.02	.94		
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	50		5	1	116	122	2.0
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			0.04	0.01	.95		
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	190		3	2	117	123	2.0
		TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME			0.03	0.02	.96		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	# CLIENT FACE TO FACE	TOTAL CASES	***	TRAVEL	WAITING	ACTIVITY	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
	COOK	ZERO							
		TOTAL N	2		0	0	42	42	.7
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.00	1.00		
		% OF TIME							
		ONE							
		TOTAL N	43		0	1	79	81	1.3
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.02	.98		
		% OF TIME							
		TWO							
		TOTAL N	24		0	13	95	108	1.8
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.12	.88		
		% OF TIME							
		THREE +							
		TOTAL N	31		0	2	118	120	2.0
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.01	.99		
		% OF TIME							
		TOTAL N	100		0	4	94	99	1.6
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.04	.96		
		% OF TIME							
	UNKNOWN	THREE +							
		TOTAL N	1		0	10	128	138	2.3
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.07	.93		
		% OF TIME							
		TOTAL N	1		0	10	128	138	2.3
		AVERAGES			0.00	0.07	.93		
		% OF TIME							
		TOTAL N	580		4	2	125	131	2.2
		AVERAGES			0.03	0.02	.96		
		% OF TIME							

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	150								
	AVERAGES			64	0	13	17	0	94	1.6
	% OF TIME			.68	0.00	0.14	0.18	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	173								
	AVERAGES			79	0	17	19	0	115	1.9
	% OF TIME			.69	0.00	0.15	0.16	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	118								
	AVERAGES			81	0	12	21	0	114	1.9
	% OF TIME			.71	0.00	0.11	0.18	0.00		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	55								
	AVERAGES			37	0	3	4	0	44	.7
	% OF TIME			.84	0.00	0.07	0.08	0.00		
TOTAL N		496								
AVERAGES				70	0	13	17	0	100	1.7
% OF TIME				.70	0.00	0.13	0.17	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	135								
	AVERAGES			33	0	5	11	0	49	.8
	% OF TIME			.67	0.01	0.11	0.22	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	257								
	AVERAGES			39	0	8	10	0	57	.9
	% OF TIME			.68	0.00	0.15	0.17	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	210								
	AVERAGES			39	0	5	9	0	52	.9
	% OF TIME			.74	0.00	0.10	0.16	0.00		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	193								
	AVERAGES			26	0	2	5	0	32	.5
	% OF TIME			.79	0.00	0.05	0.15	0.01		
TOTAL N		795								
AVERAGES				34	0	5	8	0	48	.8
% OF TIME				.71	0.00	0.11	0.17	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY -
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	163								
	AVERAGES			11	0	2	9	0	22	0.4
	% OF TIME			0.50	0.00	0.08	0.42	0.00		
MEDIUM	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	322								
	AVERAGES			12	0	2	5	0	20	0.3
	% OF TIME			.61	0.00	0.12	0.27	0.00		
LARGE	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	318								
	AVERAGES			10	0	1	6	0	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			.61	0.00	0.04	0.35	0.00		
COOK	COOK									
	TOTAL N	175								
	AVERAGES			10	0	1	6	0	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			.60	0.00	0.05	0.35	0.01		
TOTAL N		978								
	AVERAGES			11	0	1	6	0	19	0.3
	% OF TIME			.59	0.00	0.08	0.33	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	127								
	AVERAGES			87	0	10	73	0	170	2.8
	% OF TIME			.51	0.00	0.06	0.43	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	162								
	AVERAGES			76	1	21	32	0	129	2.2
	% OF TIME			.59	0.01	0.16	0.25	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	190								
	AVERAGES			57	0	15	50	0	123	2.0
	% OF TIME			0.46	0.00	0.13	0.41	0.00		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	100								
	AVERAGES			66	0	5	27	0	99	1.6
	% OF TIME			.67	0.00	0.05	0.28	0.00		
	UNKNOWN									
	TOTAL N	1								
	AVERAGES			97	0	0	41	0	138	2.3
	% OF TIME			.70	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00		
TOTAL N		580								
AVERAGES				70	0	14	46	0	131	2.2
% OF TIME				.54	0.00	0.11	0.35	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	150		66	10	2	15	0	94	1.6
	AVERAGES			.71	0.11	0.03	0.16	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	173		77	10	1	27	0	115	1.9
	AVERAGES			.67	0.08	0.01	0.23	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	118		76	12	2	23	0	114	1.9
	AVERAGES			.67	0.11	0.01	0.21	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	55		34	4	0	6	0	44	.7
	AVERAGES			.77	0.09	0.00	0.14	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
TOTAL N		496		69	10	2	20	0	100	1.7
AVERAGES				.69	0.10	0.02	0.20	0.00		
% OF TIME										

