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Executive Summary:

A work analysis and process audit was completed for three key case management roles for the adult population in the Johnson County Department of Corrections: Residential Case Managers (RCMs), House Arrest Officers (HAOs), and Intensive Supervision Officers (ISOs). Two easily correctable facility layout challenges exist for Residential and House Arrest work groups; simple location changes or additions of equipment would increase the productivity of RCMs and HAOs. Overall, some notable recommendations include: 1) the development of standardized formal correspondence forms in MS-Word, due to the time spend searching for and updating previously used letters and forms, 2) elimination of wasted paper used for the creation of background checks, which could result in a savings of at least $5743 per year, 3) development of a standardized physical file format that is flexible enough to be utilized across multiple service providers within JCDOC, due to the time spent paring and reorganizing old preexisting files, 4) investigation of continued or renewed use of technology to limit unnecessary driving to/from court, 5) elimination of non-productive tasks by case managers in Residential and House Arrest (e.g. cleaning restrooms and other operations activities), which appear to be the result of poor implementation of “matrix management” at the Residential Center Complex, 6) elimination of double data-entry related to dual use of TOADS and JIMS information systems, 7) elimination of printed case conference forms and utilization of JIMS (or other) on-screen data for end-of-month case conferences, 8) resolution of the high turnover-rate challenge in House Arrest, through a variety of administrative remedies¹, 9) utilization of multiple calendars in MS-Outlook throughout JCDOC instead of the current dependence upon excess email, which litters case managers’ email inboxes, wastes their time, and reduces their effectiveness and efficiency, 10) creation of opportunities for ISOs to make field visits on their clients, 11) investigation of the use of notebook computers by ISOs to eliminate the need for computers in client interview rooms, to expedite the translation of case notes into digital chronological logs, and to provide work flexibility and portability when ISOs are waiting at court for a hearing (possibly in an unproductive mode), and 12) utilization of the process improvement approaches currently underway at ISP as a springboard to make significant process improvements across other service areas (HA and Res) of JCDOC.

Overview Narrative

Background – Impetus for the study

Johnson County Department of Corrections (JCDOC) is the public corrections organization associated with Johnson County, in the north-central portion of eastern Kansas. It houses one of the thirty-one (31) Intensive Supervision Probation programs for the 105 counties in the state of Kansas. Johnson County has the highest population of all counties in Kansas, and encompasses several major suburban municipalities, including Overland Park, Olathe, Lenexa, etc.

The overall goal of Kansas state senate bill 14 (SB14) Risk Reduction Initiative is to reduce probation revocation rates by 20%. Three specific goals include:

¹ A note on page 25 describes the project scope and the relationship between employee turnover rates and process efficiency and effectiveness.
• Increase public safety
• Reduce the (measurable) risk level of probationers under community corrections supervision, and
• Increase the percentage of probationers successfully completing community corrections supervision

SB14 directs law enforcement and corrections activities in the state of Kansas to utilize evidence-based practices that promote the effective and efficient use of state funds in the corrections process for all state-funded corrections agencies in Kansas. Additional grant monies could be utilized to:
• Develop a Risk Reduction Initiative narrative to discuss current agency needs
• Develop a plan to close identified gaps between the need statement and a strategy designed to achieve a 20% reduction in revocation rates of probationers
• Develop a team to support local planning and implementation of the plan
• Develop a strategy and plan to monitor progress
• Develop budget summary and budget narrative documents

For FY 2008, Johnson County received $304,631 of the total $3,993,455 allocated grants budget for these activities by SB14. All 31 corrections districts that house Intensive Supervision Probation programs received approved grant funding at some level.

Based on SB14, JCDoc utilized some of the state of Kansas funding to authorize a study of three types of corrections case managers/officers in the JCDoc system: a) Intensive Supervision Officers (ISOs), b) Residential Case Managers (RCMs), and c) House Arrest Officers (HAOs).

---

Key contract objectives to be addressed:

1. Objective #1: Process mapping for three primary types of case management clients within Johnson County Department of Corrections (JCDOC), to investigate opportunities to reduce or remove wasted time, wasted effort, and wasted resources from the process.
   a. Intensive Supervision clients flow through JCDOC
   b. Residential Center clients flow through JCDOC
   c. House Arrest clients flow through JCDOC

2. Objective #2: Work analysis for three primary types of case managers within JCDOC. Determine actual work content and activities when compared to ideal work content and activities for each type of case manager:
   a. Intensive Supervision Probation Officers (ISOs)
   b. Residential Center Case Managers (RCMs)
   c. House Arrest Officers (HAOs)

3. Objective #3: Cost/benefit–like analysis for justification of any recommended improvements through economic techniques.
   a. Monetize program costs and costs of potential alternatives identified – client is responsible for responding to requests for existing process costs
   b. Determine actual economic benefit of any recommended changes to processes or case manager work content

Key tasks associated with each objective:

1. Objective #1:
   a. Group interviews with each type of case manager
   b. Produce process flow charts and documentation
   c. Recommend improvements to processes

2. Objective #2:
   a. Obtain ideal definition of work content and activities from the organization for all three primary types of case managers
   b. Obtain estimates from case managers about lists of actual daily work content and activities, and time spent performing each type of activity
   c. Further validate this list of activities and time estimates by self and/or work sampling from a sub-group of case managers; will provide and train on how to fill-out work analysis task logs
   d. Analyze and compare ideal work content versus actual work content, and determine recommendations for reducing non-value-added work content

3. Objective #3:
   a. Where possible, calculate program costs and costs of potential alternatives identified
   b. Determine actual economic benefit of any recommended changes to processes or case manager work content

3 Based generally on the contract for services between Docking Institute of Public Affairs at Fort Hays State University and Johnson County Department of Corrections
4 Most information discussed in this report was collected March through July, 2008. Any JCDOC process or procedural changes since that time might not be fully reflected in statements or recommendations herein.
Case Management Overview

Three primary types of case managers were under study:

_Residential Case Managers_ (RCMs) are responsible for administering all aspects of JCDOC clients who are assigned to the Residential Center (RC). Clients can be assigned to the Residential Center as part of their bond agreements, probation agreements, or criminal sentences. Clients live at the Residential Center without significant restraint, and are allowed to leave the facility for limited reasons such as work, court appearances, medical appointments, etc. RCMs develop Management Plans with their clients that define conditions for a successful completion of the RC program. RCMs are physically located at the Johnson County Corrections Center, at the New Century Air Center business park, just off of I-35 and 175th street near Gardner, KS. Address: 141 Mission Parkway, Olathe KS 66031

_House Arrest Officers_ (HAOs) are responsible for administering most aspects of Johnson County Department of Corrections (JCDOC) clients who have been ordered to be detained on House Arrest (HA). Clients can be assigned to HA via one of several JCDOC programs or other regional programs from another cooperating local or regional corrections program. Other participating corrections organizations (including but not limited to the cities of Overland Park, Lenexa, etc.) utilize the JCDOC HA organization. These clients include suspects who are detained as a condition of their bond agreements, as well as convicted criminals whose sentences and/or probation direct that a House Arrest process should be applied. The House Arrest unit is physically located at the Johnson County Corrections Center in the New Century Air Center business park, just off of I-35 and 175th street near Gardner, KS. Address: 101 Roeland Park Drive, New Century, KS, 66031

_Intensive Supervision Officers_ (ISOs) are responsible for administering all aspects of JCDOC clients who are released from custody, but are still on intensive supervision probation (as opposed to standard probation). These clients are typically felony-convicted criminals who require more rigorous supervision after release than could be afforded by a “standard probation” process. Case-loads for case managers that supervise “standard probation” clients are significantly higher than case-loads for ISOs; this allows for closer case management scrutiny of clients sentenced to intensive supervision. Clients under the supervision of ISOs have Management Plans that are more detailed and restrictive than clients on “standard probation”. ISOs are physically located at a field office at 12425 W. 87th Street Parkway in Lenexa, KS.

All Case Managers (ISOs, RCMs, and HAOs) are classified as non-exempt employees; they are paid hourly and are eligible for overtime pay. Case managers (those working “normal” 8-hour days) should be taking one 30-minute unpaid lunch break, and they generally take two 15-minute paid breaks every work day.

Several other key staff members may be discussed throughout this report:

- _Corrections Advisors_ (CAs) are staff at the Residential Center facilities who perform duties somewhat similar in nature to jail guards and/or prison correctional officers. Typically, CAs are at a lower pay grade than ISOs, RCMs, and HAOs.
• *Senior Case Managers* (SCMs) supervise logical groups of ten or so ISOs, RCMs, and HAOs. Three SCMs supervise the ISOs at the 87th street field office. Two SCMs supervise RCMs at the Residential Center, and one SCM supervises HAOs at the House Arrest unit at the Residential Corrections Center. SCMs are responsible for various administrative functions during the supervision of their case managers including but not limited to overall case load management, quality audit and control, case consultation, and overall accountability of the program staff that they manage.

• *Assessment Officers* are JCDOC staff members who are located at the Olathe jail in downtown Olathe, KS and at the New Century jail near the Residential Center complex. They are responsible for administering the pre-sentencing LSI-R assessments, Work Release assessments, and Bond Investigations. The LSI-R is a risk assessment tool that is used to identify areas of risk that might lead a client to re-offend. Assessment officers do not participate in other pre-sentencing investigations, but other employees are authorized and trained to perform LSI-Rs. Other JCDOC staff members are trained in LSI-R assessment administration throughout the JCDOC system, to perform periodic assessments to update clients’ LSI-R scores. However, those other employees typically do not participate in initial pre-sentencing LSI-R assessment.

• Senior JCDOC staff members are located in an administrative office near the Johnson County Courthouse in downtown Olathe, KS. Key JCDOC staff employees include:
  o Director
  o Assistant Director
  o Director of Field Services
  o Case Monitor
  o Project Manager / Grants Writer and Administrator
  o Grants and Accounting Specialist
  o JoCo HR Representative
  o Senior Accountant
General Processes involving the Residential Center, House Arrest, and Intensive Supervision

Pertaining to adult clients entering JCDOC under Intensive Supervision or the Residential Center, the following general chart describes most typical post-sentencing activities:

Figure #1: Basic Client Flow Through the Probation Process

However, House Arrest clients typically enter JCDOC through a variety of ways, not necessarily post-sentencing. A more detailed set of general flows was developed with the assistance of Tom Dugan in the JCDOC Administration office. Similar to the figure above, these processes show the most typical high-level process activities.

---

5 Original Visio file flowchart from staff at Loula Street Administrative Offices
Figure #2: JCDOC Client Entry into the System: Processes prior to detailed probation sentences
Figure #3: JCDOC Client Entry into the System: Processes after detailed probation sentences
Clients enter the House Arrest process in various ways including but not limited to: a) as courtesy cases from local municipalities, b) as a condition of bond prior to sentencing, and c) as a result of sentencing. Similarly, clients can enter the Residential Center process in a number of ways including but not limited to: a condition of bond prior to sentencing, or as a result of sentencing.

Clients enter the Intensive Supervision process either directly from sentencing or after completion of a period of supervision either by House Arrest or the Residential Center. Probation violations (see figure #2) by clients can produce formal or informal sanctions that might result in clients moving from the Intensive Supervision process back to the Residential Center, back to House Arrest, or to another process in the overall corrections system.

