

*Ann Young* *th*

C.1

A COST STUDY OF  
THE JUVENILE VOLUNTEER COURT INVESTIGATOR PROGRAM

by

Clifton A Rhodes  
Principal Management Analyst

67936

Hennepin County Court Services

February 1978



DATE: 14 March 1978  
TO: HCCS Administrative Staff  
FROM: Clif Rhodes,  
Principal Management Analyst  
SUBJECT: Executive Summary of a Cost Study of the  
Juvenile Court Investigator Program

**HENNEPIN COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF COURT SERVICES**

A cost study of HCCS' Juvenile Court Investigator Program was recently completed. This memorandum provides a brief description of the objectives, methods and findings of that study.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In early 1976 Director Ken Young asked that more complete data be obtained on the cost of using volunteers to provide services in HCCS.

The initial focus of study was the volunteer court investigator program in the Juvenile Division. A four-member ad hoc committee was formed to carry out the cost study.<sup>1</sup> The committee's objectives included: (1) to develop a model for collecting cost data on the volunteer court investigator program; and, (2) to calculate the total cost and unit cost associated with this volunteer service.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To verify and validate the research findings -- particularly where judgment data were involved -- the committee adopted the adversary principle as a guidepost for discussions. The principle called for the individual members of the committee to represent explicitly different points of view when reviewing relevant cost data. In effect, the three program staff members on the committee served as research "critics" and occasional "adversaries." They also assumed responsibility for some data collection activities. The fourth member of the committee, a social researcher, served the committee as both a "facilitator" (re developing necessary data collection methods) and a "mediator" (re managing conflict or differences of opinion).

The pivotal question in developing a conceptual framework for measurement was, "What are the primary sources of cost (i.e., the expenditure of organizational resources) for the juvenile court investigator program?" The answer to this question led to the identification of two types of organiza-

---

<sup>1</sup>The committee included: Clifton Rhodes, Principal Management Analyst; Thomas Faust, Principal Probation Officer; Richard Hodgkins, Director of Volunteer Services; and, Robert Leach, Principal Probation Officer.

tional resource that are spent in developing and supporting this program. The first involves the "time of paid staff," including that of both professional and clerical personnel. The second involves several "miscellaneous support activities" which are needed to sustain a volunteer program.

The committee assumed that dollar costs can be estimated for both paid staff time and miscellaneous support. Examination of the latter type of expenditure resulted in the quick identification of four support activities: (1) car mileage; (2) in-service training where an outside resource is used; (3) the volunteer newsletter; and, (4) an awards ceremony.

In identifying relevant paid staff activities, the committee developed a role cost model. The model stems from the concept of the volunteer's "role set." That is: In occupying a position or role in HCCS, the volunteer court investigator necessarily relates to a set of actors who occupy other organizational roles. Where such roles are occupied by a paid staff member there exists the possibility of a cost to the organization. The term "role cost" is used to describe this circumstance. The role cost model calls for pyramiding the various role costs (i.e., time invested by role occupants multiplied by hourly or annual pay rate) in determining the total cost of a volunteer program.<sup>1</sup>

The primary method of data collection for documenting the cost of miscellaneous support activities involved the inspection of existing administrative reports in the volunteer program. On the other hand, the collection of data related to paid staff time involved either an interview or a self-administered questionnaire. (A total of 34 individuals were surveyed by the committee.) The time frame for the cost study was calendar year 1976.

#### RESEARCH FINDINGS

Calculating the unit cost (i.e., cost per report) for the court investigator program involved two basic steps: (1) developing a total cost estimate for program operation during the study period; and, (2) dividing the total cost estimate by the total number of pre-disposition reports completed by volunteers during the same period, i.e., 227.

The total cost of the court investigator program for the 12 month study period was estimated at \$27,867. The following table summarizes the amount contributed to this total by the major cost categories (i.e., role costs and miscellaneous support activities).

---

<sup>1</sup>In this instance, all hourly or annual rates include fringe benefits.

TABLE: TOTAL COST ESTIMATE

COST CATEGORY	COST ESTIMATE	
	Dollars	%
1. Juvenile Volunteer Administrator	\$ 4,790	17.2%
2. Juvenile Volunteer Secretary	2,226	8.0%
3. Unit Supervisors	3,055	11.0%
4. Line Probation Officers	12,742	45.7%
5. Clerk Typists	1,069	3.8%
6. Administrative Overhead <sup>1</sup>	2,355	8.4%
7. Miscellaneous	1,630	5.9%
TOTALS:	27,867	100.0%

The unit cost for the study period was found to be \$123 per volunteer report. This estimate was obtained by dividing the total cost estimate of \$27,867 by 227 reports. By way of comparison, the unit cost for paid staff reports in calendar year 1976 was estimated at \$279 -- or a cost difference of \$156.

The implications of the study findings for administrative decision-making and future research are discussed in the committee's final report: A Cost Study of the Juvenile Volunteer Court Investigator Program (HCCS, February 1978).

<sup>1</sup>Administrative Overhead involved time contributed by the occupants of several administrative and staff positions in and outside the Juvenile Division.

<sup>2</sup>The unit cost estimate for paid staff reports is based on time and cost data supplied by the Division Director. It should be noted that 1078 reports were completed by paid staff during 1976. Moreover, a time study during that same period showed that P.O.'s spent an average of 16 hours on a pre-disposition investigation.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report accounts for research on the cost of HCCS' Juvenile Volunteer Court Investigator Program. While the report reflects the work of many people both inside and outside the Juvenile Probation Division, the author assumes sole responsibility for the presentation and interpretation of the research findings.

The author would like to express special appreciation to members of the ad hoc research team that helped to design and implement this cost study. Included are Tom Faust, Dick Hodgkins and Bob Leach. A note of gratitude is also in order for the contribution of time, interest and direct support by two Department administrators -- Jim Bergum, the Director of the Juvenile Division and Tom Lavelle, the Assistant Director of the Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESEARCH FOCUS AND OBJECTIVES . . . . . 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM . . . . . 2

    Organizational Development . . . . . 3

    Organizational Career of the Court Investigator . . . . . 5

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY . . . . . 6

    The Research Team . . . . . 6

    Conceptual Framework for Measurement . . . . . 7

    Data Collection Methods . . . . . 12

RESEARCH FINDINGS . . . . . 12

    Computational Formulae . . . . . 12

    Cost Data . . . . . 16

IMPLICATIONS FOR DECISION-MAKING . . . . . 17

    Administrative Decision-Making . . . . . 17

    Future Research . . . . . 23

APPENDIX . . . . . 24

This report describes a study aimed at determining the cost of having volunteers develop pre-disposition reports.<sup>1,2</sup> The setting for the research was the Juvenile Probation Division of Hennepin County Court Services (HCCS).

The report is divided into five sections: the first discusses the focus and objectives of the research; the second describes the volunteer court investigator program in HCCS' Juvenile Division; the third provides an overview of the study methodology; the fourth presents the major findings; and, the fifth discusses the implications of the findings for administrative decision-making and future research.

#### RESEARCH FOCUS AND OBJECTIVES

HCCS operates a large and diversified volunteer program. During 1976 -- the period of the study -- there were approximately 550 active volunteers participating in eighteen different service roles.

The development and maintenance of a volunteer program obviously cost money.<sup>3</sup> Yet, most costs have remained "hidden" or unaccounted for because of their indirect nature.

---

<sup>1</sup>The terms "volunteer" and "unpaid staff" are used interchangeably in this report. Note, at the same time, that one category of unpaid staff was excluded from consideration in the research, namely, student interns. The initial cost study focused on the work of unpaid staff who were recruited and trained by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator.

<sup>2</sup>The pre-disposition or pre-hearing report is a three-page document prepared by a Juvenile Division staff member (e.g., probation officer, volunteer) prior to the disposition hearing. As a rule, development of the report requires face-to-face contact with the juvenile offender and several significant others (e.g., family members school officials). The report is divided into four sections: unlawful conduct, the child, the family, and treatment recommendations.

<sup>3</sup>For example: as of June 1976 the monthly payroll was \$8,993.69 for the 3 professional positions (i.e., Director of Volunteer Services, Juvenile Volunteer Administrator, and Adult Volunteer Administrator) and 3 clerical positions assigned directly to the Department's volunteer program. The total for 12 months was approximately \$107,924. These calculations do not include fringe benefits.