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	135								
	AVERAGES			34	3	1	10	0	49	.8
	% OF TIME			.70	0.06	0.03	0.21	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	257								
	AVERAGES			37	4	1	15	0	57	.9
	% OF TIME			.66	0.06	0.02	0.26	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	210								
	AVERAGES			35	6	1	10	0	52	.9
	% OF TIME			.67	0.11	0.03	0.20	0.00		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	193								
	AVERAGES			24	1	0	7	0	32	.5
	% OF TIME			.74	0.04	0.01	0.21	0.01		
TOTAL N		795								
AVERAGES				33	4	1	11	0	48	.8
% OF TIME				.68	0.07	0.02	0.22	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	163		10	2	3	7	0	22	0.4
	AVERAGES			0.48	0.07	0.14	0.31	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	322		9	3	3	6	0	20	0.3
	AVERAGES			0.42	0.14	0.12	0.31	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	318		7	2	4	4	0	17	0.3
	AVERAGES			0.39	0.11	0.27	0.23	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	175		5	2	2	7	0	17	0.3
	AVERAGES			0.30	0.13	0.12	0.44	0.01		
	% OF TIME									
TOTAL N		978		8	2	3	6	0	19	0.3
AVERAGES				0.40	0.12	0.17	0.31	0.00		
% OF TIME										

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	127		89	7	3	71	0	170	2.8
	AVERAGES			.52	0.04	0.02	0.42	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	162		73	6	7	43	0	129	2.2
	AVERAGES			.56	0.05	0.06	0.33	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	190		58	6	7	52	0	123	2.0
	AVERAGES			0.47	0.05	0.05	0.42	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	100		68	6	2	23	0	99	1.6
	AVERAGES			.69	0.06	0.02	0.23	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
	UNKNOWN									
	TOTAL N	1		97	0	15	26	0	138	2.3
	AVERAGES			.70	0.00	0.11	0.19	0.00		
	% OF TIME									
TOTAL N		580		71	6	5	48	0	131	2.2
AVERAGES				.54	0.05	0.04	0.37	0.00		
% OF TIME										

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL						
	TOTAL N	150					
	AVERAGES			61	33	94	1.6
	% OF TIME			.65	0.35		
	MEDIUM						
	TOTAL N	173					
	AVERAGES			71	44	115	1.9
	% OF TIME			.62	0.38		
	LARGE						
	TOTAL N	118					
	AVERAGES			72	42	114	1.9
	% OF TIME			.63	0.37		
	COOK						
	TOTAL N	55					
	AVERAGES			34	11	44	.7
	% OF TIME			.76	0.24		
TOTAL N		496					
AVERAGES				64	36	100	1.7
% OF TIME				.64	0.36		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL						
	TOTAL N	135					
	AVERAGES			31	18	49	.8
	% OF TIME			.64	0.36		
	MEDIUM						
	TOTAL N	257					
	AVERAGES			34	23	57	.9
	% OF TIME			.60	0.40		
	LARGE						
	TOTAL N	210					
	AVERAGES			33	20	52	.9
	% OF TIME			.63	0.37		
	COOK						
	TOTAL N	193					
	AVERAGES			23	9	32	.5
	% OF TIME			.72	0.28		
TOTAL N		795					
AVERAGES				31	18	48	.8
% OF TIME				.63	0.37		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL						
	TOTAL N	163		10	12	22	0.4
	AVERAGES			0.44	.56		
	% OF TIME						
	MEDIUM						
	TOTAL N	322		8	13	20	0.3
	AVERAGES			0.37	.63		
	% OF TIME						
	LARGE						
	TOTAL N	318		6	10	17	0.3
	AVERAGES			0.39	.61		
	% OF TIME						
	COOK						
	TOTAL N	175		4	12	17	0.3
	AVERAGES			0.27	.73		
	% OF TIME						
TOTAL N		978		7	12	19	0.3
AVERAGES				0.37	.63		
% OF TIME							