Residential Center Processes

Three basic sets of processes occur for Residential Center clients: 1) intake processes, 2) ongoing case management, and 3) “out-take”, client release, or program completion processes.

Residential Intake Process

Figure #4 (see below) gives a general overview of the new client intake process. The Senior Case Managers (SCMs) in the Residential Center receive email notification from the Treatment Coordinator that a new client will be assigned to the Residential Center. A specific Residential Case Manager (RCM) is assigned, and initial work begins to create a new legal physical file for the new client, if one does not already exist in the JoCo Corrections system.

As noted from both group and individual interviews with RCMs, when new Residential Center clients have existing legal files within the adult JCDOC system, the format and information included in those files often differ from the ideal format needed by the RCMs. Thus, a preexisting file is often significantly re-worked, requiring nearly as much time as creating a new client file. Although a general legal file format is used throughout JoCo Corrections, the specific requirements of RCMs (and personal preferences of specific RCMs and SCMs) creates a need to pare down and properly organize clients’ legal physical files when they arrive from other processes within the JCDOC system. Some discussion during an initial review of a draft of this final report suggests that only a few RCMs significantly rework JCDOC files that are passed to RCMs. Although the magnitude of this challenge should be determined in order to prioritize this problem among others that could be corrected, there does not seem to be a firm level of standardization in clients’ physical files across Intensive Supervision, Residential Center, and House Arrest. Standardization in this instance should reduce unnecessary paper shuffling and increase both the effectiveness and efficiency of case management. The SCMs for these work groups should standardize, publish, and enforce a “single-best-method” format for clients’ physical files.
Upon a new client’s arrival to the Residential Center, the assigned RCM acts quickly to submit two packets of required paperwork for the new client to complete, and to set up an initial intake appointment/interview. An LSI-R assessment (Level of Service Inventory – Revised) and DNA collection are scheduled, if necessary. As mentioned previously, the LSI-R is a risk assessment tool that is used to identify areas of risk that might lead a client to re-offend. A client’s LSI-R
score is reassessed every six months, or after any significant changes to the client’s status, environment, living arrangements, etc.

After the initial intake interview and paperwork is completed, the RCM must enter a variety of data into two different and separate information systems: the Kansas TOADS (Total Offender Activity Documentation System) and the Johnson County JIMS (Justice Information Management System) information systems. The two information systems are currently not integrated, and considerable data is “double-entered” into both systems. Further discussion on this challenge is included throughout this document.

The general intake process at the Residential Center is completed by distributing necessary information to the Resource Developer and the Treatment Coordinator, (who will provide additional support for the client), and to a member of the Residential Center secretarial pool, (who will perform an initial records check on the new client). Last, the RCM creates a “working file” for the Correctional Advisors (CAs) working in the Residential housing units. Each client’s working file is kept in his/her housing pod. The working files track key information that the CAs need to manage the Residential Center clients in their daily activities. This information is updated weekly by clients’ RCMs.

Two facilitated group discussions, along with individual interviews, led to the development of the following broad set of new-client intake tasks. These categories were used to collect data from RCMs and their SCMs. In developing the work categories, some activities were combined together in logical blocks, based on the type of work being performed.

New-client intake activities
- Develop/assemble files for new clients (w/out client, before new client arrival)
- Initial new-client in-take meeting
- LSI-R Assessment or re-assessment, if necessary
- Other risk/needs assessments (for ACA data collection & accreditation)
- Administrative paperwork performed, related to new-client intake (paperwork that is not performed during the new-client meeting)
- Initial data entry for new clients into JIMS (not during new-client meeting)
- Initial data entry for new clients into TOADS (not during new-client meeting)
- After new-client intake report, distribution of information for records check, face sheet, intake assessment, etc.

Important note: Since the other new-client intake processes and client release processes for House Arrest and Intensive Supervision are similar, and because they are all relatively linear, only the new-client intake process for the Residential Center was formally flow-charted for this document, as shown in Figure #4 above.
**Ongoing Residential Case Management Processes**

Clients throughout the JoCo Corrections system operate on a “level system”, where results from client assessment and ongoing client accomplishment place each client on a “level” or grade category that indicates each client’s privileges, responsibilities, and progress toward program completion. For each RCM, ongoing case management includes weekly updates to the “level sheets” for clients’ working files, used by the CAs in the living areas/pods.

A wide variety of routine weekly activities comprise ongoing case management. As mentioned above, two facilitated group discussions, along with individual interviews, led to the development of the following broad set of weekly activities for RCMs. These categories were used to collect data from RCMs and the Residential SCMs. Some activities were combined together in logical blocks.

**Weekly activities & other maintenance tasks:**

**Weekly Client-related Tasks and daily tasks:**

- Review previous week’s client level-sheets and generate new ones
- Review and approve client requests for passes and visitors
- Read and/or respond to notes, emails or phone calls from clients
- Regular working-file maintenance activities (e.g. level sheets, approvals, changes, etc.); distribution to the CA working files in the living areas/pods
- Regular routine meetings with clients
- All TOADS and JIMS routine data entry. e.g. Chronological reports, Urine Analysis results, pay stubs & other informational reports
- Ledger entries & charge slips
- Weekly staff or informational meetings
- Generally take two 15-min breaks daily

**Other Weekly Required Administrative Tasks (some occasional tasks)**

- Drive to/from court
- Time spent at courthouse
- Car trips taken to help meet client needs
- Other work-related appointments outside of the Residential facility
- Transportation of clients who are "out of area"
- Type, develop, or respond to court motions
- Develop or respond to disciplinary reports
- Paperwork for Jail Sanction or Revocation
- Paperwork for clients who are AWOL
- Tracking paperwork needed for the physical legal file (e.g. signed disciplinary or informational reports)
- Read and/or respond to administrative emails and phone calls - requests for information
- Read and/or respond to administrative emails and phone calls - other
- Clean the bathroom, break-room, cubicles, interview rooms, etc.
- Time spent clarifying rules, procedures, processes
Residential Center Client Release Processes

A relatively short list of routine activities defines the client release process for the Residential Center. As mentioned above, two facilitated group discussions, along with individual interviews, led to the development of the following set of activities for RCMs during a routine client release process. These categories were used to collect data from RCMs and their Residential SCMs. Some activities were combined together in logical blocks. This list of work activities is generally sequential, with some exceptions. Most clients leaving the Residential Center are transferred to the Intensive Supervision process upon completion of their Residential Center programs, as suggested by the typical client release process described below.

Client release process
- Client release paperwork and "Release Plan form"
- Interstate compact paperwork, TOADS data entry, etc., as necessary
- Confirmation of Release Plan data
- Develop transfer summary & request assignment to an ISP officer
- Meeting with Supervisor to confirm basic Release Plan
- Typed Release Plan with directions for the client
- Final records check
- Letters to treatment providers, employers, D.A., and victim/witness office
- Confirm final court ledger, bills paid, etc.
- Final chronological report and status updates in TOADS and JIMS
- Review Final Release checklist
- Final meeting with client to complete and sign paperwork
- File to supervisor for file audit and transfer to ISP

Several of the RCMs' work activities associated with charge slips, court ledger, etc., are currently transitioning to a new accounts receivable process in JCDOC. The details of the new processes were not in place during interviews with the RCMs, and are not detailed in this report.

Residential Center Monthly or Occasional Activities

A variety of occasional or monthly activities cannot be measured or categorized easily as regular weekly work for RCMs. As mentioned above, two facilitated group discussions, along with individual interviews, led to the development of the following set of activities for RCMs during a routine client release process. These categories were used to collect data from RCMs and their Residential SCMs. Some activities were combined together in logical blocks.

Residential Center Monthly activities
- Case conference forms
- Send/receive treatment letters
- Misdemeanor stats
- Case-load reports
- Update case plans
- Case plan review with client
- Print-outs of JIMS and TOADS data to supervisor
- Various training & educational sessions
- Courtesy or parole case supervision updates
- DNA collection
Residential Facility Layout Diagram (First Floor)

Note that layout diagrams are not drawn to scale, and distances are approximate based on quick and dirty tape-measure calculations. Layouts are presented to discuss general challenges of efficiency and effectiveness for all three adult JCDOC case management types discussed in this report.

Figure #5: Layout of 1st Floor Residential Center Case Management Work Area
Discussion of the residential case management layout

At the current time, the copier machine doubles as both the primary printer and photocopier. No other printer is configured for the first floor residential case management area. Although the copier is centrally located for photocopying needs (which occur with greater frequency during client interviews and meetings), its location does not meet the needs for the printing activities performed by case managers. Most printing jobs occur while case managers are working in their cubicles.

Based on figure #5, locations of each of the ten case management cubicles were plotted, based on a \((x, y) = (0,0)\) origin location at the bottom left hand side of the layout, at the corner of the make-shift break area. Locations are labeled on the layout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Manager Work Cubicles</th>
<th>x-coordinate (measured in ft from (x = 0) location)</th>
<th>y-coordinate (measured in feet from (y = 0) location)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center of Mass</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #1: Center of Mass Calculation for Residential Case Management Cubicles

Although at one time the possible intent of the dual-use photocopier/printer might have been to reduce the capital investment required to support this work cell, the time wasted walking back and forth to the printer from work cubicles seems to be extremely unnecessary. Depending on the location of a case manager’s work cubicle, each trip to the printer/copier is between 20 to 70 feet (7 to 23 yards). Simple shadowing of several RCMs during normal periods of work led to the observation that most trips to the printer took a minimum of two minutes per trip, but only if print-outs were easy to locate and retrieve. A trip to the copier/printer could take five minutes or longer if multiple print jobs were cluttered on the machine. “Printer clutter” occurs often, when multiple case managers leave multiple print jobs on the printer and only pick them up in batches. Although this reduces the number of trips required to walk back and forth to the printer, it often increases the total time per trip due to the stack of print-outs that requires sorting for each of the several case managers to claim her/his print-outs.
A simple center-of-mass calculation based on estimated locations of the ten case management cubicles yields a center of mass of about (13.4, 16.3), which is extremely close to the open desk work area on the center isle near the middle of the layout in figure #5. Because most printing activities occur while case managers are working in their respective cubicles, it is strongly recommended that an additional printer be networked and available for use near the open desk work area in Figure #5. After observation of the House Arrest, Intensive Supervision, and the 1st Floor Residential case management work areas, only the 1st Floor Residential work area seems to have an insufficient number of printers to promote minimization of time wasted time due to walking to collect computer printouts.

Other than the current challenge associated with wasted time chasing down computer print-outs, the L-shaped work area promotes communication and collaboration between the residential case managers, since most of the work cubicles are centrally located “at the base of the L” in the floor layout.

**General challenges for Residential Case Management**

During the course of group discussions, conversations with individual RCMs, and direct observation of RCMs, the following challenges were observed. Remedies associated with these challenges could improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the work performed by RCMs.

1. The location of the printer in the current facility layout should be improved. As discussed above, the addition of a second printer, to be located near the current open desk work area on the main aisle of the office layout would significantly reduce wasted time associated with walking to the lone copier/printer, which is located between 20 and 70 feet away from the RCMs’ cubicles. Both the House Arrest and the Intensive Supervision case management work areas have printers that are well positioned, which eliminates time that otherwise would be wasted in excessive walking around to collect computer print jobs. This should be an inexpensive solution to save time and effort.