Following the Department's budget hearings in Spring 1976, Director Ken Young expressed concern about the lack of data on the cost of volunteer services. In June 1976, he charged two staff members -- the author and Dick Hodgkins, the Director of Volunteer Services -- with the task of securing more complete volunteer cost information.

Given the number of service roles occupied by unpaid staff, the research team had to make a choice regarding the initial focus of study. The choice was the court investigator role (or program) in the Juvenile Division. This decision was prompted by two considerations: (1) the prominence and importance of the court investigator role in the Juvenile Division; and, (2) the fact that a similar role exists for unpaid staff in two other HCCS service divisions. The latter point was deemed important because of the desire to use the same data collection model in more than one division.

The time frame for the initial study was defined as calendar year 1976.

The objectives of the study were identified as follows:

1. To develop a model for the collection of data on the cost of the volunteer court investigator program; and,
2. To calculate the total cost and unit cost associated with this volunteer service.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

This section describes the role of juvenile court investigator from the perspective of both organizational development and the organizational career of the volunteer.

### Organizational Development

HCCS' volunteer program began in the Fall of 1969. The program is designed to serve as an integral part of the Department's service delivery system. This is illustrated by the following policy statement:<sup>1</sup>

The Department of Court Services as the rehabilitation agent of the Hennepin County court system realizes that its mission cannot be fully accomplished with only the use of paid staff. The service that is needed can be expanded and intensified by using individuals from the community as unpaid staff. The type of service provided by unpaid staff may vary depending on the individual's interests, knowledge, skills, and talents. These services include probation, detention, residential treatment, family counseling and other diagnostic and therapeutic services.

Unpaid staff involvement can be maximized when used as an integral part of the service delivery team: the team being professional and unpaid staff. In this team approach, each has his own respective responsibilities relating to clients, supervisors and each other. The professional assumes the role of consultant and supervisor, while the unpaid staff member provides the direct service as assigned. As a member of this team, the unpaid staff member participates fully in helping each client to experience more improve functioning.

Unpaid staff can also be effectively utilized in sharing in administrative responsibilities, community organization tasks, and program development.

In brief, the basic purpose of HCCS' volunteer program is two-fold:

(1) to intensify the quantity and quality of services for individuals and families referred to court; and, (2) to establish a communication link between the community and two basic components of the local criminal justice system, namely, the court(s) and HCCS.

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that the policy statement regarding HCCS' use of unpaid staff is currently being revised by Department administrators. Readers who are interested in obtaining a copy of the new statement should contact HCCS' Director of Volunteer Services.

The court investigator role is one of six roles occupied by unpaid staff in the Juvenile Division.<sup>1</sup> It was established in 1970, with funding for training and research being provided by a LEAA supportive services grant.

The development of the court investigator role stemmed from a 1969 assessment that the rate of referrals to the Juvenile Court did not permit probation officers to spend enough time in providing direct supervision to juvenile probationers. HCCS administrators determined that on the average nearly one-half of a probation officer's time involved the preparation and presentation of pre-disposition reports to the Juvenile Court. They concluded that considerable time savings could result if volunteers were assigned responsibility for completing some pre-disposition investigations. It was assumed that the necessary quality of the investigative process and written report could be achieved through an intensive training program for such volunteers and the provision of on-going supervision by line probation officers.

Since the inception of the juvenile court investigator program approximately 2400 pre-disposition reports have been completed by volunteers. Included in this number are 227 reports for calendar year 1976.<sup>2</sup>

During the study period there were approximately 31 active volunteers on the juvenile court investigator roster. While there was some variation in the number assigned to the five field units in the Juvenile Division, the average number per unit was 6.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The 6 roles are: Volunteer Court Investigator, Volunteer Probation Officer, Court Officer-Court Interviewer, Guardian Ad Litem, Volunteer Monitor, and Volunteer Teacher.

<sup>2</sup>Volunteer reports (227) represented approximately 17% of all reports (1305) completed during calendar year 1976.

<sup>3</sup>The Juvenile Division was reorganized in January 1978. There are now 3 field units.

### Organizational Career of the Court Investigator

The organizational career of the typical court investigator involves four basic stages: recruit, trainee, assigned court investigator, and transfer (or termination). These stages are characterized by the following tasks and conditions.

1. The recruit - The individual must submit a written application to the volunteer program and participate in a screening interview conducted by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator. At the time of the interview, the individual is informed that the volunteer contract for a court investigator involves a 24 month service commitment. During this period the volunteer is expected to complete an average of 1 pre-disposition investigation per month.
2. The trainee - The individual is expected to participate in a series of 16 group training sessions, which are planned and conducted by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator.<sup>1</sup> At the end of the eighth training session the trainee is placed in a probation unit for concurrent "on-the-job training."
3. The assigned court investigator - Upon successful completion of the training program, the volunteer is formally assigned to a probation unit. This assignment brings with it: (a) the identification of a line probation officer with whom the volunteer will work on a continuing basis; (b) the opportunity for in-service training conducted by the unit supervisor; and, (c) the acceptance of juvenile cases on which pre-disposition investigations are to be completed. Court investigators operate with varying degrees of independence. The amount of autonomy generally depends on the experience and ability of the volunteer as well as the expectations and organizational style of the professional staff member with whom the volunteer is working. At the same time, it should be noted that from the court's perspective the line probation officer and unit supervisor are ultimately responsible for the quality of the volunteer's work. For this reason, these paid staff members must provide some form of on-going supervision. Moreover, a line probation officer is expected to appear in court at the time that all juveniles (and corresponding case reports) appear for a disposition hearing.

---

<sup>1</sup>Other paid and unpaid staff also assume responsibility for presenting material in these training sessions.

4. The transfer (or termination) - After a period of service as a court investigator, volunteers are sometimes transferred to another service role (e.g., a case monitor) or assigned additional responsibility for case follow-up.<sup>1</sup> Such transfers generally involve discussions with the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator. The same is true at the time that the court investigator terminates from the volunteer program.

### THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research model used in the cost study involved three key elements: (1) an ad hoc research team responsible for developing and implementing a data collection plan; (2) a conceptual framework for measurement; and, (3) the development and use of several data collection instruments.

#### The Research Team

The methods and results of the cost study were greatly influenced by the composition and process of the ad hoc research team.

Preliminary work on the research design and data collection was carried out by a two-member team consisting of the Department's program evaluator and the Director of Volunteer Services. A review of the research findings at the end of this phase of work led to a significant change in the team's composition and method of operation.

Concern was voiced by the Juvenile Division's Director that the objectivity of the research findings might be questioned if the research team were limited to two members -- particularly when one of the two should be judged an "advocate" of the program. To correct this situation, the Division Director was asked to appoint two additional team members. It was agreed

---

<sup>1</sup>Occasionally, volunteers also accept time-limited assignments as paid staff members.

that these appointments should include paid staff members who were known to be critical of using organizational resources to support a volunteer program.<sup>1</sup>

New ground rules were explicated at the initial meeting of the expanded research team. A critical decision involved the recognition of individual biases and preferences. This decision led to the use of the adversary principle in team discussions.<sup>2</sup> The adversary principle called for individual team members to represent explicitly different points of view when reviewing relevant cost data. It was hoped that this discussion model would serve to verify and validate the research findings.

In addition to serving as research "critics" and occasional "adversaries," the three program staff members on the team assumed responsibility for some data collection activities. However, primary responsibility for data collection was vested in the fourth member of the team, the program evaluator. The evaluator also served the team as a "facilitator" (with regard to developing necessary data collection methods) and a "mediator" (with regard to managing conflict or differences of opinion).

#### Conceptual Framework for Measurement

The pivotal question in developing a conceptual framework for measurement was, "What are the primary sources of cost (i.e., the expenditure of organizational resources) for the juvenile court investigator program?"

---

<sup>1</sup>The team members appointed at this time were Bob Leach, principal probation officer, and Tom Faust, principal probation officer.

<sup>2</sup>For a discussion of the adversary approach in evaluation research use: Murray Levin, "Scientific Method and the Adversary Model: Some Preliminary Suggestions," The Journal of Educational Evaluation, Vol. 4., No. 2, June 1973; and, Marilyn Kourilsky, "An Adversary Model for Educational Evaluation," The Journal of Educational Evaluation, Vol. 4, June 1973.

The answer to this question led to the identification of two types of organizational resource that are spent in developing and supporting the program. The first involves the time of paid staff, including both professional and clerical personnel. The second involves several miscellaneous support activities which are needed to maintain a volunteer program.