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL						
	TOTAL N	127					
	AVERAGES			84	85	170	2.8
	% OF TIME			0.50	.50		
	MEDIUM						
	TOTAL N	162					
	AVERAGES			66	63	129	2.2
	% OF TIME			.51	0.49		
	LARGE						
	TOTAL N	190					
	AVERAGES			52	70	123	2.0
	% OF TIME			0.43	.57		
COOK							
TOTAL N	100						
AVERAGES			65	33	99	1.6	
% OF TIME			.66	0.34			
UNKNOWN							
TOTAL N	1						
AVERAGES			97	41	138	2.3	
% OF TIME			.70	0.30			
TOTAL N		580					
AVERAGES			66	65	131	2.2	
% OF TIME			.50	0.50			

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	150									
	AVERAGES			57	14	4	4	15	0	94	1.6
	% OF TIME			.60	0.15	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	173									
	AVERAGES			52	41	2	6	13	0	115	1.9
	% OF TIME			0.46	0.36	0.02	0.06	0.11	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	118									
	AVERAGES			66	26	1	13	8	0	114	1.9
	% OF TIME			.58	0.23	0.01	0.11	0.07	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	55									
	AVERAGES			37	0	0	5	1	0	44	.7
	% OF TIME			.84	0.01	0.00	0.12	0.03	0.00		
TOTAL N		496									
AVERAGES				55	25	2	7	11	0	100	1.7
% OF TIME				.55	0.25	0.02	0.07	0.11	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	135									
	AVERAGES			34	5	1	2	6	0	49	.8
	% OF TIME			.69	0.11	0.03	0.04	0.13	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	257									
	AVERAGES			33	16	0	3	5	0	57	.9
	% OF TIME			.58	0.28	0.00	0.05	0.09	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	210									
	AVERAGES			39	5	0	4	4	0	52	.9
	% OF TIME			.74	0.10	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	193									
	AVERAGES			20	0	0	11	1	0	32	.5
	% OF TIME			.61	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.04	0.01		
TOTAL N		795									
AVERAGES				31	7	0	5	4	0	48	.8
% OF TIME				.65	0.15	0.01	0.11	0.09	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	163									
	AVERAGES			18	0	0	0	3	0	22	0.4
	% OF TIME			.83	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.14	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	322									
	AVERAGES			17	2	0	0	1	0	20	0.3
	% OF TIME			.83	0.10	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	318									
	AVERAGES			15	0	0	1	0	0	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			.90	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.02	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	175									
	AVERAGES			14	0	0	2	0	0	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			.86	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.02	0.01		
TOTAL N		978									
AVERAGES				16	1	0	1	1	0	19	0.3
% OF TIME				.85	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.06	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	127									
	AVERAGES			129	1	8	1	30	0	170	2.8
	% OF TIME			.76	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.18	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	162									
	AVERAGES			99	9	6	3	12	0	129	2.2
	% OF TIME			.77	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.09	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	190									
	AVERAGES			110	5	3	0	4	0	123	2.0
	% OF TIME			.89	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	100									
	AVERAGES			81	0	0	14	3	0	99	1.6
	% OF TIME			.82	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.03	0.00		
	UNKNOWN										
	TOTAL N	1									
	AVERAGES			53	0	80	5	0	0	138	2.3
	% OF TIME			0.38	0.00	.58	0.04	0.00	0.00		
TOTAL N		580									
AVERAGES				106	5	5	4	12	0	131	2.2
% OF TIME				.81	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.09	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	SUPVSN INTAKE	PAPERWORK CORRESP	COURT HEARING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MAXIMUM	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	150		75	13	4	2	1	0	94	1.6
	AVERAGES			.79	0.13	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.00		
	% OF TIME										
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	173		88	15	5	4	3	0	115	1.9
	AVERAGES			.76	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.00		
	% OF TIME										
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	118		79	19	9	4	3	0	114	1.9
	AVERAGES			.69	0.17	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.00		
	% OF TIME										
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	55		28	7	6	2	1	0	44	.7
	AVERAGES			.63	0.16	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.00		
	% OF TIME										
TOTAL N		496		75	14	6	3	2	0	100	1.7
AVERAGES				.75	0.14	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.00		
% OF TIME											