2. Greater standardization of electronic/digital forms and letters, and improved computer file organization.
   a. From direct observation of several residential case managers, a significant amount of time can be spent by RCMs looking for a “good model” of a specific type of letter or other formal correspondence with court officials. As an example, several RCMs under observation used previously submitted letters as foundational examples for new letters to court, but the search for those form letters took a relatively substantial amount of time, nearing ten minutes just to find the “right letter”. Although the premise is sound, (relying on the fact that supervisors had previously approved the format and content of these previously sent letters), a significant amount of time was required to find these letters, and then re-write them for new or updated use. The recommended approach is standardization. All Residential Case Managers as a group should adopt a single best format for each primary type of required correspondence. Form letters in MS-Word should be developed and pre-approved by supervisors that limit the content of each type of correspondence to a minimum required number of variable pieces of information. These letters should allow modification of only key pieces of information, with standardized language throughout the body of each letter that cannot be edited. A
minimum necessary set of form letters should be maintained and utilized consistently by all residential case managers. This should significantly reduce:

i. Time wasted looking for a good example of a previously written letter
ii. Time wasted tailoring letters by cut-and-paste, typing over, and re-typing
iii. Time wasted trying to improve previous letters or write new ones (if a good example or form letter cannot be readily found)
iv. Time wasted by supervisors who have to evaluate, edit, and approve a wide variety of formats, content, and styles originating from different case managers’ perceptions about what a good letter should look like.

b. The computer file system seems to have a significant amount of clutter (old copies of previously used letters, forms, data, etc.) A case manager could look through several separate hard drives, folders, and sub-folders for similar examples of the same type of standard correspondence. It is strongly recommended that time should be invested to minimize the number of areas where data and form letters are stored by JCDOC case managers. Users, such as case managers, possibly should have read-only access to some of the computer drives, and possibly should not be allowed to store additional files; thus not increasing the level of clutter in basic document storage sections of the networked hard disk storage system. As mentioned above, the number of stored basic form letters should be minimized by supervisors as a collective group, who should develop well-designed correspondence with approval from the JCDOC headquarters office. After these file copies are finalized, then they should be designated as “read-only” so that the base copy cannot be altered. Case managers should be able to “save-as” a new copy with specific tailored information for each individual client case. The same base copy of each type of letter or form should be used every time that it is required, to increase standardization and reduce wasted time spent editing and “wordsmithing” these basic forms of correspondence.

3. A significant amount of paper is generated and recycled to perform background checks. Discussions with several residential case managers noted that each background check generates between 15 - 50 printed pages of information for each client, depending on a client’s previous record and case history. Usually, the lifecycle of a hardcopy of a background check is less than eight hours. After a request is made to an authorized system user, the background check is run and the results are printed out. The printed hard copy is hand-delivered to the residential case manager, who reviews the information, saves the cover pages for proof that the check occurred, and then deposits the hard-copies into a locked “destroy document” container. No specific recommendations are made at this time, due to systemic constraints related to user access. Based on conversations with various JCDOC employees, a perception exists through JCDOC that no significant improvements to this process can be made, based on legal and procedural limitations:

a. Electronic copies of background checks cannot be made or emailed to case managers.

b. Only a limited few system operators have access and are trained and approved to utilize the background check system, thus limiting the case managers from performing background checks themselves and avoiding printing a hard-copy.
c. Perception of JCDOC employees is that the JoCo Sheriff’s Office, which oversees the system, training, and processes, will allow only a limited number of employees at JCDOC to be trained and to have access to the system.

d. However... it is strongly recommended that high-level discussions occur to promote alternatives to the current processes. This problem pervades not only Residential Center, but also House Arrest, and Intensive Supervision.

i. Although the current staff members who are trained and authorized to perform these background check tasks have only secretarial and/or office assistant level positions in JCDOC, the degree of importance associated with performing background checks aligns much more closely with case managers’ job descriptions and responsibilities.

ii. House Arrest averages about 1300 intakes per year; with relatively short durations; conservatively assume only one background check per client. Then assume approximate ongoing average loads of 180 cases combined for Residential and Therapeutic Community and 620 cases for Intensive Supervision, each @ two background checks per year, for a total of 1600 background checks per year. These combined, JCDOC is performing at least (1600 + 1300 =) 2900 background checks per year in these programs. Then, at an average of 20 pages per background check, at least 58,000 pages of background checks per year are printed and then disposed of almost immediately. At about $37 for 10 reams (5000 sheets) of paper, this is about $429 per year in paper. However, the cost of a printer cartridge (e.g. generic HP LaserJet 3005 remanufactured cartridge = $162 for 13,000 pages) increases this total by about $723 for a conservative total cost of at least $1152 per year. (see Appendix A).

4. Significant time can be spent by RCMs paring down or otherwise organizing a new client’s physical legal file. Clients who have already received services from other areas within adult JCDOC may already have a physical legal file somewhere in the system. Many different case managers throughout JCDOC have mentioned one or more of the following challenges associated with dealing with clients’ physical legal files:

a. Different services within JCDOC (e.g. Residential, House Arrest, and Intensive Supervision) prefer to have information in clients’ physical legal files emphasized or organized differently.

b. Different supervisors (SCMs) or case managers prefer to have information in clients’ physical files emphasized or organized differently, with varying levels of detail. For example one residential case manager specifically stated “I like my files better.”

c. It can be challenging to “keep up” with physical file maintenance and/or electronic file maintenance on busy work days... sometimes filing and file maintenance activities are saved for “slower work days”. Delays in file maintenance and filing can produce errors, loss of detail or granularity of information, and/or lost/forgotten information.

d. Because of the physical structure of the current files, a substantial amount of time can be required to insert a document into its proper place in the physical file, especially for a larger physical file (for a client who has been in the system longer). For example:
i. Opening the metal brads and removing materials that are on top (in the
way) of the location where the new material should be inserted into the
physical file

ii. Determining the correct sequence of materials and inserting the new file
materials

iii. Replacing materials that were removed and placing them back in the
correct order and location

iv. Closing/folding the metal brads back into place

e. File-related recommendations and suggestions: at a minimum, physical legal file
formats and content should be independent of individual employees and/or
individual supervisors. File content and format should be driven by organizational
needs and should be process-driven based on the real needs of the organization,
rather than on individual employees’ or individual supervisors’ personal
preferences. SCMs, with administration oversight and approval, should invest
time to determine the “one best way” for file format and content for each of the
major JoCo Corrections services (e.g. ISP, HA, and Res). Whenever possible,
consistency between services’ formats should be established to reduce “rework”
or unnecessary modifications to clients’ files when files are transferred between
services. Ideally, files should not require re-organization if a client is reassigned
from one case manager to another, or if a case manager is assigned to a new SCM.
The file organization and content should be consistent and independent of
individual employees. Further suggestion: brief discussions were held with a
couple of supervisors and case managers regarding experimenting with a different
type of physical file, e.g. three-ring binders or something similar. One of the
potential advantages was clear: the ability to quickly insert new file materials into
exactly the proper location in the file, without wasting time removing and re-
inserting other materials in the file. Especially for moderate to large-sized client
files, the advantages should be clear. Time is wasted when case managers must
disassemble portions of the physical file in order to simply insert new file
materials. Also, the current physical files were clearly designed for long-term
storage of clients’ materials after clients’ programs had been completed
successfully. The improvement of long-term storage processes (electronic storage
of clients’ files) would nullify any concerns regarding long-term client physical
file storage. However, the expense and convenience trade-off between the current
file folders and any potential alternative remains unclear. One suggestion would
be to conduct a limited trial of an alternative physical file to determine the
feasibility of a physical file that requires less wasted time in file maintenance.

5. Driving to/from court. Although case managers must make court appearances for their
clients as an essential part of their jobs, there was some indication that JCDOC has some
limited technologies available that could allow for teleconference appearances by RCMs
rather than in-person appearances.

a. To the extent that the technology is in-use, this should continue to be explored.
More active discussions should occur regarding cost-effective implementation of
technology between JCDOC and the various applicable court jurisdictions. The
use of “remote testimony” via technology is becoming more pervasive throughout
the judicial system, and the use of technology in lieu of live court appearances should be explored to its maximum benefit.

b. If the implementation of teleconference technology by JCDOC will be infeasible in the near future, explore the possibility of RCMs utilizing mobile computing to maintain productivity and accomplish real work while waiting for court, which is typically “non-productive time” for RCMs who are required to appear in court. Although some doubt might exist as to the effectiveness or potential productivity of RCMs while they are waiting for court, a well-designed pilot study to investigate the potential of this solution would incur only the following costs: 1) cost of a notebook or laptop computer, 2) cost of software and hardware required to make the RCM productive during wait-times (e.g. connectivity-related software and hardware), and 3) cost of time associated with checking-out and checking-in the mobile equipment. Ideally, if a pilot study proves cost-effectiveness of the concept, then RCMs should be able to check-out notebook computers that could be utilized to accomplish work while waiting for court.

6. Based on conversations with RCMs and HAOs, some conflict appears to exist between the facilities management structure (Operations staff) and the case management structure at the residential center complex. Any “matrix” management structure can benefit from the efficiencies of resource utilization that matrix organizations can provide, but this environment appears to have fostered at least some level of dysfunctional conflict. From a historical perspective, it is possible that the elimination of the Programs Assistant Director created a void in power and control for Programs and Case Management, which has led to the current conflict (perceived or real).

a. RCMs and HAOs are responsible for cleaning their own restrooms as well as their own conference rooms and client interview rooms. Based on the position descriptions that were available for RCMs and HAOs, no custodial or janitorial activities were listed under “Essential Duties”. Although these position descriptions do mention that “This position may at times be requested to perform other duties or special projects that are in the best interest of the County”, it does not appear that the intent of that clause was to require case managers to perform janitorial services for the operations staff of the Residential Center. Position descriptions should either be re-written, or case managers should not be performing these duties.

b. “Operations sends all of their emails to everyone”. Multiple RCMs and HAOs mentioned that most operations emails are not applicable to case management at the Residential Center, which wastes time by creating excess work opening, reading, and deleting emails. It is recommended that operations emails only be sent to SCMs, and allow SCMs to filter important information and pass along to case managers only those emails that they judge to be sufficiently important.

7. Double data entry into TOADS and JIMS information systems. This is a well-known time-waster for nearly all JCDOC case managers. As mentioned several times, integration of TOADS and JIMS data has been planned, but has not yet occurred. This integration of data could reduce case management workloads noticeably. For example, data duplication for a new client from JIMS back into TOADS can create up to 30 minutes of work for each new client. This does not consider other ongoing duplication of data entry.
8. Based on conversations with RCMs (and HAOs and ISOs), most SCMs require hard-copy printouts of case conference forms for monthly meetings with case managers. As noted by several case managers, this task could be accomplished by a case manager and his/her SCM reviewing information at the same time in TOADS and/or JIMS, rather than having case managers spend time creating additional printouts or creating additional summary pages of existing data.

