

Are Female Parolees Different? Results from the Workload Study

Helen Braithwaite, Theresa Lavery, Holly Westfall & Susan Turner

Center for Evidence-Based Corrections

University of California, Irvine

December 13, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, thank you to the parole agents who participated in this research and diligently completed study materials during the data collection period. This research project relied upon the participation of agents and we were extremely pleased by the agent response we received. Thank you also to the many parole administrators and Unit Supervisors who worked behind the scenes to make it happen. A special thank you to Jahmal Prudhomme who pilot tested materials for UCI and provided feedback on what worked (and what didn't).

Within DAPO, we'd like to thank the many individuals who have strived to improve supervision for female offenders, particularly Dan Stone and Maritza Rodriguez (both now retired). Helen Speed and Jon Stern both contributed ideas and guidance that shaped this research during its development. More recently, Mona Begell from the Fidelity Assurance and Outcomes Unit has assisted the research team enormously - her ongoing support and expertise is very much appreciated. Thanks also to Dan Warstler and Doug Eckenrod for their input into the study and ability to get things done out in the field. We also appreciate the support of the DAPO Executive Team for allocating resources to this project.

CDCR's Office of Research staff have, as always, provided invaluable assistance and advice to this research and our broader evaluation of the HEAL initiative. Thank you.

At CEBC, appreciation is extended to Dr. Sharon Farrell and Center Manager Jean Merrell for their assistance with this project.

GLOSSARY

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
CCR	Case Conference Review
CDCR	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
CEBC	Center for Evidence-Based Corrections
CCCMS	Correctional Clinical Case Management System
COMPAS	Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions
CPSRM	California Parole Supervision and Reintegration Model
DAPO	Division of Adult Parole Operations
DRP	Division of Rehabilitative Programs
EOP	Enhanced Outpatient Program
FOPS	Female Offender Programs and Services
FOTEP	Female Offender Treatment and Employment Program
GPS	Global Positioning System
GR	Gender Responsive
HEAL	Housing, Employment and Linking Services
OD	Officer of the Day
PC	Penal Code
UCI	University of California, Irvine

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This workload study was completed under a research contract between the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the Center for Evidence-Based Corrections (CEBC) at the University of California, Irvine (UCI). CDCR's Office of Research and the Division of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO) collaborated with UCI research staff to design the study, develop data capture instruments that were then pilot tested in the field, identify parole agents to participate in the study, and provide agent training. DAPO was responsible for coordinating the study with parole administrators, unit supervisors and agents in the field. UCI collaborated on instrument development, collected and analyzed data, and provided reports to CDCR and DAPO.

The need for a workload study was identified during DAPO training on gender-responsivity (GR). During several two-day training sessions, parole agents expressed concern over the amount of time involved in the supervision of female offenders. Agents reported that, as a consequence of female parolees being more relational and having a broader range of criminogenic needs than males, females took more time. Agents perceived that face-to-face contacts with female parolees were longer, and that additional time was spent on activities such as speaking with females on the telephone and liaising with programs.

Under the California Parole Supervision and Reintegration Model (CPSRM), parole caseloads in California are funded at a ratio of 53:1. Due to the perceived additional workload involved in supervising female parolees, some agents attending training were concerned that the introduction of female-only, GR caseloads would be too much work unless the number of females on a GR caseload was lower than 53 parolees. Sixteen GR caseloads (operating at a 53:1 ratio) had been implemented in California at the time of this study. Certain specialized caseloads with reduced caseload sizes are employed in California for Enhanced Outpatient Program (EOP) offenders with mental health issues and non-high risk sex offenders (operating at 40:1), in addition to Global Positioning System (GPS) specialized caseloads for gang members and high risk sex offenders (operating at approximately 20:1). Other states have implemented smaller, specialized caseloads for offenders with drug and alcohol problems, mentally ill offenders, domestic violence offenders, and female offenders. Research has shown that these specialized caseloads may result in recidivism reductions (Jalbert & Rhodes, 2012; Jalbert, et al., 2011; Klein, Wilson, Crowe & DeMichele, 2005; Gies, et al., 2012; Wolff, et al., 2014).