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	SUPVSN INTAKE	PAPERWORK CORRESP	COURT HEARING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MEDIUM	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	135									
	AVERAGES			37	9	2	0	0	0	49	.8
	% OF TIME			.76	0.19	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	257									
	AVERAGES			42	8	2	2	2	0	57	.9
	% OF TIME			.75	0.15	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	210									
	AVERAGES			36	10	4	2	2	0	52	.9
	% OF TIME			.68	0.18	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	193									
	AVERAGES			15	3	11	1	2	0	32	.5
	% OF TIME			0.48	0.10	0.35	0.02	0.05	0.01		
TOTAL N		795									
AVERAGES				33	8	.5	1	2	0	48	.8
% OF TIME				.69	0.16	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	SUPVSN INTAKE	PAPERWORK CORRESP	COURT HEARING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
MINIMUM	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	163									
	AVERAGES			13	8	0	0	0	0	22	0.4
	% OF TIME			.59	0.36	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	322									
	AVERAGES			14	5	0	1	1	0	20	0.3
	% OF TIME			.68	0.23	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	318									
	AVERAGES			9	7	1	0	1	0	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			.53	0.39	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N	175									
	AVERAGES			7	6	2	1	2	0	17	0.3
	% OF TIME			0.41	0.35	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.01		
TOTAL N		978									
AVERAGES				11	6	.1	0	1	0	19	0.3
% OF TIME				.58	0.32	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - SUPERVISION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

CASE TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	*** SUPVSN INTAKE	PAPERWORK CORRESP	COURT HEARING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
INTAKE	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	127								
	AVERAGES		106	46	0	1	17	0	170	2.8
	% OF TIME		.63	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	162								
	AVERAGES		71	43	2	4	9	0	129	2.2
	% OF TIME		.55	0.33	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	190								
	AVERAGES		77	38	0	4	3	0	123	2.0
	% OF TIME		.63	0.31	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	100								
	AVERAGES		63	22	2	5	6	0	99	1.6
	% OF TIME		.64	0.22	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.00		
	UNKNOWN									
	TOTAL N	1								
	AVERAGES		85	30	0	11	12	0	138	2.3
	% OF TIME		.62	0.22	0.00	0.08	0.09	0.00		
TOTAL N		580								
AVERAGES			79	38	1	3	8	0	131	2.2
% OF TIME			.61	0.29	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	49								
	AVERAGES			111	6	50	296	0	464	7.7
	% OF TIME			0.24	0.01	0.11	.64	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	54								
	AVERAGES			113	6	53	340	0	512	8.5
	% OF TIME			0.22	0.01	0.10	.66	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	124								
	AVERAGES			58	7	50	270	1	386	6.4
	% OF TIME			0.15	0.02	0.13	.70	0.00		
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	COCK									
	TOTAL N	53								
	AVERAGES			67	0	32	117	0	216	3.6
	% OF TIME			0.31	0.00	0.15	.54	0.00		
	TOTAL N	280								
	AVERAGES			80	5	47	259	0	392	6.5
% OF TIME			0.20	0.01	0.12	.66	0.00			
PART PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	8								
	AVERAGES			35	3	45	99	0	181	3.0
	% OF TIME			0.19	0.01	0.25	.55	0.00		
LARGE										
TOTAL N	8									
AVERAGES			41	1	69	205	0	317	5.3	