House Arrest Processes

As mentioned above, since the new-client intake processes and client release processes for House Arrest and Intensive Supervision are similar to the Residential Center processes, and because they are all relatively linear, only the new-client intake process for the Residential Center was formally flow-charted for this document, as shown previously in Figure #4.

New Client Intake Process

Two facilitated group discussions, along with individual interviews, led to the development of the following broad set of new client intake tasks for the House Arrest work group. These categories were used to collect data from House Arrest Officers (HAOs) and from their Senior Case Manager (SCM). In developing the work categories, some activities were lumped together in logical blocks, based on the type of work being performed.

Because new clients may arrive at House Arrest through a variety of processes, new clients can arrive at House Arrest at almost any time of day, and on any day of the week. Although some new clients may arrive at the House Arrest office without notice, a fax, phone call, or email usually precedes a new client arrival. Often, a House Arrest officer must pick up a new client either from the JoCo jail in Olathe, or from the New Century jail located near the House Arrest facility.

Courtesy cases taken by House Arrest for local municipalities are handled differently from the normal flow of new clients into House Arrest. Once per week (Thursdays), a “mass-intake” process occurs at the City of Overland Park, KS. Responsibility for this process falls on a single dedicated HAO who specifically is assigned nearly all of the municipal courtesy cases.

For direct sentencing cases, an email is sent from the probation representative (Room 326 at the Olathe courthouse) to the HAO group. Usually no exact start date is given for direct sentence cases, but the jail will call when a new client requires pick-up from the jail and transportation to House Arrest administrative offices to begin the HA intake process.

Depending on daily workload, staffing, time of day, and arrival rates of new clients, a single new client intake can take between one and two hours (not including transportation time associated with picking-up a new client from jail). New client intakes typically end around 8:00 pm daily, and start each day as early as 5:00 am. During overnight hours between approximately 8:00pm and 5:00am, one Correctional Advisor (CA) is available to answer the House Arrest main phone line to address basic questions and resolve basic equipment problems.
House Arrest Tasks prior to new-client intake

- Process/organize information on new inbound HA clients (e.g. phone calls, emails, faxes, just show up, etc.)
- Schedule appointment or determine date for intake, into Outlook calendar system
- Transportation activity to/from jail
- Wait time at jail for client transfer to HA officer

Intake process activities

- Physical paperwork
- Equipment check-out
- Orientation checklist with the new client
- Records check form filled out, and process initiated with secretary
- Ledger entries for U/A and HA charges
- “Release of information” forms for employment & treatment provider(s)
- Verification of information on employment and treatment
- Letters to the JoCo victim/witness office and to the D.A.
- Room mate consent form
- Initial programming of the equipment (MEMS system)
- JIMS data input (possibly new JIMS file)
- Initial Urine Analysis sample taken
- Physical demonstration/presentation on equipment use
- Assign case to a specific case manager

House Arrest Routine Weekly Client Maintenance Processes

House Arrest typically has a population of clients around 175 at any given time. The HAOs and their SCM estimate that about half of an HAO’s workload deals directly with his/her own assigned clients. The other half of the workload is generated by other HAOs’ clients, while those HAOs either are off-duty or occupied with other tasks.

Out of necessity, House Arrest is less structured and less formal than either the Residential Center case management work group or Intensive Supervision case management work group. Similarly, the SCM in House Arrest is more a member of the team and less of a traditional supervisor than in the other two adult case management work groups. Numerous features of the required responsibilities of the HAOs and their SCM naturally formed the House Arrest unit into a self-organizing work team. These features include:

- the unpredictable nature of the of the overall workload,
- unplanned random client problems, challenges, or events that require immediate attention, often triggered by the random timing of the MEMS system calls to clients
- staggered (shift-work) HAO work schedules covering weekends and early/late hours
- 24/7 general coverage expectations to accommodate existing ongoing clients
- higher-than-average turnover rates for HAOs (compared to RCMs and ISOs)

As noted by the House Arrest SCM, maintaining full staffing is difficult. Full staffing is eight HAOs, but House Arrest has had about eight new HAOs in the last two years (approximately
50% rate per year). Additionally, the need to cover weekends, holidays, late and early shift times, and the general stress associated with this work environment has kept turnover rates high in this work unit. Planned vacations and extended absences (e.g. Family Leave Act) are difficult to juggle, and they create additional workload for the HAOs who are “left behind” to staff the facility while others are on extended leave.

Conversations with other case managers in Intensive Supervision and at the Residential Center also confirm that House Arrest is often viewed as a training ground or spring-board into other less stressful and more stable positions (stable work schedules and loads) within Johnson County Department of Corrections, particularly case management positions in Intensive Supervision or in the Residential Center. This perception (based on reality or otherwise) has increased turnover rates in House Arrest and thus has further increased the chaotic nature of the House Arrest work group.

Note: The following discussion describes why high employee turnover rates in House Arrest should be considered in scope for this project, which was to focus on work analysis, processes and efficiency. Efficiency (or utilization) is defined in its most basic terms as work output divided by resource input. Because of the relatively high employee turnover rate in House Arrest, there are periods of time where the resource inputs into the HA processes are reduced, which directly impacts work efficiency in its most basic definition. The impact on efficiency surfaces in one or more of the following ways when House Arrest is not fully staffed: 1) the ability of HAOs as a work group to complete all expected tasks is diminished, due to the need to focus on only the most vital tasks when full resources are not available (somewhat reduces the overall work output), 2) the use of overtime to compensate for a temporary shortage of full-time HAOs increases resource inputs to a certain extent (somewhat increases work input costs per employee), and 3) when staffing is less than full for extended periods of time, increased work-related stress can contribute to decreased task accomplishment and reduced task quality by decreasing employee morale and motivation. Longer periods of time with increased work-related stress and decreased employee morale and motivation enhance the risk of continued high employee turnover rates.

Although each client is assigned a specific HAO, House Arrest is a 24/7 operation. The trademark feature of the House Arrest unit is that “the phone is always ringing”. Based on multiple days of direct observation, this is nearly literally true. In this work environment, all HAOs must be generally familiar with all clients, or must be able to quickly become familiar with a client and his/her needs. Based on conversations with individual HAOs, the Pareto rule generally holds true: about 20% of the ongoing clients create about 80% of the unexpected or unplanned problems/challenges. To their credit, and seemingly out of necessity, nearly all of the HAOs seem to be at least somewhat familiar with the 20% of the clients that create these unexpected or unplanned problems/challenges.

Routine daily, weekly and occasional activities:
- Ongoing records checks (every three months)
- Dealing with equipment problems & trouble-shooting
- Participation at mass-intake at OP Municipal Court - every Thursday
- Intakes for conditional release from Residential (every Tuesday)
- Fax back copies of contracts to municipalities to show acceptance into the program
- Read and/or respond to administrative emails and phone calls - requests for information: attorneys, jail, referrals, etc.
- Read and/or respond to administrative emails and phone calls - other
- Read and/or respond to notes, emails or phone calls from clients
- Check results in MEMS Computer Files
- Follow-up on non-compliance for positive breathalyzer results
- Make calls to home, employer, etc.
- Spot checks / field checks
- Make law-enforcement requests (AWOLs, Out-of-place assignment)
- Program schedule change requests for clients
- Respond to client emergency requests/schedule deviation requests
- Weekly Chronological reports - JIMS
- Equipment retrieval
- Equipment inventory
- Case load list
- Jail assessments (acceptability)
- Equipment calibration
- Progress reports (client status for judges, D.A.)
- Weekly term summaries (short-term clients)
- Type/write motions for court cases
- Goal sheets - (case plans) review, every 30 days
- Treatment suggestions - DUI bond condition request for evaluation
- Time spent trying to find clients who are non-compliant
- Informational reports - non-compliances, emergencies, etc.
- Revocations
- Letters to employers & treatment providers
- Weekly meetings with clients
- Billing for services - ledger entries and related paperwork
- Drive/transport to/from court
- Time spent at court
- Violation memos
- Correspondence with primary case manager(s)
- Routine Urine Analyses (U/As), drug screens, etc.
- Information verification (pay stubs, receipts, etc.)
- Case management strategy with supervisor and/or other case managers
- Placing clients into custody
- Phone logs
- Check in/out phone
- Car log
- Check in/out car
- Cleaning bathrooms, interview rooms, conference rooms, etc.
- Check warrant and custody status of clients
- Follow-up on all client court activity
• Follow-up on U/As on color-code list
• Request additional information on positive U/A tests
• Two 15-minute paid breaks per day

House Arrest Client Release Processes

Discharge/release activities
• Update JIMS
• Deactivate equipment
• Determine instructions for equipment retrieval
• MEMS system file close
• Double-check account balance
• Charge slips
• Last Chronological log entry in JIMS
• Term summary --> file
• Short-term clients file preparation: Open and close JIMS file, etc.
• File to supervisor for audit
• File broken down for document scanning

House Arrest Monthly and Occasional activities

Monthly/Occasional Activities
• Case conferences with supervisor
• Preparation for case conferences
• Peer review / staff meeting
• Equipment summary
• Statistics (for ACA accreditation purposes)
• CWIPS - weekend intervention program (every 3rd weekend)
• Prepare information for CWIPS weekends
House Arrest Facility Layout

Reminder: layout diagrams are not drawn to scale, and distances are approximate based on quick and dirty tape measure calculations. Layouts are presented to discuss general challenges of efficiency and effectiveness for all three case management types discussed in this report.

Figure #6: Layout of House Arrest Case Management Area
**Discussion of House Arrest Case Management Area Layout**

There were no substantial complaints from the house arrest case officers (HAOs) regarding the layout of their work area, with the exception of the location of the copy machine. As shown in Figure #6, the copier is located about 60 ft (20 yards) from the client interview rooms, at the opposite corner in the layout from the interview rooms. Similar to copier use by the Residential Case Managers as discussed previously, the copier in House Arrest is used by the HAOs substantially more for new client processes and during routine meetings with clients than for any other purpose. Copies are made of clients’ receipts and pay-stubs and other relevant materials for ongoing case management. Additionally, although the copier could also be networked to serve as a printer, at the current time it has not been properly configured as such. Two potential locations for the copier would better serve the needs of the HAOs and eliminate a substantial amount of time that is currently wasted walking back and forth to the opposite corner of the HAO work area. Ideally, the copier could be located just inside the locked security door between the cluster of HAO cubicles and the interview rooms. This would provide a better balance of serving the needs of the HAOs. An alternative location might include the currently unused Front Office area, near the SCM office. This is less ideal because this location also creates increased travel distance for copier jobs that are not related to client activities occurring in the interview rooms.

Otherwise, the centralized location of all HAO cubicles is conducive to the current group/teamwork approach that has evolved naturally in the House Arrest work environment.

**General challenges for House Arrest Case Management**

1. As mentioned above, to eliminate wasted time and effort associated with using the copy machine, the copier should be relocated to a position much closer to the client interview rooms. Additionally, to increase its effectiveness, the copier should be properly networked to allow it to function in dual mode as a printer.