The research team assumed that dollar costs could be estimated for both staff time and miscellaneous support. Examination of the latter type of expenditure resulted in the quick identification of four support activities: (1) car mileage; (2) in-service training where an outside resource is used; (3) the newsletter (i.e., The Informer); and, (4) an awards ceremony. On the other hand, the identification of relevant paid staff activities involved a much more time consuming research exercise. In this regard, the research team focused initially on the development of a conceptual model keyed to the notion of role cost.

Role Cost Model. The role cost model stems from the concept of the volunteer's role set. That is: in occupying a position or role in HCCS, the volunteer court investigator necessarily relates to a set of actors who occupy other organizational roles. Where such roles are occupied by a paid staff member there exists the possibility of a cost to the organization. The term role cost is used to describe this circumstance.

The role cost model calls for pyramiding the various role costs in determining the total cost of a volunteer program.

Close examination of the role set of the juvenile court investigator led the research team to identify several paid staff roles that are connected to the operation of the court investigator program. The most proximate include:

1. The Juvenile Volunteer Administrator,
2. The secretary to the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator,
3. The unit supervisor,
4. The line probation officer, and
5. The clerk typist.

Other roles that are salient, but more distant, relate mainly to administrative positions inside and outside the Juvenile Division. These include:

1. The Division Supervisor,
2. The Director of HCCS,
3. The Director of Volunteer Services,
4. The secretary to the Director of Volunteer Services,
5. HCCS' Business Officer,
6. The secretary to the Business Officer,
7. The Director of Probation Evaluation, and
8. The secretary/research assistant of the program evaluator.

In effect, these latter set of roles represent a form of "administrative overhead" for the juvenile court investigator program.

Corresponding Staff Activities. In the process of collecting relevant cost data, occupants of all the paid staff positions identified above were interviewed. Each of these interviews began with a question regarding the performance of activities that might be viewed as supporting the juvenile court investigator program.

Three of the paid staff roles received more attention than the others, namely, the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator, the line probation officer, and the unit supervisor. This was due to the research team's assumption that these roles account for most of the costs attributable to the court investigator program.

The team determined that the work activities of the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator corresponded with the career stages of the juvenile court investigator. This point is illustrated by the following table.

TABLE 1: CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WORK ACTIVITIES OF JUVENILE VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATOR AND CAREER STAGES OF VOLUNTEER

Work Activities of Juvenile Volunteer Administrator	Career Stages of Volunteer Court Investigator
1. <u>Program Planning</u> , as it involves program analysis/evaluation, needs assessment, and program direction and design.	
2. <u>Recruitment and Selection</u> , as they involve interacting with unpaid/paid staff, public speaking and public information, and interviewing program applicants.	The Recruit
3. <u>Training</u> , as it involves preparation time, coordination/organization, presentation/attendance, and evaluation/follow-up.	The Trainee
4. <u>Supervision</u> , as it involves direct supervision of trainees, and problem solving/consultation.	The Assigned Court Investigator
5. <u>Terminations and/or Reassignment</u> , as they involve dismissals and assignments.	Transfer

The research team found, in turn, that the relevant activities of line probation officers and unit supervisors correspond closely with the points-in-process associated with the juvenile court investigator completing a pre-disposition investigation.<sup>1,2</sup> These points or process steps include:

1. Case Assignment - Unit Supervisor or line probation officer calls volunteer to assign case for pre-disposition investigation.
2. Case Planning - Two basic steps are usually involved:
  - a. Volunteer and line P.O. go over the case prior to (or shortly after) initial contact with the youth. They confer re available information; and, they determine who needs to be contacted.
  - b. Volunteer reports to line P.O. re what he/she has found out from the youth and significant others. In addition, options are explored re possible recommendations in the pre-disposition report.
3. Review of Written Report - Two basic steps are usually involved:
  - a. Volunteer and line P.O. examine draft of report to see if there is common understanding and agreement on its contents.
  - b. The report is then read/checked by the unit supervisor.
4. Court Appearance - A line P.O. must appear with the volunteer at the time that the case is presented in court.
5. Case Transfer/Reassignment - After the disposition hearing the case is generally transferred to a line P.O., who must in turn review the probation plan and develop a relationship with the juvenile client and/or his parents.

---

<sup>1</sup>Not included in these points-in-process is the time spent by unit supervisors in preparing for and presenting in-service training to court investigators.

<sup>2</sup>The time estimates for each point-in-process are presented in Appendix A.

### Data Collection Methods

The primary method of data collection for documenting the cost of miscellaneous support activities involved the inspection of existing administrative reports in the volunteer program. On the other hand, the collection of data related to paid staff time involved either an interview or a self-administered questionnaire.<sup>1,2</sup> A total of 34 individuals were involved in the latter survey including: 3 volunteers, 10 probation officers, 5 unit supervisors, 6 clerk typists, the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator, the Juvenile Volunteer Secretary, the Division Supervisor, the Director of HCCS, the Director of Volunteer Services, the secretary to the Director of Volunteer Services, HCCS' Business Officer, the secretary to the Business Officer, HCCS program evaluator, and the secretary/research assistant to the program evaluator.

### RESEARCH FINDINGS

This section presents the major findings of the cost study. The information provided includes the computational formulae used in making relevant cost calculations, and estimates for the total cost and unit cost associated with the court investigator program.

#### Computational Formulae

Calculating the unit cost (i.e., cost per report) for the court investigator program involved two basic steps:

---

<sup>1</sup>Initial consideration was given to the possibility of conducting a form of time-study where paid staff and unpaid staff would be asked to record the time spent on randomly selected reports. This method/design was rejected, since it appeared too cumbersome and unreliable.

<sup>2</sup>Two self-administered questionnaires were developed: one for probation officer (Appendix B) and a second for unit supervisors (Appendix C).

1. Developing a total cost estimate for program operation during the study period -- calendar year 1976; and,
2. Dividing the total cost estimate by the total number of pre-disposition reports completed by volunteers during the same period, i.e., 227.

The total cost estimate was obtained by summing the annual role costs for relevant paid staff and the annual costs for miscellaneous support activities.

The key elements in the computational formulae for the role costs of paid staff included: (1) an estimate of the time spent by the role occupant(s) in relating to the juvenile court investigator program; and, (2) the hourly (or annual) rate of pay for the position or role in question. To simplify the task of calculating the pay rate, the hourly and annual rates were taken as of June 1976.<sup>1,2</sup> Where more than one person was involved in a given paid staff role (e.g., unit supervisor, line P.O.), the average hourly and/or annual rate was used.

To illustrate the use of these principles, consider the calculation of role cost for unit supervisors. Two types of activity were accounted for in calculating the time invested by unit supervisors: (1) Role Cost ( $RC_1$ ) regarding time spent in training volunteers for court investigator responsibilities; and, (2) Role Cost ( $RC_2$ ) regarding time spent in supervising work related to the completion of pre-disposition reports by volunteers. Regarding training time, 5 unit supervisors estimated that they spent a grand total of 116 hours during the study period. Thus,

---

<sup>1</sup>HCCS employees received their only cost of living adjustment for calendar year 1976 in June of that year.

<sup>2</sup>All salary or wage figures included "fringe benefits."

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Role Cost}_1 (RC_1) &= \text{Total \# of hrs spent in training} \quad \times \quad \text{Average rate per hour} \\ &= 116 \text{ hrs} \quad \times \quad \$13.31 \\ &= \$1,543.96 \end{aligned}$$

Regarding supervising time, 15 respondents (unit supervisors and P.O.'s) estimated that supervisors spent an average of 30 minutes (.5 of an hour) per report. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Hours} &= \text{Average Time per report} \quad \times \quad \text{Total \# of Reports} \\ &= .5 \text{ hrs} \quad \times \quad 227 \text{ reports} \\ &= 113.5 \text{ hours} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Role Cost}_2 (RC_2) &= \text{Total Hours} \quad \times \quad \text{Average Rate per hour} \\ &= 113.5 \text{ hours} \quad \times \quad \$13.31 \\ &= \$1,510.69 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the total role cost for unit supervisor is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Role Cost} &= RC_1 + RC_2 \\ &= \$1,543.96 + \$1,510.69 \\ &= \$3,054.65 \end{aligned}$$

In some instances, role occupants could estimate the time they spent with "the volunteer program" in the Juvenile Division, but they could not break this down into a specific estimate for the court investigator pro-

gram. With these roles, the research team invoked the one-fifth-time rule. That is: It was assumed that the role occupant(s) spent an equal amount of time in relating to each of the five program areas in the Juvenile Volunteer Program.<sup>1</sup> Thus the specific time estimate for the court investigator program, as one of the 5 program areas, would be one-fifth or 20 percent of the role occupant's total time estimate.