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFENDER	VICTIM	OTHER	NONE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
	% OF TIME			0.13	0.00	0.22	.65	0.00		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	1		10	0	14	51	0	75	1.3
	% OF TIME			0.13	0.00	0.19	.68	0.00		
TOTAL N AVERAGES		17		37	2	54	146	0	239	4.0
% OF TIME				0.15	0.01	0.23	.61	0.00		
FULL PTI	COOK									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	41		73	0	29	116	0	218	3.6
	% OF TIME			0.33	0.00	0.13	.53	0.00		
TOTAL N AVERAGES		41		73	0	29	116	0	218	3.6
% OF TIME				0.33	0.00	0.13	.53	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	49								
	AVERAGES			132	24	16	293	0	464	7.7
	% OF TIME			0.28	0.05	0.03	.63	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	54								
	AVERAGES			72	16	17	407	1	512	8.5
	% OF TIME			0.14	0.03	0.03	.79	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	124								
AVERAGES				75	32	19	259	1	386	6.4
% OF TIME				0.19	0.08	0.05	.67	0.00		
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	COOK									
	TOTAL N	53								
	AVERAGES			71	14	9	122	0	216	3.6
	% OF TIME			0.33	0.07	0.04	.56	0.00		
TOTAL N	280									
AVERAGES				83	24	16	268	1	392	6.5
% OF TIME				0.21	0.06	0.04	.68	0.00		
PART PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	8								
	AVERAGES			59	26	4	92	0	181	3.0
	% OF TIME			0.33	0.14	0.02	.51	0.00		
LARGE										
TOTAL N	8									
AVERAGES				70	35	18	191	4	317	5.3

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	FACE TO FACE	TELEPHONE	MAIL	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
	% OF TIME			0.22	0.11	0.06	.60	0.01		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	1		10	14	0	51	0	75	1.3
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		17		0.13	0.19	0.00	.68	0.00		
				61	29	10	136	2	239	4.0
				0.26	0.12	0.04	.57	0.01		
FULL PTI	COOK									
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	41		86	12	5	115	0	218	3.6
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		41		0.40	0.05	0.02	.53	0.00		
				86	12	5	115	0	218	3.6
				0.40	0.05	0.02	.53	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	*** CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL					
	TOTAL N	49				
	AVERAGES		110	353	464	7.7
	% OF TIME		0.24	.76		
	MEDIUM					
	TOTAL N	54				
	AVERAGES		53	459	512	8.5
	% OF TIME		0.10	.90		
	LARGE					
	TOTAL N	124				
	AVERAGES		51	335	386	6.4
	% OF TIME		0.13	.87		
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	COOK					
	TOTAL N	53				
	AVERAGES		62	154	216	3.6
	% OF TIME		0.29	.71		
	TOTAL N	280				
	AVERAGES		64	328	392	6.5
% OF TIME		0.16	.84			
PART PSI	SMALL					
	TOTAL N	8				
	AVERAGES		35	146	181	3.0
	% OF TIME		0.19	.81		
LARGE						
TOTAL N	8					
AVERAGES		39	279	317	5.3	