2. One of the greater challenges facing this work group is the employee turnover rate of HAOs (see previous note on page 26 regarding the relationship between process efficiency and employee turnover rates). As noted by the Senior Case Manager, House Arrest has replaced eight HAOs in the last two years, for an average turnover rate of 50% per year. The general root cause of the high turnover rate is most likely work-related stress, which stems from a variety of causes, including:
   a. Work schedules for HAOs regularly include holiday and weekend hours. Additionally, newer HAOs often work less desirable schedules and shifts, some of which are dramatically different than a traditional standard work week. Since the salary schedule for HAOs generally is the same as that for RCMs and ISOs, house arrest is often viewed by case managers in JCDOC as a training ground for other positions within the system that have more stable work schedules.
   b. As mentioned previously, “the phone is always ringing” at the House Arrest work unit. Out of necessity, all of the HAOs must have some awareness of all of the ongoing clients who seem to have regular ongoing challenges. The self-organizing work group that has evolved has done so due to the impossible alternative: that each case manager deal only with her/his own clients. This group teamwork approach, although better suited to meeting clients’ needs than a set of
strict individual client-to-case-manager relationships, creates stressful mental challenges for all HAOs. The teamwork approach requires that all eight HAOs have some level of working knowledge about all 175 house arrest clients. As mentioned earlier, often this is reduced to the “20% of the clients that tend to cause 80% of the unexpected problems/challenges”.

c. Due to the small number of HAOs, when one or more of them take vacation days or utilize Family Leave Act time, the remaining HAOs must “pick up the slack”. As a percentage basis, compared to the overall number of RCMs and ISOs, this places a larger burden of the overall work on each remaining House Arrest staff member, including the SCM.

d. There is some indication from questionnaire data and personal conversations that the HAOs routinely do not take two 15-minute breaks (or a reasonable equivalent) each day. Several of them also noted that they occasionally work through their 30-minute lunch breaks at their desks. Occasionally during such conversations, this behavior almost seemed like a *badge of honor* to some employees: that their roles were so vital that they did not have time to take breaks. Although the work ethic should be commended, this is not a set of positive behaviors in the long term. The burn-out demonstrated by the high turnover rate is exacerbated by the unwillingness or inability to take planned and well-deserved breaks from this stressful job.

e. Suggestions and recommendations associated with the stressful work environment:

i. Investigate using call center personnel to handle inbound phone calls to House Arrest. Currently, the Department of Kansas Child Support Enforcement utilizes a call center to handle first-line calls and routine child support issues for ongoing clients. The opportunity here is to significantly reduce employee stress, and the turnover associated with job stress. A well-trained call center employee should be able to:
   1. help clients troubleshoot equipment problems
   2. pre-sort phone calls and only direct the more critical calls to full-time HAOs
   3. take note of check-in calls from clients who return from work or other allowable outside activities, and who request a MEMS event
   4. make allowable adjustments to clients’ schedules in the MEMS system
   5. take detailed messages for clients’ HAOs, who can then return calls to clients at a convenient or appropriate time
   6. reduce the immediate stress of HAOs having to respond to client “emergencies”, and allow them to focus on more direct value-added activities

ii. Reduce shift-work for HAOs as much as possible by hiring a pseudo-CA level employee (“House Arrest Associate” - possibly requiring a new or modified job description) to answer phone calls and handle first-line routine house arrest issues. The job responsibilities of a House Arrest Associate (HAA) would be similar to the tasks described above for a call-center employee. These HAAs should report to the House Arrest SCM,
and could be selected based on their interest and desire for future full-time employment as HAOs. This would be appropriate for employees who would make qualified applicants for HAO, but who might not yet have two years of work experience in corrections, as required by the HAO job description. This pipeline of potential future HAOs should bolster the pool of candidates when HAO positions open up, and should reduce the HR-related time and effort required to quickly fill vacant HAO positions. By offloading routine tasks onto a lower-wage employee, and thus reducing stresses on HAOs, these HAAs also should be helping to reduce turnover rates in House Arrest.

iii. To reduce organizational stress and possibly reduce total costs, some potential exists to limit the need for 24/7 coverage in House Arrest. Because clients arrive at House Arrest from a variety of routes and at a wide variety of times, a number of separate issues must all be addressed to reduce “shift work” or other “after-hours” House Arrest staffing:

1. Communication with and reeducation of local bond companies to redirect incoming condition of bond clients to scheduled intake appointments. Specific blocks of time could be set aside for incoming condition of bond clients. Scheduling could then be limited to more traditional work shifts and work days. This suggested action is probably the cheapest/easiest to implement, requiring only a policy change, time/effort in communicating the change, and enforcement/reinforcement of the change.

2. High-level communication with regional judiciary and/or Johnson County Sheriff’s office personnel might be necessary to modify the expectations of House Arrest; current clients who are on direct sentence to House Arrest might be instructed to “immediately report to House Arrest”, possibly just after the completion of a short jail sentence. The current process for House Arrest follows “the directions of the bench”, but there is some indication that the Residential Center is granted latitude regarding the time/date at which clients might report for their programs (e.g. due to space availability, Residential Center programs for a client might not start “immediately” upon release from jail). Discussions with the judiciary should include: a) the timing of sentences involving House Arrest, such that new clients could be processed during traditional or scheduled work shifts and work days, and b) slightly flexible windows for new HA clients to report to HA facilities.

3. Ideally, at the current time, non-compliant clients who “blow numbers” during routine MEMS checks should be forced to report to House Arrest as soon as possible, to verify non-compliance via urine analysis or other confirmation. By limiting House Arrest work hours and shifts to a more traditional schedule, either an alternative process should be developed for checking after-hours non-compliant clients, or the rigor associated with follow-up on non-compliant clients probably would be reduced.
4. Additionally, it is currently unclear how flexible House Arrest can be with CWIPS (2\textsuperscript{nd} DUI) clients who are mandated to spend three days on House Arrest immediately following two days of jail time at the Residential Center. If the timing is mandated via legislation, then interpretation of the law that established the program might be necessary to gauge the possibility that CWIPS clients could be processed on Monday mornings, instead of on Sundays (for example). The goal would be to conduct these intakes during traditional work shifts and work days, if possible.

5. An additional suggestion might include outsourcing CWIPS clients to another service provider, instead of processing them through JCDOC. However, the current charge to CWIPS clients for the three-day house arrest commitment is $120, which is the same rate for any House Arrest client being processed for a program of fewer than ten (10) days. From the perspective of the overall system, considering the relatively short client time, this source of revenue might outweigh the current cost of providing the service through JCDOC. Obviously, the “return on investment” for JCDOC of a three-day client is higher than for a ten-day client. A more detailed cost analysis would be necessary to evaluate specific opportunities to outsource CWIPS, and assess the cost/benefit associated with the status quo, as opposed to the cost/benefit of other alternatives to serving these clients.

iv. Formalize the current self-organizing work group into two distinct case management teams that have group “ownership” of a relatively smaller number of cases. Currently, all eight HAOs must have some awareness of all 175 cases, especially those 20\% of clients (approximately 35 or so at any time) that incur the majority of routine challenges for case management. This approach potentially could cut in half the number of active cases about which any one HAO should be knowledgeable; this should reduce the mental stresses associated with maintaining awareness of a large number of client cases.

v. Monitor and enforce required break times and lunch breaks for all hourly employees. It should be self-evident that this is both a legal issue, as well as a stress-related issue. If break times cannot be enforced without significantly increasing stress or workload, then this might be an indication that the House Arrest group in general is understaffed in some manner.

3. A minor issue, related to the email inbox problem, regards organizing HAO leave time and other scheduling data. Currently, a separate hard-copy calendar is used to track HAO planned leave and vacation dates, while the standard Outlook calendar is used to track expected arrival dates for new HA clients. It is recommended that a new and separate calendar in Outlook should be constructed and accessible by all HAOs for tracking HAO planned leave and vacation time, as well as other major events that are not appropriate for the current client-related Outlook calendar, such as: important JCDOC HR dates, optional and required training dates, dates of optional JCDOC social or community service events,
etc. After development and implementation, this could easily be maintained by the SCM, but available for all HAOs to see. Additional training in MS-Outlook with proper configuration of each employee’s settings might be necessary.

**Intensive Supervision Processes**

As mentioned previously, since the new-client intake processes and client release processes for House Arrest and Intensive Supervision are similar to the Residential Center processes, and because they are all relatively linear, only the new-client intake process for the Residential Center was formally flow-charted for this document, as shown previously in Figure #4.

**ISP New Client Processes**

New clients arrive at the Intensive Supervision process either from direct sentencing, or as the final part of a package of sentencing requirements that first might have included jail, house arrest, and/or Residential Center programs. Clients entering the ISP process usually (but not always) already have a legal physical file somewhere in the JCDOC system.

Two facilitated group discussions, along with individual interviews, led to the development of the following broad set of new client intake tasks (and routine weekly tasks, etc.) for the Intensive Supervision case management work group. These categories were used to collect data from Intensive Supervision Officers (ISOs) and from their Senior Case Managers (SCM). In developing the work categories, some activities were combined together in logical blocks, based on the type of work being performed.

ISP New Client In-Take Processes

- Contact new client to set-up initial face-to-face meeting
- Create new or modify old incoming physical client file (e.g. sentencing, police reports, records check request, account ledger, obligations, DNA, drug-screen process, etc.)
- Track down missing (original) information for inbound client physical file
- Establish a new TOADS file for new client
- Perform LSI-R if not done yet
- Initial face-to-face meeting
- Meeting notes into TOADS
- Generate referral for orientation (if not already done)
- Generate field services agreement
- Confirm that all data is correct in TOADS (self-audit)
- LSI-R data into TOADS for KDOC, and into JIMS, if necessary
- Phone calls to collateral contacts (to double-check LSI-R data)
- Check and correct data in JIMS if necessary
- Signed release for employer
- Generate date-based referrals to programs/services
- Case Plan development
- Courtesy clients - extra time and tasks associated
- Sex offenders - contract/document generated
- Sex offenders - registration process & review with client
- Audit / Verify that TOADS and JIMS data is consistent
- DNA submission dates to JIMS and TOADS, generate hardcopy for the client file
- Schedule the DNA appointment
- Assign U/A color, (if applicable), contact lab (CMS)

Routine Weekly ISP Processes

The frequency of meetings with clients is based on the “level system”, as previously described with respect to the Residential Center. Previously, ISOs were meeting with clients slightly more frequently, but now they are meeting with clients based on Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC) standards. Based on a client’s LSI-R score and other factors, an ISO meets with a client anywhere from once per month (for a client on “level 4”) to once per week (for a client on “level 1”). ISOs meet with “level 3” clients twice per month, and they meet with “level 2” clients three times per month. Some ISOs try to adopt a more stable schedule, where almost all client meetings occur in the 2nd and 4th weeks of any month (except for level 1 and level 2 clients). This gives them the 1st and 3rd weeks of any month to focus on catching up on paperwork, completing and updating chronological entries, and other tasks that require larger blocks of time and fewer scheduled interruptions.