For example, the Division Supervisor estimated that 5 percent of his time during the study period was spent in "volunteer-related" activity. Using the one-fifth-time rule, this meant that 1 percent of his time was spent in the court investigator program area. The calculation of the corresponding role cost is as follows:

Total Hours	=	Total Annual Hrs	X	% of time in Specific Program area
	=	2080 Hours <sup>2</sup>	X	.01
	=	20.8		
Role Cost	=	Total Hours	X	Hourly Rate
	=	20.8 Hours	X	\$16.81
	=	\$350		

---

<sup>1</sup>As reported in footnote no. 1, page 4, there are actually 6 roles or program areas in the Juvenile Volunteer Program. In developing the one-fifth-time rule 2 of these program areas -- monitoring and volunteer teacher -- were given a "one-half" weighting based on time and staff commitment estimates by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator and the Director of Volunteer Services.

<sup>2</sup>2080 hours is the base number of paid work hours in a 12 month period, assuming 52 weeks in a year and 40 work hours per week.

Cost Data

The total cost estimate for the court investigator program in 1976 was \$27,867. The following table summarizes the amount contributed to this estimate by the major cost categories (i.e., role costs and miscellaneous support activities).<sup>1</sup>

TABLE 2: TOTAL COST ESTIMATE

COST CATEGORY	COST ESTIMATE	
	Dollars	%
1. Juvenile Volunteer Administrator	\$ 4,790	17.2%
2. Juvenile Volunteer Secretary	2,226	8.0%
3. Unit Supervisor	3,055	11.0%
4. Line Probation Officers	12,742	45.7%
5. Clerk Typists	1,069	3.8%
6. Administrative Overhead <sup>2</sup>	2,355	8.4%
7. Miscellaneous Support	1,630	5.9%
TOTALS:	\$27,867	100.0%

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix D for detailed accounting of cost calculations.

<sup>2</sup>See page 9 for a reference to "administrative overhead" and the corresponding paid staff roles.

The above table shows that the role cost for line probation officers represents nearly one-half of the total estimated cost of the program. In order, the 3 highest cost categories are: (1) line probation officers (45.7%), (2) Juvenile Volunteer Administrator (17.2%), and (3) Unit Supervisors (11.0%). Together, these three role costs accounted for nearly three-fourths (73.7%) of the total cost estimate.

The unit cost (i.e., cost per report) was \$123. This estimate was obtained by dividing the total cost estimate of \$27,867 by 227, which is the number of pre-disposition reports that were completed by volunteer court investigators during the study period.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR DECISION-MAKING

This is the final section of the research report. It discusses the implications of the research findings for administrative decision-making and future research.

##### Administrative Decision-Making

The findings of the cost study show that the juvenile court investigator program is not a "free" service resource. The recruitment, training and supervision of volunteers are costs to the Department that can be systematically accounted for. A question that may be asked by HCCS administrators is: "Are the costs justifiable?" To answer this question, the research team looked for additional evidence regarding cost savings, time savings and program effectiveness.

Cost Savings. To determine if any cost savings are realized through the juvenile court investigator program, the research team compared the unit cost of unpaid staff reports with that of reports completed by paid staff. This was done with the recognition that there are some important differences between the role of the volunteer court investigator and the role of the paid probation officer. The differences include:

1. Case selection - Unit supervisors tend to be more selective when assigning cases to volunteers. Those cases that appear to be more difficult or complex (e.g., where out-of-home placement is likely) are often reserved for paid staff.
2. Worker autonomy - Volunteer court investigators operate with varying degrees of independence depending on their experience in the agency and the expectations or style of the supervising paid staff person. Generally speaking, the work of the unpaid staff member is closely monitored during the first year on the job. After this period, the volunteer may call most of his or her own shots with respect to case assessment and case recommendations. However, there is clear recognition that a probation officer or unit supervisor remains the accountable person for all cases served by a volunteer. This accountability is reflected in the requirement that a probation officer or supervisor be present at the time that the volunteer's case and report go to court for representation. By way of comparison, the probation officer -- as investigator -- is expected to handle all aspects of case preparation and presentation on an independent basis.

The research team concluded that a cost comparison of unpaid staff and paid staff reports should account for differences regarding not only who does the work but also what type of cases are involved. Unfortunately, the available data did not permit this sort of discrimination or detail.

The primary source of data for developing a unit cost figure for paid staff reports was the Division Director and administrative reports that he provided the research team. The time period accounted for corresponded with the study of volunteer reports, namely, calendar year 1976.

Table 3 summarizes the cost elements associated with a paid staff report.

TABLE 3: UNIT COST OF PAID STAFF REPORTS<sup>1</sup>

COST CATEGORY	COST ESTIMATE	
	Dollars	%
1. Line Probation Officer	\$181.44	65.0%
2. Clerk Typist	4.01	1.5%
3. Unit Supervisor	64.44	23.1%
4. Administrative Overhead <sup>2</sup>	24.69	8.8%
5. Miscellaneous (car mileage)	4.73	1.7%
TOTAL:	\$279.31	100.0%

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix E for a detailed accounting of cost calculations for paid staff reports.

<sup>2</sup>"Administrative overhead" includes the following roles inside and outside the Juvenile Division: Division Director, HCCS Director, Assistant Director of HCCS, HCCS Business Manager, Secretary to Business Manager, HCCS Program Evaluator, Secretary to Program Evaluator.

Table 3 shows that the estimated unit cost for a paid staff report in 1976 was \$279. This finding suggests that a cost savings of approximately \$156 may be realized when a pre-hearing report is completed by a volunteer (where the estimated unit cost was \$123). At the same time, it should be noted that the cost savings estimate is based on a comparison of average unit costs for paid and unpaid staff reports. As such the estimate does not account for qualitative differences in cases investigated by probation officers and volunteers.

Time Savings. To determine if the court investigator program saves paid staff time, a sample of ten juvenile probation officers were asked the following question:<sup>1</sup>

Do you "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree", or "strongly disagree" with the following statement -- All things considered, the volunteer court investigator saves me time by completing work that would otherwise be my direct responsibility.

As shown by the distribution in Table 4, eight of the ten probation officers in the study sample responded "positively" (agree or strongly agree) to this question.

---

<sup>1</sup>The sample involved probation officers who were identified by the research team as having had a direct experience in supervising the work of volunteer court investigators. The information on time savings was collected in a phone interview (see Appendix B for copy of interview schedule).

TABLE 4: TIME SAVINGS AS REPORTED BY P.O.'S

RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTION
1. Strongly Agree	3 ( 30%)
2. Agree	5 ( 50%)
3. Disagree	2 ( 20%)
4. Strongly Disagree	-
TOTAL:	10 (100%)

Another piece of data related to time savings was obtained in an interview with the Division Director. The Director observed that:

While there are many hidden costs, the volunteer program gives us a cadre of people that we would otherwise not have on tap. They can step in and be immediately productive. Having trained people who can carry out emergency or temporary work on a need or time limited basis saves time in regard to reassigning or tracking-down other staff resources.

Program Effectiveness. Information on the effectiveness of the juvenile court investigator program was drawn from two studies that were conducted by the Juvenile Division's program evaluation committee in 1975-1976.<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Evaluation Findings on the Juvenile Division's Pre-Hearing Investigation Reports (HCCS Research, January 1976). This report describes an evaluation study that was aimed at determining the value of the PSI report as both a court-advising tool and a treatment-planning tool. The sample included 172 reports. Each report in the sample was rated by two types of respondent: (1) a Judge/Referee of the Juvenile Court, who assessed its value as a court-advising tool; and, (2) a Unit Supervisor, who judged its value as a treatment-planning tool. The ratings were based on several criteria associated with content, writing style, and logic of the report.

