

Average Caseloads Supplemental Report

2/25/2014

For the timeframes 1/12-6/12; 7/12-12/12; 1/13-6/13; 7/13-12/13

Nebraska Rev. Stat. § 29-2252.01 asks for the following information to be included in a semi-annual report regarding probation:

- The total number of felony cases supervised by the office in the previous six months for both regular and intensive supervision probation;
- The total number of misdemeanor cases supervised by the office in the previous six months for both regular and intensive supervision probation;
- The felony caseload per officer for both regular and intensive supervision probation on the last day of the reporting period;
- The misdemeanor caseload per officer for both regular and intensive supervision probation on the last day of the reporting period;
- The total number of juvenile cases supervised by the office in the previous six months for both regular and intensive supervision probation;
- The total number of predisposition investigations completed by the office in the previous six months;
- The total number of presentence investigations completed by the office in the previous six months; and
- The total number of juvenile intake screening interviews conducted and detentions authorized by the office in the previous six months, using the detention screening instrument described in section 43-260.01.

In 2006, Probation Administration began a transformation, whereby we moved away from an offense based system to an offender or probationer risk based system. For the purposes of this report, risk refers to the propensity of reoffending. In other words, classification of probationers and problem solving court participants is based on their individual risk to reoffend, and not solely on their offense. This shift in supervision practice resulted in a shift in sentencing practices as the court looked to probation to determine the level of supervision necessary. For example in 2012 approximately 950 adults were placed on Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) by the court, in contrast approximately 3,400 adults were supervised at a high risk CBI level (see below for definition). In 2013, 850 adults were placed on ISP by the court, compared to approximately 3,500 adults supervised at a CBI level.

The information provided below will not reflect categories such as misdemeanor, felony and ISP, but will reflect Probation's specific risk based categories, as defined below:

Classification	Definition
PSC	Adult Problem Solving Court participant: PSC is intended for high risk individuals.
SSAS	Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision: SSAS is intended for high risk felony drug

	offenders and those with 3 or more DUI convictions.
CBI	Community Based Intervention: CBI is intended for those probationers assessed to be the highest risk of reoffending and in need of intensive supervision. This classification also includes domestic violence, sex offenders, and those with three or more DUI convictions regardless of their assessed risk level.
CBR	Community Based Resource: CBR is intended for those probationers assessed to be medium high to very low risk.
JPSC	Juvenile Problem Solving Court: JPSC is intended for high risk juveniles.
JCBI	Juvenile Community Based Intervention: JCBI is intended for those juveniles assessed to be the highest risk.
JCBR	Juvenile Community Based Resource: JCBR is intended for those juveniles assessed to be medium low to very low risk.

In creating our standards for caseloads, we sought out information from national resources on appropriate caseload sizes. One such resource was the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA). The workload study information that was created in conjunction with the Bureau of Justice Assistance in 2011, can be found at: <http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/pubs/CSWCFPS.pdf>. Another report completed by Bill Burrell, of Temple University, was also used to inform our caseload standards. This report, from 2006, provided standards for both adult and juvenile officers. The national standards represented below are from this document, which can be found at: http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip_CSPP.pdf. Another document from APPA has also assisted us in making decisions regarding caseload: http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip_CS.pdf.

Standards for Adult Caseloads

National Standards		Nebraska Standards	
Intensive	1:20	SSAS	1:24
Moderate to High	1:50	PSC	1:30
Low Risk	1:200	Very High	1:30
Administrative	Unlimited	High	1:50
		Medium High	1:100
		Medium Low	1:150
		Low	1:500
		Very Low	1:1,000*
		Administrative	1:2,500*

*This represents the ratio of officer to cases. It does not take into account additional staff, such as case monitors, who also assist with ongoing case management needs.

Standards for Juvenile Caseloads

National Standards		Nebraska Standards	
Intensive	1:15	JPSC	1:15
Moderate to High	1:30	Very High	1:15
Low Risk	1:100	High	1:20
Administrative	Not Recommended	High Moderate	1:30
		Low Moderate	1:40
		Low	1:50
		Very Low	1:100
		Administrative	1:100

Impacts on caseload include the length of time associated with the replacement of an officer and those who may be on extended medical leave. Both of these will impact the caseload size of other officers at any given time. Within a statewide system it is expected to see caseload numbers that fall within a range, in order to account for some of the area specific issues. Also note, that staff resourcing within the judicial branch is not the same as that of executive branch agencies. We are resourced at a 1:1 ratio, while other agencies are resourced at a 1:1.5 or even 1:1.9 ratios, to assist with coverage of staff that may be sick or out on extended leave.