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	CLIENT FACE TO FACE	ALL OTHER	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
	% OF TIME			0.12	.88		
	COOK						
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	1		10	65	75	1.3
	% OF TIME			0.13	.87		
TOTAL N AVERAGES		17		35	204	239	4.0
% OF TIME				0.15	.85		
FULL PTI	COOK						
	TOTAL N AVERAGES	41		71	147	218	3.6
	% OF TIME			0.33	.67		
TOTAL N AVERAGES		41		71	147	218	3.6
% OF TIME				0.33	.67		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	49									
	AVERAGES			329	0	25	9	83	18	464	7.7
	% OF TIME			.71	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.18	0.04		
	MEDIUM										
	TOTAL N	54									
	AVERAGES			393	5	10	3	102	0	512	8.5
	% OF TIME			.77	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.20	0.00		
	LARGE										
	TOTAL N	124									
	AVERAGES			294	4	18	9	61	1	386	6.4
	% OF TIME			.76	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.16	0.00		
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	COOK										
	TOTAL N	53									
	AVERAGES			122	0	19	56	19	0	216	3.6
	% OF TIME			.56	0.00	0.09	0.26	0.09	0.00		
	TOTAL N	280									
AVERAGES			287	2	18	16	65	4	392	6.5	
% OF TIME			.73	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.17	0.01			
PART PSI	SMALL										
	TOTAL N	8									
	AVERAGES			131	0	7	0	43	0	181	3.0
	% OF TIME			.72	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.24	0.00		
LARGE											
TOTAL N	8										
AVERAGES			219	3	23	10	63	0	317	5.3	

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	***	OFFICE	HOME	JAIL	COURT	OTHE	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
	% OF TIME			.69	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.20	0.00		
	COOK										
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	1		10	0	0	65	0	0	75	1.3
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		17		0.13	0.00	0.00	.87	0.00	0.00		
				165	1	14	9	50	0	239	4.0
				.69	0.00	0.06	0.04	0.21	0.00		
FULL PTI	COOK										
	TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME	41		138	0	7	60	14	0	218	3.6
TOTAL N AVERAGES % OF TIME		41		.63	0.00	0.03	0.27	0.06	0.00		
				138	0	7	60	14	0	218	3.6
				.63	0.00	0.03	0.27	0.06	0.00		

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	*** INTERVIEWING	INFORMATION GATHERING	REPORT WRITING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
FULL PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	49								
	AVERAGES		138	138	171	4	13	0	464	7.7
	% OF TIME		0.30	0.30	0.37	0.01	0.03	0.00		
	MEDIUM									
	TOTAL N	54								
	AVERAGES		52	102	350	6	2	0	512	8.5
	% OF TIME		0.10	0.20	.68	0.01	0.00	0.00		
	LARGE									
	TOTAL N	124								
	AVERAGES		57	132	152	7	37	1	386	6.4
	% OF TIME		0.15	0.34	0.39	0.02	0.10	0.00		
COOK										
TOTAL N	53									
AVERAGES		60	46	91	2	17	1	216	3.6	
% OF TIME		0.28	0.21	0.42	0.01	0.08	0.01			
TOTAL N	280									
AVERAGES		71	111	182	5	22	1	392	6.5	
% OF TIME		0.18	0.28	0.46	0.01	0.06	0.00			
PART PSI	SMALL									
	TOTAL N	8								
	AVERAGES		65	67	19	7	23	0	181	3.0
	% OF TIME		0.36	0.37	0.11	0.04	0.13	0.00		
LARGE										
TOTAL N	8									
AVERAGES		44	93	121	18	39	3	317	5.3	

ILLINOIS COURTS 1987 TIME STUDY - INVESTIGATION

PREPARED BY
NCCD
MADISON, WI

CASES MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARDS

INVESTIGATION TYPE	AGENCY SIZE	TOTAL CASES	*** INTERVIEWING	INFORMATION GATHERING	REPORT WRITING	CASE STAFFING	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL MINUTES	TOTAL HOURS
	% OF TIME		0.14	0.29	0.38	0.06	0.12	0.01		
	COOK									
	TOTAL N	1								
	AVERAGES		10	40	25	0	0	0	75	1.3
	% OF TIME		0.13	.53	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00		
TOTAL N		17								
AVERAGES			52	78	68	12	29	1	239	4.0
% OF TIME			0.22	0.32	0.28	0.05	0.12	0.00		
FULL PTI	COOK									
	TOTAL N	41								
	AVERAGES		69	50	86	5	8	0	218	3.6
	% OF TIME		0.32	0.23	0.40	0.02	0.04	0.00		
TOTAL N		41								
AVERAGES			69	50	86	5	8	0	218	3.6
% OF TIME			0.32	0.23	0.40	0.02	0.04	0.00		