<sup>2</sup>Evaluation of the Juvenile Division's Pre-Hearing Investigation Report As A Treatment-Planning Tool (HCCS Research, May 1976). This report describes an evaluation study that involved a sub-sample of 87 PHI reports from the 172 reports in the study described above in footnote no 1. The primary research objective was to determine the value of the PHI report as a treatment-planning tool. The distribution of reports by author type was 37.9% paid, 33.3% unpaid, and 28.7% special. The primary source of judgment data was a direct service worker inside or outside the Juvenile Division who had case responsibility in the post-disposition period. To prevent a situation where people would have to rate their own reports, a decision was made to include only PHI's where an "exchange" had taken place in regard to case responsibility. Respondents were asked to judge each of the four major sections of the report (i.e., unlaw conduct, the child, the family, and treatment) in terms of its completeness, accuracy and relevance for treatment-planning.

The studies were aimed at assessing the effectiveness of the pre-hearing report as both a court-advising tool and a treatment-planning tool. The results of the research suggest that the quality of unpaid staff reports compares favorably with paid staff reports with respect to both court-advising and treatment planning.

Table 5 presents the distribution of judge/referee responses on the "report as a whole" question where the value of the pre-hearing report as a court-advising tool was the focus of measurement.

TABLE 5: VALUE OF REPORT AS COURT-ADVISING TOOL

TYPE OF AUTHOR	DISTRIBUTION		
	Positive Rating	Negative Rating	Row Totals
1. Paid	77 (81.9%)	17 (18.1%)	94 (100.0%)
2. Unpaid	25 (69.4%)	11 (30.6%)	36 (100.0%)
3. Special - Volunteers on paid staff status during period of study	25 (89.3%)	3 (10.7%)	27 (100.0%)
Col. Total/Row %	127 (80.9%)	31 (19.8%)	157 (100.0%)

Table 5 shows that paid staff reports and unpaid/special staff reports (combined) had approximately the same percentage of positive ratings, or 81.9% and 78.1% respectively.

Table 6 presents findings on the value of the pre-hearing report as a treatment-planning tool. In this instance, the source of judgment data was a direct service worker inside or outside the Juvenile Division who had case treatment responsibility in the post-disposition period.

TABLE 6: AVERAGE RATINGS BY AUTHOR TYPE

AUTHOR TYPE	CRITERIA					
	COMPLETENESS		ACCURACY		RELEVANCE	
	Positive Rating	Negative Rating	Positive Rating	Negative Rating	Positive Rating	Negative Rating
1. Paid	83.3%	16.7%	96.1%	3.9%	93.9%	6.1%
2. Unpaid	80.4%	19.6%	95.5%	4.5%	88.4%	11.6%
3. Special	85.8%	14.2%	90.6%	9.4%	95.0%	5.0%

Examination of the difference between the average percentage of positive ratings on three evaluation criteria -- completeness, accuracy and relevance -- suggests that unpaid and paid staff reports were essentially equal in quality on the treatment-planning dimension. The percentage difference between lowest and highest scores shows that on each criterion the range across the three author types was 6.6% or less.

Conclusions. The available data on cost savings, time savings and program effectiveness suggest that the juvenile court investigator program is producing a cost-effective product. For this reason, the program appears justifiable and in turn warrants continued administrative support.

Future Research

Hopefully, the conceptual work and data collection model presented in this report will aid the development of cost data on other volunteer services in HCCS. In this regard, early attention should be given to those programs that bear some similarity to the juvenile court investigator program, namely, the court investigator programs in District Court Probation and Domestic Relations.

APPENDIX

TIME ESTIMATES FOR POINTS-IN-PROCESS

POINT-IN-PROCESS	TIME ESTIMATE <sup>1</sup>
1. Case Assignment (by Supervisor)	10 min.
2. Case Planning (with P.O.)	70 min.
3. Review of Written Report	
a. By P.O.	60 min.
b. By Supervisor	25 min.
4. Court Appearance (with P.O.)	60 min.
5. Case Transfer (with P.O.)	105 min.
TOTAL TIME P.O.	245 min.
TOTAL TIME SUPERVISOR	35 min.
OVERALL PAID STAFF TIME	330 min.

---

<sup>1</sup>Estimates are rounded off to nearest 5 minute mark.



DATE: 15 December 1976  
 TO:  
 FROM: Clif Rhodes, ext 3261  
 SUBJECT: Volunteer Cost Study - Time Estimates from  
 Juvenile Probation Officers

**HENNEPIN COUNTY  
 DEPARTMENT OF COURT SERVICES**

Your help is needed in completing a research study that is aimed at determining the cost of having volunteers develop pre-disposition reports in the Juvenile Division.

Purpose of Research

There are two basic purposes associated with the research. First, questions regarding the cost of volunteer services are often asked of program managers. Given the local and national prominence of HCCS's volunteer program, Court Services' administrators are interested in taking the first-step toward developing a model for generating relevant cost data. Secondly, HCCS administrators have been asked to identify and justify the cost of maintaining its large volunteer program by the County's budget office. The initial research study is focusing on developing cost figures related to the development of pre-disposition reports by unpaid staff in the Juvenile Division.

Time Estimates from Probation Officers

As part of this study we need to document: (1) the time spent by probation officers in supervising the work of volunteer court investigators; and, (2) the transfer time involved when a case is assigned to a probation officer after the pre-disposition report has been completed by a volunteer.

I will be calling you (i.e., a phone interview) during the next week to obtain answers to the following questions.

1. Looking at Attachment A ("Time Estimates for Completing PHI Reports"), do you agree or disagree with the time estimate for each Point in Process? If you disagree, what is your estimate?
2. How much extra time, if any (e.g., reviewing the probation plan, developing rapport), do you spend when a case is assigned to you after the pre-disposition report has been completed by a volunteer? (The point of comparison is with those cases for which you have responsibility for both the pre-disposition investigation and the implementation of a probation plan.)

Your assistance in answering these questions, will be most appreciated.

---

\*Members of the research committee include Tom Faust, Dick Hodgkins, Bob Leach and Clif Rhodes.

VOLUNTEER COST STUDY  
PHONE INTERVIEWS - JUVENILE P.O.'S

Name of P.O.: \_\_\_\_\_

Today's Date: \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWER: Last week you should have received a memorandum from our office describing a study that is currently underway to determine the cost of having volunteers develop pre-disposition reports in the Juvenile Division. Did you receive the memorandum? (If not, a copy should be sent to the respondent.) Do you have time available to answer some questions? The interview will take about 10 minutes.

You should know that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions that I will be asking you. Your best judgment, based on personal experience in working with volunteer court investigators, is all that I want.

You should also know that all of your answers will be kept confidential. The information collected in this interview will be put together with information obtained from several other probation officers. This data will in turn be presented in summary form, with no individual P.O.'s or volunteers identified by name.

1. Have you been assigned responsibility during the past 2 years for supervising the work of volunteer court investigators?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

a. Approximately how many volunteer court investigators did you supervise during the period July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976?

\_\_\_\_\_ No. of volunteers

2. Do you have the attachment to the memorandum in front of you? (If not, perhaps I can identify both the points-in-process and the corresponding statements of activity.) For each point-in-process I want you to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the time estimate. Where you disagree, I will ask you for your estimate.

a. Point #1 is Case Assignment. The time estimate is 5 minutes. Do you:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - Your estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (9) Cannot determine from personal experience

b. Point #2 is Case Planning. The time estimate is 60 minutes. Do you:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - Your estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (9) Cannot determine from personal experience

c. Point #3 is Review of Written Report. The time estimate is 60 minutes for the probation officer. Do you:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - Your estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (9) Cannot determine from personal experience.

Under this same point-in-process, the time estimate for the unit supervisor is 15 minutes. Do you:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - Your estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (9) Cannot determine from personal experience

d. Point #4 is Court Appearance. The time estimate is 45 minutes. Do you:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - Your estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (9) Cannot determine from personal experience

3. Are there any other points-in-process that you think should be added to those already mentioned? (If so, what are the corresponding time estimates?)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. In the memorandum that you received there is a reference to something called "transfer time." Transfer time is defined as any extra time that you as a probation officer spend with a case as a consequence of having a volunteer court investigator complete the pre-disposition investigation. The activities associated with transfer time might include: reviewing the probation plan and developing rapport with the juvenile client and/or his parents. The point of comparison is with those cases for which you have responsibility for both the pre-disposition investigation and case follow-up.