Starting with Table 1 below, you will find a breakdown of average caseloads along with a statewide average for each classification discussed above. In calculating these caseload numbers please note that most officers carry a caseload that has some blend of classification. For example, CBI officers supervise both those who are classified at a very high risk and those classified at high risk, while CBR officers supervise those caseloads that range from very low and administrative levels to medium high. For that reason, we provided a modified caseload standard to help when reviewing the tables below. Those standards are as follows:

Classification	Modified Standard
PSC	1:30
SSAS	1:24
CBI	1:50
CBR	1:200
JPSC	1:15
JCBI	1:20
JCBR	1:45

Additionally, until 2013, with the passing of LB561, staff was not specialized between adult and juvenile supervision in all areas of the state.

Table 1: January to June 2012

Classification	1	2	3A	3J	4A	4J	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	State Average Per Officer
PSC	27	38	--	--	--**	--	--	27	19	--**	--	--	25	40	29
SSAS*	--	24	24	--	28	--	--	27	--	--	24	--	26	--	26
CBI	79	42	44	--	51	--	72	55	32	58	77	78	74	57	60
CBR	125	187	304	--	199	--	78	144	143	221	203	201	98	93	105
JPSC	--	20	--	15	--	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	36	16
JCBI	28	34	--	38	--	49	94	68	35	27	62	35	35	66	48
JCBR	129	121	--	94	--	68	222	257	241	130	309	110	143	209	169

*SSAS supervision includes both probationers and parolees. The table above only reflects those who were on probation. It does not include parolees in the caseload calculated.

**This caseload was covered by the coordinator in 2012. An officer to assist with supervision was not allocated until recently. As a result, the caseload was not calculated.

Table 2: July to December 2012

Classification	1	2	3A	3J	4A	4J	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	State Average Per Officer
PSC	24	19	--	--	--**	--	--	34	18	--**	--	--	27	43	27
SSAS*	--	24	24	--	28	--	--	31	--	--	24	--	28	--	26
CBI	82	41	44	--	48	--	71	53	30	22	78	85	62	62	56
CBR	123	180	251	--	192	--	75	144	131	61	201	195	92	53	141
JPSC	--	24	--	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28	21
JCBI	21	31	--	37	--	44	80	57	39	11	65	34	19	19	38
JCBR	117	89	--	78	--	38	212	204	201	28	336	97	75	46	127

*SSAS supervision includes both probationers and parolees. The table above only reflects those who were on probation. It does not include parolees in the caseload calculated.

**This caseload was covered by the coordinator in 2012. An officer to assist with supervision was not allocated until recently. As a result, the caseload was not calculated.

Table 3: January to June 2013

Classification	1	2	3A	3J	4A	4J	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	State Average Per Officer
PSC	23	17	--	--	--**	--	--	37	22	31	--	--	39	43	30
SSAS*	--	24	23	--	29	--	--	37	--	--	24	--	32	--	28
CBI	83	53	39	--	43	--	42	44	34	78	33	62	35	48	49
CBR	378	170	422	--	204	--	105	141	142	140	304	186	98	53	195
JPSC	--	21	--	17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28	22
JCBI	23	32	--	33	--	50	45	69	60	34	64	61	26	51	42
JCBR	124	93	--	49	--	26	172	159	94	68	129	167	121	94	108

*SSAS supervision includes both probationers and parolees. The table above only reflects those who were on probation. It does not include parolees in the caseload calculated.

**This caseload was covered by the coordinate in 2012. An officer to assist with supervision was not allocated until recently. As a result, the caseload was not calculated.

Table 4: July to December 2013**

Classification	1	2	3A	3J	4A	4J	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	State Average Per Officer
PSC	23	21	--	--	29	--	--	33	28	32	--	--	23	33	28
SSAS*	--	23	23	--	31	--	--	39	--	--	26	--	34	--	29
CBI	54	50	43	--	44	--	44	40	31	82	53	60	45	66	51
CBR	190	195	361	--	139	--	66	138	100	111	157	78	76	52	139
JPSC	--	22	--	14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28	21
JCBI	8	13	--	7	--	16	21	10	19	8	14	6	13	19	13
JCBR	66	25	--	16	--	19	43	38	23	19	61	34	43	59	37

*SSAS supervision includes both probationers and parolees. The table above only reflects those who were on probation. It does not include parolees in the caseload calculated.

**In July 2013, LB561 went into effect, which resulted in the hiring of additional juvenile specific officers.