Routine (Daily/Weekly) Activities
- Generally take two 15-minute paid breaks per day
- Enter U/A data into TOADS (lab enters into JIMS)
- Hand-enter U/A lab results into client physical file
- Supervise U/A collection on-site
- Print paper "back-ups" from TOADS or JIMS and place in client physical file
- "Self-audits" - ongoing data updates (data entry) between JIMS and TOADS to maintain consistent data
- Meet with clients
- Set-up / schedule / re-schedule appointments with clients
- Transfer meeting notes into Case Plan, Chronological Reports
- Follow-up LSI-Rs (about every six months)
- LSI-R's for absconders
- Drive to/from court
- Time spent at court
- Records checks (about every six months)
- "Document everything in TOADS"
- Request "invoking the statute"
- Write-up sanctions / violations
- "ongoing collateral verifications with relatives"
- Write-up court motions
- Follow-up to verify or investigate assumed or known violations before taking action
- Look for / wait for foreign language or deaf interpreter
- Activities associated with taking care of "illegal alien" cases
- Check police bulletins, JoCo booking sheets
- Activities associated with "interstate compact" cases
- Car check-out and check-in, Car log
- Take car for maintenance
- Staffing for facility programming purposes
- Process clients through the metal detector
- Answer the doorbell after hours
- Run/walk back/forth to printer
- Sort through "which printouts are mine" at the printer
- Run/walk back/forth to copy machine
- Read and/or respond to administrative emails and phone calls - requests for information
- Read and/or respond to administrative emails and phone calls - other
- Read and/or respond to notes, emails or phone calls from clients
- Create and track status of documentation with court system
- Respond to client paperwork requests during client meetings (walking back to cubes…)
- Pre-revocation meeting with client, supervisor, etc.
- Field visits
- Training - ongoing training and training reviews
- Informal meetings to brainstorm treatment/actions for clients
- Take client to job interview, Wal-Mart, "clothes closet", treatment, etc.

**ISP Client Release Processes**

After a client completes his/her programs and all court conditions are met, the following general set of tasks is completed.

**ISP Client Release Tasks**
- Check - restitution complete? All court conditions met? All Case Plan conditions met?
- Final records check
- Finalize all data and "close-out" all TOADS screens
- Perform "Discharge LSI-R"
- Discharge letter to employer
- "Four-page summary form" for supervisor
- Final TOADS/JIMS data audit
- Print Chronological reports and place in file
- Submit file to supervisor for audit/review
- Clean-up any data, if necessary, from audit on supervisor request
- Have "term order" signed and filed
- Track status of all documentation to the court
- Close-out JIMS
- Send client physical file to "Teresa"
Monthly/Occasional Activities

- Case Conference Forms & Data entry into TOADS
- Case conference meetings with supervisors
- Print case plans
- Chronological updates to Case Review Plan
- For each client, print "contacts" once per month
- Sign-up for DNA assistant duty/obligation
- SB123 Cases - Review monthly invoices and submit
- SB14 - Voucher and incentive requests
- Print case lists - TOADS and JIMS
- Check court payment ledgers
- Verification with collateral contacts, employer, etc.
- Meetings with treatment providers
- Peer review meetings, staff meetings
Intensive Supervision Facility Layout

Reminder: layout diagrams are not drawn to scale, and distances are approximate based on quick & dirty tape-measure calculations. Layouts are presented to discuss general challenges of efficiency & effectiveness for all three case management types discussed in this report.

Figure #7: Intensive Supervision Case Management Work Area
Discussion of Intensive Supervision Facility Layout

During the original data collection process for this report, there were no major comments or concerns from ISOs regarding facility layout at the ISO administrative work area at the 87th Street facilities. Although the basic layout in Figure #7 shows the copier machine located nearer to the administrative assistants than to the ISO’s cubicles, photocopies are more often needed during routine interviews with clients, which occur in the Interview Rooms, (located to the right of this work area and not shown in Figure #7). A second copier (not pictured) is more proximal to the Interview Rooms and typically that copier is used during meetings with clients. These client interview rooms (not pictured, to the right of the ISO work area) were generally well-supported with access to this secondary copy machine and at least one other printer. Similarly, the work areas for ISOs were well-supported with printers and other resources. Due to the somewhat sprawling nature of the ISO’s cubicles and office space, some specific cubicles have slightly better or worse access to copy machines, printers, administrative assistants, supervisors’ offices, etc. A more detailed analysis with the support of the SCMs might be done to optimize the location of the copier shown in Figure #7. It is unclear if the copier receives heavier use by the administrative assistants, (who work in the windowed area at the top right of Figure #7) or by the ISOs, whose cubicles are more densely populated at the bottom of Figure #7.

However, it should be noted, after a brief review of the draft copy of this final report by JCDoc case managers and staff, that the layout at ISP has changed slightly, and that the availability of printers to many ISOs has become more challenging. The following changes have occurred: the printer in the bottom left corner of the layout diagram has been moved to an area nearer to the “open office” next to the SCM office. Additionally, cubicles for ISOs have been added. The new positions of the printers (1st near the administrative assistants, 2nd near the two SCM offices, and the 3rd moved to near the single SCM office) does not benefit the efficiency of ISOs. The center of mass of all ISOs is closer to the bottom of the layout diagram, but the 3rd printer in its new location appears to be more convenient for the SCMs than for the ISOs.

General challenges for Intensive Supervision

1. Related to the recent change in the workplace layout at Intensive Supervision, it is recommended either that 1) a 4th printer be networked and positioned closer to the bottom of the layout shown in figure #7, or 2) the 3rd printer, which was originally located at the bottom of the ISP layout, be relocated closer to the bottom of the layout. Although the layout in figure #7 might suggest that the straight-line distance from the original location of the 3rd printer to its current position was somewhat short, the rectilinear distance (“city-block” or street-map distance) is longer. ISOs along the bottom corridor in the layout have much further to walk now than previously, to access a networked printer. A closer analysis of printing volume by individual SCMs and ISOs should be conducted to optimize the locations of the 2nd printer (by the two SCM offices) and the 3rd printer (currently near the single SCM office). By using the same center-of-mass technique as shown above in the discussion of RCMs, with additional information about printing
volumes of each ISO and SCM, ideal locations of printers could easily be determined. This task should be completed based on the new updated layout, not pictured here.

2. As mentioned previously with respect to Residential Case Managers, significant amounts of time are spent setting up new client files, or organizing and paring down client files that pass to ISP from Residential or House Arrest. As recommended previously, at a minimum, file formats and content should be independent of individual employees and/or individual supervisors. File content and format should be driven by organizational needs and should be process-driven based on the real needs of the organization, rather than on individual employees’ or individual supervisors’ personal preferences. SCMs, with administration oversight and approval, should invest time to determine the “one best way” for file format and content for each of the major JCDOC adult services (e.g. ISP, HA, and Res). Whenever possible, consistency between services’ formats should be established to reduce “rework” or unnecessary modifications to clients’ files when files are transferred between services. Ideally, files should not require re-organization if a client is reassigned from one case manager to another, or if a case manager is assigned to a new SCM.

3. Based on conversations with ISOs and their SCMs, only very few ISOs have time to conduct field visits, despite the fact that this task is implied in the ISO position description: “Ensures that client activity is in accordance with all court and program requirements through such supervisory activities as monitoring client reporting, employment, participation in treatment and other programming, and any monitoring other special conditions imposed by the court.” A clear consistent policy should exist for all SCMs about the expected frequency of field visits by ISOs for each client. Several ISOs noted that they only make a significant effort to track down a client with a field visit when there is a fear that that client is about to be officially classified as “abscended”.

4. As mentioned previously with respect to email at the Residential Center, ISOs email inboxes easily become inundated with unimportant “time-waster” emails that are intended for HR, JCDOC administration or supervisors, or support staff. Even throughout the brief period of time required by this analysis, it was common for several ISOs’ email boxes to reject inbound emails because they were “full”. Similar to the previous discussion, it is recommended that such administrative emails not be sent to “all employees”, but rather funneled through SCMs, who should filter out administrative noise and pass along only those emails that are important or appropriate for ISOs.

5. Related to the email overload problem, it is strongly recommended that a secondary calendar view in Outlook be established so that ISOs and other employees can view dates of important JCDOC events such as deadlines for HR issues, training, “Feed the Need”, optional social events, etc. This could easily be established and maintained by a JCDOC HR employee, and take the place of many of the informational emails that clog email inboxes across JCDOC.

6. Consistency between the ISO position description and measurement/observation of their work.
   - The ISO position description does not officially note that shift work is required, but some clarification should be made to properly address the fact that: 1) some employees must work earlier/later shifts to accommodate clients’ needs for meetings with ISOs, or 2) that some employees have the opportunity to utilize flex time, often which is mutually beneficial for JCDOC for coverage/scheduling reasons, as well as for individual ISOs.
i. Conversations with SCMs in Intensive Supervision suggest that ISOs have sufficient flexibility to make minor modifications to their weekly work schedules, to accommodate the needs of their clients.

ii. ISOs should continue to be able to make legal requests for schedule changes within the flextime system, without violating the constraints of the system. After conversations with ISOs, however, it would be appropriate to remind ISOs of this information regularly; many have a narrow view of what is allowable, and they might not be taking full advantage of the current policy. Likely, annual (or more frequent) communication would be appropriate to convey clearly the boundaries and possibilities of the flextime system for use by ISOs to accomplish their work effectively and efficiently.

- The pending potential requirement that ISOs supervise their clients’ entrance and/or exit through metal detection equipment. Currently, this does not appear to be covered by the ISO job description. General concerns include the fact that this incongruence could become a legal issue if a client were to bring a weapon through the metal detector, and there are unclear expectations placed on ISOs regarding use of the metal detectors. If this does become policy, due to its potential significance both from a safety and a liability perspective, it should be included in the job description, with clear written policies, formal training for ISOs, etc.

7. The current merit evaluation system, as designed by Johnson County for JCDOC, deserves further attention. Although this issue does not directly fall under the auspices of JCDOC, case managers are significantly impacted. Their perceptions of merit and reward for their work (based on reality or otherwise) directly relates to their work-related motivation, and their abilities to efficiently and effectively contribute to meeting the goals and objectives of JCDOC. It is strongly recommended that JCDOC continue to work with Johnson County to continuously improve the merit and evaluation system for JCDOC case managers.

8. As discussed previously, individual and group interviews with Intensive Supervision Officers (ISOs) as well as with Case Managers in the Residential Center and House Arrest, indicate significant frustration with data double-entry requirements of the Kansas TOADS (Total Offender Activity Documentation System) and the Johnson County JIMS (Justice Information Management System) information systems during and throughout clients’ programs during their supervision periods within the JCDOC system. Additionally, some duplication of information occurs within clients’ files and between the two information systems (JIMS and TOADS).