As a rule do you think that there is any transfer time involved when a case is assigned to you after the pre-disposition investigation has been completed by a volunteer?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

a. (If "Yes") Please describe the specific activities that you associate with transfer time:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

b. (If "Yes") What is your estimate of the average amount of time spent on these activities for a single case? Your estimate should be in minutes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. of minutes

5. Tell me whether you "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree" with the following statement: All things considered, the volunteer court investigator saves my time by completing work that would otherwise be my direct responsibility.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (9) Cannot answer from personal experience

6. Finally, did you participate in any of the 15 training sessions for volunteer court investigators that were conducted by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator (beginning October 30, 1975)?

(1) Yes

(2) No

a. (If "Yes") How many hours of your time were spent in preparing for and participating in the training sessions?

\_\_\_\_\_ Total No. of Hours

7. Are there any additional comments that you would like to make regarding this interview or the volunteer cost study?

---

---

---

\* \* \*

THIS COMPLETES THE INTERVIEW. THANK YOU FOR YOUR WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE.



DATE: 14 December 1976  
 TO: J Benson, B Gunn, B Dotter,  
 R Lundquist & K Williams  
 FROM: Clif Rhodes, ext 3261

**HENNEPIN COUNTY  
 DEPARTMENT OF COURT SERVICES**

SUBJECT: Volunteer Cost Study - Time Estimates from Unit Supervisors

Your help is needed in completing a research study that is aimed at determining the cost of having volunteers develop pre-disposition reports in the Juvenile Division.

Purpose of Research

There are two basic purposes associated with the research. First, questions regarding the cost of volunteer services are often asked of program managers. Given the local and national prominence of HCCS' volunteer program, Court Services' administrators are interested in taking the first-step toward developing a model for generating relevant cost data. Secondly, HCCS administrators have been asked to identify and justify the cost of maintaining its large volunteer program by the County's budget office. The initial research study is focusing on developing cost figures related to the development of pre-disposition reports by unpaid staff in the Juvenile Division.

Time Estimates from Unit Supervisors

As part of this study we need to document the time spent by Unit Supervisors in training and supervising volunteer court investigators.

Your estimates and comments on the following items should be made on Attachment B.

1. Re Training Time Estimates - Please go through your appointment book (or other source documents, including your memory) to determine the total number of hours that you spent in training volunteer court investigators who were assigned to your unit during the period of the cost study -- July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976. Your estimate should include time spent in training both new and old (2nd year) court investigators.

Keep in mind: the only formal training program for "new" VSSP's that was conducted by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator during the period of the cost study began on October 30, 1975. A total of 15 training sessions were held. Volunteers were assigned to field units in approximately the 8th week of training, or around February 1, 1976.

---

\*Members of the research committee include: Tom Faust, Dick Hodgkins, Bob Leach and Clif Rhodes.

Page 2  
Memo to Unit Supervisors - Juvenile Division  
14 December 1976

2. Re Supervision Time Estimate - Several staff members have been interviewed. The estimate for the average time spent by a Unit Supervisor in supervising the work of an unpaid staff member on a pre-disposition report is 20 minutes. The calculations for this time estimate are presented in Attachment A.

Please look over this attachment. If your experience suggests a different time estimate at any point in process, note that difference on Attachment A.

3. Re Time Spent in Volunteer Training Program - If you participated in the aforementioned training program for court investigators (beginning October 30, 1975), please note that and the time spent on Attachment B.

If you have any questions please call me at 348-3261. Thank you very much for your help on this matter.

HCCS VOLUNTEER TIME STUDY  
 TIME ESTIMATES FOR COMPLETING PHI REPORT  
 WHERE PAID STAFF TIME REPRESENTS A COST TO HCCS

POINTS IN PROCESS	AVERAGE TIME
1. <u>Case Assignment</u> - Unit supervisor or line probation officer calls volunteer to assign (to find out whether he/she will be available to handle) case.	5 min. (1 contact)
2. <u>Case Planning</u> - Two basic steps are usually involved:	
a. Volunteer and line P.O. go over the case prior to (or shortly after) initial contact with the youth. They confer re available information; and, they determine who needs to be contacted.	30 min. (1 contact)
b. Volunteer reports to line P.O. re what he/she has found out from the youth and significant others. In addition, options are explored re possible recommendations in the PHI report.	30 min. (1 contact)
3. <u>Review of Written Report</u> - Two basic steps are usually involved:	
a. Volunteer and line P.O. examine draft of PHI report to see if there is common understanding and agreement on its content. (This is usually done on the basis of a formal appointment with the line P.O.)	60 min. (1 contact)
b. The report is then read/checked by the Unit Supervisor.	15 min. (1 contact)
Dotter estimated that altogether steps (3a) and (3b) generally take 45 min.	
Dotter said that approximately 25% of the reports are returned to the volunteer for additions/corrections. However, no time-consuming review is involved after these changes are made.	
Vader said that in 2 out of every 10 cases (more serious or complicated in nature) both the line P.O. and the unit supervisor will sit down with the volunteer to discuss case needs and recommendations. 60 minutes is the average amount of time involved in these meetings. Dotter indicated that this does not happen in his unit. He sees this as a function of the case assignment process. His volunteers are not assigned cases that are particularly serious or complicated.	
4. <u>Court Appearance</u> - A line P.O. must appear with the volunteer at the time that the case (PHI report) is presented in Court. Time varies. Vader suggested that the range is 15 - 90 min. Estimate shown is Pat Hannum's.	45 min. (1 contact)
TOTAL TIME LINE P.O.	165 minutes
TOTAL TIME SUPERVISOR	20 minutes
OVERALL PAID STAFF TIME	185 minutes

VOLUNTEER COST STUDY  
TIME ESTIMATES FROM UNIT SUPERVISORS

HCCS: 12/76

Name of Unit Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

WRITE IN (where applicable) or CIRCLE THE NUMBER that corresponds with your answer to each question below. The completed questionnaire should be returned to Cliff Rhodes (A-506) by Wednesday, December 23, 1976.

1. Approximately how many volunteer court investigators were assigned to your unit during the period July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976?

\_\_\_\_\_ No. of Volunteers

- a. Of this number (if one or more):

- (1) How many were assigned prior to the court investigator training program that began on October 30, 1975?

\_\_\_\_\_ No. of Volunteers

- (2) How many were assigned from the October 1975 class of court investigators?

\_\_\_\_\_ No. of Volunteers

2. During the study period, did you spend any time training volunteer court investigators who were assigned to your unit? (NOTE: Training refers to formal instruction on "general how-to aspects" of the job. It could occur before or after cases have been assigned to a volunteer. Supervision, on the other hand, refers to "case-specific activities" related to making case assignments, advising line probation officers who are responsible for direct supervision of volunteer court investigators, and reviewing written reports.)

(1) Yes

(2) No

- a. If your answer to Question #2 is "Yes", briefly describe the nature of the training in your unit:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- b. If your answer to Question #2 is "Yes", what is your best estimate of the total number of hours that you spent training volunteer court investigators who were assigned to your unit during the study period?

\_\_\_\_\_ Total No. of Hours

3. Carefully examine Attachment A, "Time Estimates for Completing PHI Report."

Indicate below whether you agree or disagree with the time estimate for each Point in Process. Where you disagree, write in your estimate.

- a. Point #1 - Case Assignment, 5 min.

(1) Agree

(2) Disagree - My estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.

(3) Cannot determine from personal experience

b. Point #2 - Case Planning, 60 min.

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - My estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (3) Cannot determine from personal experience.

c. Point #3 - Review of Written Report

By Line P.O., 60 min.:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - My estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (3) Cannot determine from personal experience

By Unit Supervisor, 15 min.:

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Cannot determine from personal experience

d. Point #4 - Court Appearance, 45 min.

- (1) Agree
- (2) Disagree - My estimate is: \_\_\_\_\_ min.
- (3) Cannot determine from personal experience

4. Are there any other Points in Process -- or other comments -- that you think should be added to Attachment A? Please provide time estimates.

---

---

5. Did you participate in any of the 15 training sessions for volunteer court investigators that were conducted by the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator (beginning on October 30, 1975)?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

a. If you answer to Question #5 is "Yes", how many hours of your time were spent in preparing for and participating in the training sessions?

\_\_\_\_\_ Total No. of Hours

6. Please use the space below for any additional comments that you would like to make regarding this questionnaire or the volunteer cost study.

---

---

---

CALCULATIONS: COST OF VOLUNTEER PHI REPORT

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST
<p>1. Juvenile Volunteer Administrator</p>	<p>Assumption: The volunteer court investigator program was one of 5 volunteer programs (with 2 of 6 programs weighted as 1/2) operating in the Juvenile Probation Division during the study period -- calendar year 1976. For purposes of the research study, it was assumed that the Juvenile Volunteer Administrator's time was equally distributed across these 5 programs. In other words it is estimated that this administrator spent 1/5th (or 20%) of his time on the volunteer court investigator program. (The one-fifth-rule applies to all positions identified below with a single asterisk -- * -- next to the position or role title.)</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = % of Annual Time X Total Annual Salary                      = 20% X \$23,950<sup>1</sup>                      = <u>\$4,790.00</u></p>	<p>\$ 4,790.00</p>
<p>2. Juvenile Volunteer Secretary*</p>	<p>Role Cost (RC) = % of Annual Time X Total Annual Salary                      = 20% X \$11,128                      = <u>\$2,225.60</u></p>	<p>\$ 2,225.60</p>
<p>3. Unit Supervisors</p>	<p>Two types of activity were considered in calculating the time invested by unit supervisors in the volunteer court investigator program: Role cost (RC<sub>1</sub>) re time spent in <u>training</u> volunteers for court investigator responsibilities; and, Role cost (RC<sub>2</sub>) re time spent in <u>supervising</u> work related to completion of pre-disposition reports by volunteers.</p> <p>Re training, 5 unit supervisors estimated that they spent a grand total of 116 hours during the study period.</p> <p>Role cost<sub>1</sub>(RC) = Total # Hours Spent in Training X Average Rate per Hour                      = 116 hours X \$13.31                      = <u>\$1,543.96</u></p> <p><sup>1</sup>All salary/wage figures include <u>fringe benefits</u>.</p>	

Appendix "G"

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST
	<p>Re supervising, 15 respondents (unit supervisors and P.O.'s) estimated that supervisors spent an average of 30 min. (.5 of an hour) per report.</p> <p>Total Hours = Average Time per PHI Report X Total # of PHI Reports                      = .5 hours X 227 reports                      = 113.5 hours</p> <p>Role Cost<sub>2</sub>(RC) = Total Hours X Average Rate per Hour                      = 113.5 hours X \$13.31                      = <u>\$1,510.69</u></p> <p>Total Role Cost = RC<sub>1</sub> + RC<sub>2</sub> = \$1,543.96 + \$1,510.69 = <u>\$3,054.65</u></p>	<p>\$3,054.65</p>
<p>4. Line Probation Officers</p>	<p>Two types of activity were considered in calculating the total Role Cost for Line Probation Officers: Role cost (RC<sub>1</sub>) re time spent in <u>supervising</u> volunteer court investigators; and, Role cost (RC<sub>2</sub>) re <u>transfer time</u>.</p> <p>Re supervising time by P.O.'s, 15 respondents estimated that an average of 190 min (or 3.2 hrs) were spent by P.O.'s on 3 activities: (1) case planning, (2) review of written report, and (3) court appearance.</p> <p>Total Hours = Average Time per Report X Total # of PHI Reports                      = 3.2 hours X 227 reports                      = 726.4 hours</p> <p>Role Cost<sub>1</sub>(RC) = Total Hours X Average Rate per Hour                      = 726.4 hours X \$11.34                      = <u>\$8,237.38</u></p>	

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST
	<p>Re transfer time, 10 respondents (P.O.'s only) estimated average of 105 minutes (or, 1.75 hours) per report. (The estimates ranged from a low of 15 minutes to a high of 300 minutes.)</p> <p>Total Hours = Average Time per Report X Total # of PHI Reports                      = 1.75 hours X 227 reports                      = 397.25 hours</p> <p>Role Cost<sub>2</sub>(RC) = Total Hours X Average Rate per Hour                      = 397.25 X \$11.34                      = <u>\$4,504.82</u></p> <p>Total Role Cost = RC<sub>1</sub> + RC<sub>2</sub> = \$8,237.38 + \$4,504.82 = \$12,742.20</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$12,742.20</p>
<p>5. Clerk Typists</p>	<p>Six (6) clerk typists estimated that an average of 52.5 minutes (or, .88 hours) is spent in typing PHI reports completed by volunteer court investigators. (The estimates ranged from a low of 45 minutes to a high of 90 minutes.)</p> <p>Total Hours = Average Time per Report X Total # of PHI Reports                      = .88 hours X 227 reports                      = 199.76 hours</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Average Rate per Hour                      = 199.76 X \$5.35                      = <u>\$1,068.72</u></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$1,068.72</p>

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST
<p>6. Administrative Overhead (Juvenile Division and Central Administration)</p> <p>a. Division Director*</p> <p>b. Director of Volunteer Services*</p> <p>c. Secretary to the Director of Volunteer Services*</p>	<p>Division Supervisor estimated that 5% of his time during the study period was spent in "volunteer-related" activity. Using the 1/5th rule, this means that 1% of his time was spent on the volunteer court investigator program.</p> <p>Total Hours = Total Annual Hours X % of Time in Specific Program Area</p> <p>= 2080 hours X .01</p> <p>= 20.8 hours</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate</p> <p>= 20.8 hours X \$16.81</p> <p>= <u>\$349.65</u></p> <p>Direct of Volunteer Services estimated that he spent a total of 320 hours on the "juvenile volunteer program." Using the 1/5th rule, this means that he spent 64 hours in the area of the volunteer court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate</p> <p>= 64 hours X \$13.50</p> <p>= <u>\$864.00</u></p> <p>The secretary to the Director of Volunteer Services estimated that she spent a total of 52 hours (1 hour per week for 52 weeks) on the "juvenile volunteer program." Using the 1/5th rule, this means that she spent 10.4 hours in the area of the volunteer court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate</p> <p>= 10.4 hours X \$5.39</p> <p>= <u>\$56.06</u></p>	

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST
d. Director of Court Services*	<p>Director of Court Services estimated that he spent a total of 24 hours on the "juvenile volunteer program." Using the 1/5th rule, this means that he spent 4.8 hours in the area of the court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate = 4.8 hours X \$23.03 = <u>\$110.54</u></p>	
e. Business Officer*	<p>Business Officer estimated that he spent a total of 52 hours (1 hour per week for 52 weeks) on the "juvenile volunteer program." Using the 1/5th rule, this means that he spent 10.4 hours in the area of the court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate = 10.4 hours X \$13.83 = <u>\$143.83</u></p>	
f. Secretary to Business Officer*	<p>Secretary to Business Officer estimated that she spent a total of 78 hrs (1.5 hrs/week) on the "juvenile volunteer program." Using the 1/5th rule, this means that she spent 15.6 hours with the court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate = 15.6 hours X \$6.82 = <u>\$106.39</u></p>	

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST
<p>g. Program Evaluator</p> <p>h. Secretary to Program Evaluator</p>	<p>The Director of Program Evaluation estimated that he spent a total of 50 hours on the volunteer court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate            = 50 hours X \$12.24            = <u>\$612.00</u></p> <p>The secretary to the Director of Program Evaluation estimated that she spent a total of 20 hours related to the court investigator program.</p> <p>Role Cost (RC) = Total Hours X Hourly Rate            = 20 hours X \$5.61            = <u>\$112.20</u></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$2,355.00</p>
<p>7. Other Costs</p> <p>a. Car Mileage for Volunteer Court Investigators</p> <p>b. In-service Training</p>	<p>Car Mileage Cost = Total Miles Vol. X 13.5¢ per mile            Ct. Investigator            = 10,741 miles X 13.5¢            = <u>\$1,450.04</u></p> <p>It was found that a total of \$600 was allocated in the overall Volunteer budget, of which \$200 was spent in the Juvenile Division. Using the 1/5th rule, this means that <u>\$40.00</u> was spent in the court investigator program.</p>	