- As noted from conversations with at least one SCM and one employee from the JCDOC administration office, Johnson County Dept of Corrections is moving toward a single LSI-R entry stored in the TOADS system. Due to contractual limitations on the use and storage of proprietary LSI-R data, double data-entry of LSI-R data into both the TOADS and JIMS information systems costs twice as much as a single entry into only one system. An initial pilot study was completed, and JCDOC is moving toward using only LSI-R data stored in TOADS.
• As noted by more than one ISO, information about clients’ Urine Analysis (U/A) results are stored in multiple locations, both in hard-copy form and in digital form in TOADS. For example:
  i. Results entered onto a log sheet in the client’s physical file
  ii. The printed results are stored in the client’s physical file
  iii. On-site log book records results for on-site U/As
  iv. Client receives a receipt for on-site U/As
  v. TOADS data entry on U/A results

• End of month case conference forms. ISOs must prepare case conference forms for each client in preparation for end-of-month meetings with their SCM. Even though the forms have been streamlined to require less time to prepare only the most pertinent information for each client, all of the data required for the monthly meeting can be found in TOADS. As mentioned previously with respect to end-of-month meetings, most ISOs believe that end-of-month case conferences could occur between an ISO and his/her SCM by directly reviewing data in TOADS, without the creation of separate paper forms. Estimates made by several ISOs suggest that it takes about 10 minutes per client per month to generate case conference forms. Ten minutes per client @ about 30 clients per ISO yields about 300 minutes (5 hours) per month per ISO, spent preparing paperwork from data that is already stored in TOADS. For 30 ISOs, this yields 150 worker-hours per month, which is almost one entire ISO employee’s monthly hours. The general recommendation is to simplify and eliminate printed paper, where possible. If case conferences can occur with two individuals reviewing data on a single TOADS computer monitor, then the time, energy and paper spent generating physical hard-copies of case conference forms seems wasteful.

9. The computers in the client interview rooms do not receive much use, and might not be meeting their original intended purpose. As mentioned by several ISOs: although ISOs could be using the computer terminals in the client meeting rooms during client meetings to take notes during those meetings (chronological log entries), there is a fear of losing important personal contact between the client and the case manager by allowing the distraction of typing and data entry to get between the client and the case manager. By typing case notes while meeting with the client, several ISOs believe that clients could become alienated and feel as though they are not of primary importance, which could reduce the level of trust and honest communication between the client and the case manager.

• Accessibility: whenever related upgrades to the computers occur in the client interview rooms, each ISO must “set-up” himself or herself on the computers in all of the interview rooms, which is somewhat time consuming. Recommendation: this is a task that should be performed by IT support personnel for all ISOs, after the computer upgrades are completed.

• With one ISO, we experimented during a couple of client interviews by utilizing a notebook computer with computerized pen to take basic notes. The objective was to test the ability of the notebook computer to save the ISO time in converting traditional hand-written notes into text that ideally could be input into JIMS chronological entries. The assumption was that the hand-written notes on a
notebook computer would be less intrusive in a client meeting than typing on a computer keyboard.

i. When using “freeform” input mode, the handwriting recognition program performed too poorly to convert handwriting to text, and required too much editing to make the original notes usable in digital form.

ii. When using the “input line” to take notes on the notebook computer, the handwriting recognition performed well and was easier to edit on the fly. If the notebook computer that was used would have had access to JIMS, then the case notes could have been “cut&pasted” into a chronological entry.

- Recommendation: explore the utilization of notebook computers with docking stations for ISO use. Identify a small number of candidates (ISOs) who are willing to participate in a controlled trial (pilot study) using notebook computers with electronic pens, in their client meetings. The notebook computers are then docked as primary PCs in the ISOs’ cubicles. The potential benefits to be identified and quantified:
  
  i. Time saved in taking notes during client meetings and then converting them to chronological entries, rather than translating hand-written notes.
  
  ii. Money saved in having computers in dual use; instead of one computer in each ISO cubicle and one computer in each client interview room, no computers fixed in client interview rooms.
  
  iii. Enhanced productivity of mobile computing: related to unproductive time that ISOs spend waiting at court for court hearings. Argument is identical as that suggested for RCMs who have to wait at court for required court appearances. Having sufficient connectivity available in the notebook computer should enable it to be functional for use while ISOs are in “wait mode” for required appearances in court.

10. New-client intake process modifications are already underway. Independent of this project study, modifications to the new-client process were planned and were initiated. Key to this process improvement effort was the utilization and re-tasking of office administrative staff. First, the schedules of the two administrative assistants were shifted and staggered to provide better daily coverage for clients and for the ISOs during each business day (one at 10 hours/day, 4 days/week on MTWU and one at 10 hours/day, 4 days/week, TWUF). For the improved new-client intake process: a) office administrative assistants will receive notice from one of the SCMs that a new client has been assigned to ISP, they will have four days total to initiate the new client, b) office administrative assistants then will have three days to initiate paperwork and start the new physical file, and set-up TOADS and JIMS files for the new client, and then c) they will perform the initial records check on the new client, and deposit the new physical file into the new ISO’s mailbox.

- This current process improvement effort is mentioned here primarily to highlight the following: the coherent integration of office administrative assistants and ISOs.

- The physical separation of administrative assistants from House Arrest Officers’ work areas and Residential Case Managers’ work areas significantly hinders future potential process improvement efforts in HA and Res. As discussed
previously, the “matrix management” approach utilized in general at the Residential Center has the opportunity to maximize individual productivity of employees, but the concept of dual supervision or dual responsibilities inherently creates conflicts that need to be managed carefully. In order for the office assistants associated with House Arrest and the Residential Center to be integrated into any time-saving or labor-saving process improvements, the supervisory connections between SCMs and the office assistants need to be strengthened. This will require a minor organizational realignment.

Additional general considerations

ACA Accreditation

Throughout this project, many case managers, SCMs, and other JCDOC staff have noted that some specific required tasks were performed strictly for data collection purposes, for maintaining ACA accreditation.

Based on the underlying history behind why JCDOC originally sought ACA accreditation for various programs, it might be worthwhile to discuss the costs and benefits of continuing with ongoing ACA accreditation. Typically, organizations acquire outside accreditation to provide evidence to external parties that best practices are performed or that minimum acceptable standards are met. From information provided by various administrative staff at JCDOC, ACA accreditation was sought initially to provide JoCo judges with a level of comfort in assigning clients to various probation services available through JCDOC. Now, based on the established track records of the probation services currently available through JCDOC, and the comfort level that has been established between the JoCo judiciary and JCDOC, this original underlying need no longer exists.

However, despite the fact that this original need lacks importance at the current time, other benefits of maintaining ACA accreditation still remain. The procedural data collection and process improvement activities associated with maintaining ACA accreditation have real benefit.

Currently, employees, their assigned tasks, and the ACA-related processes in which they participate are all systematized and synchronized after several years of ACA accreditation. It should be noted, too, that these processes and procedures (and related employees) incur real costs in time and effort to JCDOC. If JCDOC administration decides to end ongoing ACA accreditation efforts from some or all JCDOC programs, the temptation to save budget dollars by also ending some or all of the related continuous improvement efforts could be significant, particularly considering the current economic conditions in Johnson County. For JCDOC to maintain and improve the credibility of its programs, the same types of continuous improvement efforts need to be maintained and should remain in place whether or not ACA accreditation is maintained. Granted that without the data collection demands of ACA accreditation, some data collection may cease, and some of those related costs would be saved. However, that decision should not create a wholesale reduction of all data collection and continuous improvement efforts.
Case Management Work Load

Cognitive and logical inconsistencies exist between the work requirements of case managers in JCDOC and the legal status of their positions as non-exempt. After a brief conversation with Chuck Dunlay (Johnson County legal staff), in addition to a review of the US Federal descriptions of exempt and non-exempt job classifications, it is suggested that the current classification of these positions as non-exempt is appropriate, and falls within the federal definition of non-exempt.

However, customers of any organization (internal or external customers) should expect that the organization continue to provide services (or products) to the customer, despite the schedules of specific individual employees. Hourly (non-exempt) employees in any organization should have a parallel expectation that the work of the organization should continue to be accomplished when an individual employee is sick, takes a vacation, or utilizes personal leave time. The output of the organization should continue in the absence of specific employees. The work accomplished by individual employees should be continued in their absence, independent of the reason for their absence.

However, in JCDOC, when an ISO, HAO, or RCM utilizes vacation time, sick time, or personal leave time, a relatively significant amount of work is not accomplished by the organization in the absence of that individual employee. This is due to the assignment of specific clients to specific case managers. For this reason, an individual case manager often has a significant amount of work to complete after his/her return to work. In other circumstances, this scenario (expectation of work) is most commonly associated with salaried (exempt) employees that have broad job descriptions and sufficient job flexibility to accomplish assigned work.

This incongruity in JCDOC service delivery and dependence on individuals is due to:
- specific cases are assigned to specific case managers,
- specific case managers are assigned to specific SCMs
- specific individualized tasks are associated with specific cases
- work is not completely re-assigned to other capable employees in the absence of a specific employee

Although the utilization of SCMs, clients’ physical files, and the TOADS and JIMS information systems should give other case managers a solid overview of a specific client’s case history, the work associated with maintaining that client is most often not performed fully in the absence of the client’s specific case manager.

This inherently creates a challenging work environment. Potentially negative outcomes of this current process include:
- services provided by JCDOC to clients are dependent upon specific employees instead of dependent upon the capabilities and systems of the entire organization; the service provided by JCDOC to a specific client is less robust in the absence of the specific case manager assigned to that specific client.
hourly (non-exempt) employees are not completely relieved of work when they take personal leave, vacation days, or sick days
  o hourly (non-exempt) employees must often significantly increase the intensity of work after taking sick days, personal days, or vacation days to “catch up”
  o increased workload to “make up” for vacation days or other leave days also increases the possibility of perceived poor work performance
    ▪ inability to manage time
    ▪ inability to meet expected deadlines
    ▪ etc.
  o organizational benefits of employees taking vacations, such as rest, reduced stress, perception of employee value to the organization, is diminished.

The overall recommendations here include:

- Case managers should continue to utilize flextime appropriately and to its fullest extent possible under the current Johnson County rules and policies. As mentioned previously, some case managers may require reinforcement of this information.
- Investigate utilizing a team-based approach for logical sets of case managers to cover for each other in the absence of another team member.
  o This work element should be included in position descriptions, and SCMs should evaluate their staff members appropriately on this job criterion.
  o This general approach is currently utilized by House Arrest, although the use of a single large team probably is not optimal.
    ▪ In ISP and Residential, possibly two teams per SCM might give the flexibility necessary to accomplish necessary work in the absence of one primary case manager.
    ▪ Formal assignment to tasks is required, probably by the SCM. Voluntary coverage likely will not produce the desired effect of seamless coverage for the client.
- Investigate utilizing the formal “duty days” concept in ISP and Residential, as currently used by Court Services. This should accomplish a result similar to small team coverage. Ideally, one staff member per day for each SCM might be assigned a “duty day”, where:
  o Similar to the team-based approach, “duty days” should be included in position descriptions, and case management execution should be evaluated by SCMs
  o SCMs need not assign specific coverage tasks to random case managers
  o The Duty Day (DD) officer does not schedule his/her “normal” work on an assigned DD.
  o The DD officer covers tasks for case manages who are absent
  o The DD officer rotates daily, probably on a two-week rotation (about ten case managers per SCM?)
- Allow appropriate and judicious use of approved overtime (OT). Granted that opportunities for OT should be budgeted and constrained to promote workplace efficiency, OT should be authorized if other mechanisms are not implemented to ensure the effectiveness of the services that are delivered to clients. The system should expect any solution to be both efficient and effective.
- Allow sufficient and appropriate use of the flextime system within the boundaries of that system, to eliminate excessive overtime.
- Give SCMs direct budgetary responsibility for overtime use, and evaluate SCMs on its discrete use.
  - By forcing this decision down to a lower (first-line) management level, JCDOC administration decreases wasted time and effort in this decision-making process.
  - As a performance criterion for SCMs, the approval of overtime hours by SCMs maintains its importance, and continues to enforce the efficiency expectations held by upper administration in JCDOC.