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST																											
c. The Informer*	Total cost estimate across 4 divisions (in which the volunteer program was operating during the study period) was \$2,600, with paid staff time included. The distribution by operating Division is \$650 for each. Using the 1/5th rule in the Juvenile Division, the cost allocated to the court investigator program is <u>\$130.00</u> .																												
d. Award Ceremony*	Total cost estimate of \$200, divided by 4 Divisions, or \$50 per Division. Using the 1/5th rule, this means that <u>\$10.00</u> can be allocated to the court investigator program.	\$1,630.00																											
Total Cost of Volunteer Court Investigator Program:																													
<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;">PAID STAFF ROLE</th> <th style="width: 20%;">ESTIMATED COST</th> <th style="width: 20%;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Juvenile Volunteer Administrator</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 4,790</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Juvenile Volunteer Secretary</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2,226</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Unit Supervisors</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3,055</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Line Probation Officers</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,742</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Clerk Typists</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1,069</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Administrative Overhead</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2,355</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Miscellaneous Support</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>1,630</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>\$27,867</u></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			PAID STAFF ROLE	ESTIMATED COST		1. Juvenile Volunteer Administrator	\$ 4,790		2. Juvenile Volunteer Secretary	2,226		3. Unit Supervisors	3,055		4. Line Probation Officers	12,742		5. Clerk Typists	1,069		6. Administrative Overhead	2,355		7. Miscellaneous Support	<u>1,630</u>		TOTAL	<u>\$27,867</u>	
PAID STAFF ROLE	ESTIMATED COST																												
1. Juvenile Volunteer Administrator	\$ 4,790																												
2. Juvenile Volunteer Secretary	2,226																												
3. Unit Supervisors	3,055																												
4. Line Probation Officers	12,742																												
5. Clerk Typists	1,069																												
6. Administrative Overhead	2,355																												
7. Miscellaneous Support	<u>1,630</u>																												
TOTAL	<u>\$27,867</u>																												
<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Cost per PHI Report:</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>\$27,867</u></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">= \$123</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">227 reports</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			Cost per PHI Report:	<u>\$27,867</u>	= \$123		227 reports																						
Cost per PHI Report:	<u>\$27,867</u>	= \$123																											
	227 reports																												
TOTAL: \$27,867																													
PER UNIT: \$123																													

CALCULATIONS: UNIT COST OF PAID STAFF REPORT

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST PER REPORT
1. Line Probation Officer	<p>A 1976 time study showed that Juvenile P.O.'s spent an average of 16 hours in completing a pre-disposition investigation.</p> <p>Cost element = 16 hrs. X \$11.34 per hour                      = \$181.44 per report</p>	\$ 181.44
2. Clerk Typist	<p>Using time estimates from the volunteer cost study, it is estimated that the average paid staff report requires 45 min. to type.</p> <p>Cost element = .75 hrs X \$5.35 per hours                      = \$4.01 per report</p>	\$ 4.01
3. Unit Supervisor	<p>The Division Director estimated that unit supervisors spend approximately 55% of their time on PHI-related matters.</p> <p>Total Hours = 5 supervisors X 2080 hrs per year = 10,400 hrs                      = 10,400 hrs per year X .55 = 5,720 hrs                      = 5,720 - 501 hrs (time on volunteer reports)                      = 5,219 hrs</p> <p>Total Cost = 5,219 hrs X \$13.31 per hour = \$69,464.89</p> <p>Cost element = <math>\frac{\\$69,464.89}{1078 \text{ reports}}</math> = \$64.44 per report</p>	\$ 64.44

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST PER REPORT
<p>4. Administrative Overhead (Juvenile Division and Central Administration)</p> <p>a. Division Director</p>	<p>The Division Director estimated that his time is distributed in the follow way: (1) 5% for volunteer program; (2) 30% directly for PHI matters; (3) 40% directly for case supervision matters; and, (4) 25% for other (which is generally in support of PHI and case supervision activities). In calculating the Division Director's contribution to the cost of paid staff reports, the "other" category of activity (25%) was "reallocated" on a proportional basis to PHI's and case supervision. The resulting totals were 40.7% and 54.3% respectively (which again accounted for 95% of his time -- excluding the 5% for volunteer related activities).</p> $\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{2080 \text{ hrs per year} \times .407 \times \$16.81 \text{ per hr}}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$14,230.67}{1078} = \$13.20 \text{ per report} \end{aligned}$	
<p>b. HCCS Director</p>	<p>The Director estimated that overall his time is distributed in the following way: (1) 40% for general administration; (2) 45% for juvenile services; and, (3) 15% for adult services. The 45% spent on juvenile services breaks down to: (1) 40% for Juvenile Probation; (2) 33.3% for CHS; and, (3) 26.7% for Juvenile Center. Multiplying 45% by 40% yields 18% for the Juvenile Division. The amount of time for "general administration" was reallocated on the basis of the percentage of HCCS permanent staff in the Juvenile Division -- or 21.1%. Multiplying 40% by 21% yields 8.4%. 18% plus 8.4% results in a total of 26.4% of the Director's time for Juvenile Division matters. To obtain the percentage of time for PHI related activities 26.4% was multiplied by 40.7% (from the Division Director's time allocation) for a total of 10.7%.</p>	

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST PER REPORT
	$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{2080 \text{ hrs} \times .107 \times \$23.03 \text{ per hour}}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$5269}{1078} = \underline{\$4.89 \text{ per report}} \end{aligned}$	
<p>c. Asst. HCCS Director</p>	<p>Formula included following points:</p> $\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{2080 \text{ hrs} \times \overset{\substack{\% \text{ Permanent staff} \\ \text{in Juv. Division}}}{.21} \times \overset{\substack{\text{See Division Director}}}{.407} \times \$15.36 \text{ per hour}}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$2730.66}{1078} = \underline{\$2.53 \text{ per report}} \end{aligned}$	
<p>d. Business Officer</p>	<p>Same basic formula as Asst. HCCS Director:</p> $\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{2080 \text{ hrs} \times .21 \times .407 \times \$13.83}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$2458.66}{1078} = \underline{\$2.28 \text{ per report}} \end{aligned}$	

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST PER REPORT
e. Secretary to Business Officer	<p>Same basic formula as Asst. HCCS Director:</p> $\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{2080 \text{ hrs} \times .21 \times .407 \times \$6.82}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$1212.44}{1078} = \$1.12 \text{ per report} \end{aligned}$	
f. Program Evaluator	<p>Same as for unpaid staff reports: The program evaluator estimated that he spent 50 hours related to an evaluation of paid staff reports.</p> $\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{50 \text{ hrs} \times \$12.24}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$612}{1078} = \$0.57 \text{ per report} \end{aligned}$	
g. Secretary to Program Evaluator	<p>Same as for unpaid staff reports:</p> $\begin{aligned} \text{Cost element} &= \frac{20 \text{ hrs} \times \$5.61}{1078 \text{ Reports}} \\ &= \frac{\$112.20}{1078} = \$0.10 \text{ per report} \end{aligned}$	\$ 24.69

PAID STAFF ROLE	CALCULATIONS	ESTIMATED COST PER REPORT														
5. Miscellaneous - Car Mileage	<p>Since P.O.'s are often able to schedule visits with more than one client during a single trip into the community, their mileage total per client is less than a volunteer. The estimate for paid staff was 35 miles per case vs. 50 miles for a volunteer.</p> <p>Cost element = 35 miles per report X 13.5¢ per mile = \$4.73</p>	\$ 4.73														
	<p>Total Unit Cost:</p> <table><thead><tr><th data-bbox="889 574 1076 596">PAID STAFF ROLE</th><th data-bbox="1229 551 1338 596">ESTIMATED COST</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="868 621 1183 645">1. Line Probation Officer</td><td data-bbox="1229 621 1310 645">\$181.44</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="868 645 1066 670">2. Clerk Typist</td><td data-bbox="1257 645 1310 670">4.01</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="868 670 1115 695">3. Unit Supervisor</td><td data-bbox="1251 670 1310 695">64.44</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="868 695 1087 720">4. Admin Overhead</td><td data-bbox="1251 695 1310 720">24.69</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="868 720 1072 745">5. Miscellaneous</td><td data-bbox="1257 720 1310 745">4.73</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="1129 745 1193 769">Total</td><td data-bbox="1229 745 1310 769"><u>\$279.31</u></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>UNIT COST TOTAL:</p>	PAID STAFF ROLE	ESTIMATED COST	1. Line Probation Officer	\$181.44	2. Clerk Typist	4.01	3. Unit Supervisor	64.44	4. Admin Overhead	24.69	5. Miscellaneous	4.73	Total	<u>\$279.31</u>	\$279.31
PAID STAFF ROLE	ESTIMATED COST															
1. Line Probation Officer	\$181.44															
2. Clerk Typist	4.01															
3. Unit Supervisor	64.44															
4. Admin Overhead	24.69															
5. Miscellaneous	4.73															
Total	<u>\$279.31</u>															

**END**