Data Collection

The original proposed data collection process (to determine better exactly how case managers spend their time), did not yield usable information. The extremely sparse data that was collected via work logs from case managers did not yield a sufficient volume of usable information that would allow reasonable analysis. Although a variety of frequent reminders were sent via email to all three primary case management work groups involved in this study, the overall participation level was very low. A few dedicated case managers submitted several work-days worth of data, but due to the low overall participation rate, it was insufficiently representative and not generalizable. Several case managers submitted only two or three days of data, after the request had been for five to ten days worth of data. The smaller work groups (House Arrest and Residential Center) had higher participation rates, but also only with sparse data (fewer days of data than required for analysis).

Most likely, root causes to the low participation include:
1. Case managers who were already very busy with routine work
2. General negative attitudes about efforts to improve work processes
3. Poor experiences in the past with consultants or other efforts to improve work processes
4. Intermittent or insufficient support or coercion by SCMs to encourage case managers to participate in the data collection process
5. An insufficient number of consultants on-site simultaneously at all three work locations to reinforce the need for the data collection process

A greater volume of direct observation, group interviews, individual interviews, and etc. replaced the reliance on the planned data collection processes.

Some comments by several JCDOC employees on the initial draft of this report suggested that case managers “missed out” on an opportunity to voice their concerns and make a difference in their future work lives. It should also be noted, from direct observation, that the workloads assigned to ISOs, HAOs, and RCMs are significant. While some non-participants may be indifferent to the efforts of JCDOC to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of their jobs, it is also likely that many case managers did not participate in this project because they did not have time to do so. Their lack of participation should not be seen strictly as a missed opportunity for them. Lack of sufficient participation should be seen as a missed opportunity for the entire
JCDOC organization. The efforts of all of the JCDOC employees that did participate are greatly appreciated.

**Summary and Conclusion**

A number of specific recommendations and suggestions were made throughout this report based on specific conversations with, and direct observations of Residential Case Managers, House Arrest Officers, Intensive Supervision Officers, and their various Senior Case Managers. This effort was supplemented by interviews with other administrative employees from JCDOC. Although the planned data collection processes were not successful due to insufficient participation, a wide variety of challenges presented themselves and were worthy of analysis and ongoing consideration.

Although many of the “low hanging” opportunities seem obvious, a fair number of substantial opportunities for savings in time and resources will require significant investment in change. A formal and structured *lean services/systems* initiative would properly focus the efforts of JCDOC on all of the challenges described in this report. The Intensive Supervision work group already has begun the process of shifting appropriate work away from ISOs toward administrative assistants; their process-centric approach should be duplicated and continued, if possible, across the Residential Center work group and the House Arrest work group. JCDOC administration should note any ongoing successes that the ISP SCMs achieve, and administration should look for ways to replicate the successful process improvement techniques across the remainder of the organization.
## Appendix A: Background Check Paper and Ink Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated year to date average daily populations</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Supervision</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>not including fugitive offenders, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Center</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Community</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average Caseload</td>
<td>About 800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiply by average of two background checks per year

| Average number of House Arrest intakes per year, assuming one background check per client intake | 1300 background checks |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of background checks</th>
<th>$2900 = 1300 + 1600</th>
<th>Annual Estimate for HA, ISP, and Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of pages @ about 20 pages per background check</td>
<td>$58,000 = 20 * 2900</td>
<td>Estimate of 20 pages per background check, based on 10 – 35 page ranges observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of paper</strong></td>
<td>$429.20 = $37 * (58,000 / 5000)</td>
<td>Paper only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of typical remanufactured generic printer cartridge</td>
<td>$162 for 13,000 pages</td>
<td><a href="http://www.officedepot.com/a/browse/laserjet-3005-series/N=5+101313&amp;Ne=100000/">http://www.officedepot.com/a/browse/laserjet-3005-series/N=5+101313&amp;Ne=100000/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of ink</strong></td>
<td>$722.77 = $162 * (58,000 / 13,000)</td>
<td>Printer cartridges only, refurbished generic HP LaserJet 3005, w/ qty discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong> =</td>
<td>$1152 = 723 + 429</td>
<td>Total estimated cost savings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Efficiency, Work Analysis, Motivation, and Merit Review

The intent of this appendix is to promote the continuous improvement of the Johnson County performance appraisal methodology, as it relates to case managers (ISOs, HAOs, and RCMs) in JCDOC. For convenience, the details provided below are based on documents associated with employees classified as "Intensive Supervision Officer I".

One key purpose of any employee evaluation and compensation system should be to properly motivate employees to maximize their effectiveness and efficiency in achieving the goals and objectives of the organization. This is particularly true when employee merit ties directly to employee compensation via a merit evaluation system. For work analyses that focus on the efficiency and effectiveness of employees, employee motivation often is driven by an appropriate merit review and compensation system. Employees are not motivated to excel when they sense that accomplishment is not rewarded: e.g. when they perceive that a significant increase in work will not be followed by an equivalent increase in compensation. Expectancy Theory best summarizes this basic sense of fairness in increased compensation for increased work.\(^6\)

If the overall objective of this process/work analysis was to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of case managers in JCDOC, then the connected issues of job description \(\rightarrow\) performance plan \(\rightarrow\) performance appraisal \(\rightarrow\) compensation \(\rightarrow\) work motivation \(\rightarrow\) work effectiveness, should also be addressed.

Based on conversations and e-mails with senior case managers, and other administrative personnel in JCDOC, the following information was gathered and perceptions expressed:

- The following overall merit evaluation grades are utilized to rate employees. Definitions were taken from the generic Performance Appraisal packet utilized by JCDOC:
  - Significantly exceeds expectations – “Performance consistently exceeds the performance standard and produces outstanding achievements.”
  - Exceeds expectations – “Performance consistently exceeds the position’s performance expectations.”
  - Fully meets expectations – “Performance meets all performance expectations. Often exceeds normal expectations of the position.”
  - Meets most expectations – “Performance meets most position expectations. Needs assistance or counseling in some activities.”
  - Does not meet expectations – “Performance clearly fails to meet position expectations. Performance improvement is required.”

- The previous merit evaluation system (prior to the current one) routinely rated about 60% of all employees as “Exceeds expectations”, which was perceived to be too high of a percentage.
- The current merit evaluation system has achieved success in curtailing the previously skewed number of employees that are rated as “exceeds”. However, based on

---

\(^6\) For example, see: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectancy_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectancy_theory)
conversations with SCMs and others, it is possible that “the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction”.

- In the current merit evaluation system, to achieve an overall merit rating of “exceeds” or “significantly exceeds”, employees are expected to demonstrate achievement above and beyond the Performance Expectations/Measurements as listed in an employee’s Performance Plan. Specifically, this would require successful achievement or performance of additional activities that are “above and beyond” the list of routine performance expectations. As described by SCMs and other JCDOC administrators, the determination of these additional activities should be the initiative and responsibility of individual case managers who seek higher overall performance ratings.

The Non-exempt Performance Plan for ISOs shows specific Duties and Responsibilities and their relative priorities (1, 2, or 3) as they are mapped from the Position Description for an ISO. Specific sets of Performance Expectations/Measurements are mapped from each of the specific Duties and Responsibilities. These Performance Expectations/Measurements in the Performance Plan are the key evaluative statements used by SCMs to rate the performance of case managers. In the Performance Appraisal document, ratings are assigned by SCMs for each case manager’s ability to achieve these individual Performance Expectations/Measurements.

The fundamental opportunity for improvement in the current Johnson County merit review system for JCDOC case managers (again, with ISOs as an example) is based on the following challenges that should be addressed:

- The intent of the new performance evaluation system (to curtail excessive use of overall “exceeds” ratings) is supported by the design of the Performance Plan with the Performance Appraisal. The statements utilized by SCMs to evaluate ISP case manager performance (listed as Performance Expectations/Measurements) are worded such that senior case managers should easily be able to evaluate their case managers as “fully meets…”, “meets most…”, or “does not meet expectations”. However, these statements are not worded in such a fashion as to allow for the ratings of “exceeds…” or “significantly exceeds expectations.” This should be satisfactory, provided that employees have a firm grasp on the behaviors and activities that would be necessary to achieve an overall performance evaluation that is higher than “fully meets expectations.” It is not clear that case managers have a handle on the types of additional activities that constitute “above and beyond”, that would qualify them for consideration of a higher performance rating.

- As mentioned previously from conversations with SCMs and JCDOC administrators, “exceeds” and “significantly exceeds” should only be awarded to employees who have demonstrated accomplishments that are “above and beyond” the work as described by their normal performance expectations. The overall sentiment expressed was that employees should take the initiative to determine appropriate activities and pursue them, in order to achieve an overall evaluation of “exceeds expectations”. Formally, (again with ISOs as an example) based on a review of the Position Description, Performance Plan, and Performance Appraisal documents, there is no clear indication of the type, quantity, or quality of activities that would warrant an
overall employee rating of “exceeds expectations” or “significantly exceeds expectations”. The definitions of these terms, as discussed above, also do not provide guidance for employees who might seek to achieve a higher overall performance rating.

- The definitions of the five primary overall employee ratings are provided on the Appraisal Summary page in the Performance Appraisal document (“significantly exceeds…” through “does not meet…”). However, as expressed above, there is no indication or instruction provided for SCMs as to how an individual case manager might qualify to receive a rating on any issue other than the primary Performance Expectations/Measurements. Again, with ISO documents as the example, the Appraisal Summary page provides space for the SCM to provide “performance achievement” information: “Document actual performance in relation to the performance expectations which are described in the performance plan.” The Appraisal Summary page does not provide specific opportunity for the SCM to address any activities or achievements by the case manager that might be considered “above and beyond” the basic job requirements defined in the performance plan. With this in mind, the SCM also has not been given formal written guidance that might assist individual case managers to determine specific activities or achievements that would be properly perceived by JCDOC administration as “above and beyond” the Performance Expectations/Measurements.

The primary suggestion to address this challenge is the implementation of some derivation of Management by Objectives (MBO), to provide guidance, goal-setting, and evaluation of employees who seek performance ratings higher than “fully meets expectations”. The employee performance appraisal process could easily accommodate the addition of individual goal-setting between the SCM and case manager. Similar to other activities encompassed in the Performance Appraisal (such as the Performance Improvement Action Plan or the Training and Development Plan), an annual Employee Goals and Objectives Plan could be used to delineate additional activities (not training) that are “above and beyond”, the Performance Expectations/Measurements of the position. Reiterating prior statements from above, these additional activities should continue to be based on the initiative and responsibility of the individual case manager. The obvious incentive for the employee would be to achieve a higher overall performance rating, to which is tied increased compensation. The incentive for JCDOC includes:

- increased work motivation for employees via a concrete process by which they can create and act on their own opportunities,
- a less ambiguous performance appraisal process for SCMs (and for case managers) that defines better what “exceeds expectations” really means for individual employees, and
- decreased friction between case managers and JCDOC administration via a tangible process in which all case managers have the opportunity to participate and excel.

For example see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Management_by_objectives