The purpose of the workload study was to collect data to examine whether female parolees are *more* work or *different* work than male parolees. That is, do contacts with females take longer or are they different in nature than contacts with males? For this study, agents reported their daily contacts and the time they allocated to various work activities using a Daily Activity Log. Data were collected every day for five weeks. Agents supervising fifteen GR caseloads participated in the GR group. Approximately 30 agents supervising regular mixed-gender CPSRM caseloads were selected by DAPO for inclusion in a control group, used for comparison purposes.

The study concludes that female parolees are both *more* work and *different* work than male parolees. Female contacts are longer overall, certain tasks are performed more often with female parolees, and certain tasks were shown to take longer with female than male parolees. Other jurisdictions in the

United States have adopted a *specialized caseloads* approach to female offenders by reducing caseload sizes; the findings of this study support such an approach.

Key findings from the Daily Activity Logs

- ✧ Face-to-face parolee contacts reported by agents were approximately 30 minutes in length on average. GR agent contacts were almost 5 minutes longer on average compared with the contacts of control group agents (33.9 minutes as opposed to 29.3 minutes). Controlling for the influence of other variables (in a regression analysis) we found that contacts with female parolees were longer than contacts with male parolees.
- ✧ The contacts of GR group agents were different in nature than those of the control group. They were less likely to occur at the parole unit and more likely to involve a search and drug test. GR agents were more likely to review rewards/incentives and financial assistance during a contact than control group agents, and were less likely to spend time reviewing a parolee's goals and progress. Agents supervising GR caseloads were more likely to discuss a broad range of services with parolees during their interactions, including housing, family/parenting, health/dental and mental health needs. Contacts by GR agents more often included a discussion of at least one service need, as opposed to having no service areas discussed. Discussing certain services was found to take longer with female parolees than when discussed with male parolees.
- ✧ Contrary to our expectations, GR agents did not report allocating more time than control group agents on additional face-to-face contacts and other types of contacts (e.g., telephone and collateral contacts); they reported almost five minutes less time on additional contacts and almost 7 minutes less on other types of contacts than control group agents.
- ✧ There were no group differences in the reported rate of referrals, violations/sanctions or arrest as outcomes of contacts. GR agents reported using positive recognition more frequently and spent more time on referrals/programming and miscellaneous activities, and less time on pre-release planning activities and driving during the work day. However, all agents spent approximately 6½ hours per day on other activities even though they used that time differently, suggesting that agents adjusted their allocation of time to tasks based on caseload demands.
- ✧ All agents reported a consistent work day of just over 8½ hours (which included 30 minutes of overtime approved for the study).
- ✧ Factors that had a significant impact on contact length were performing initial interviews, Case Conference Reviews, driving the parolee, having contacts in the field or residence as opposed to the parole office, and an outcome of arrest/violation. We also observed interaction effects, in which certain activities took longer with females (e.g., discussing housing and mental health services, processing a violation/sanction) while some took longer with males (e.g., conducting initial interviews).

This report presents a brief summary of results from the Daily Activity Log component of the workload study. A more comprehensive report titled *Parole Agent Workload Study* is available that includes results from the parole agent surveys (a separate component of the Workload Study), a detailed description of methods, and a full data analysis including figures, data tables and statistical tests of significance. Please refer to this larger report for more detail on study results.

INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) Division of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO) currently supervises approximately 35,000 offenders on parole. Approximately 3,000 of these parolees are female. CDCR has recognized, as have other jurisdictions across the United States, that effective correctional policies must incorporate evidence-based reentry strategies such as responsivity in order to reduce recidivism. Female offenders have unique needs and pathways into offending, requiring a trauma-focused, gender-responsive (GR) approach from correctional agencies.

In July 2005, CDCR established the Female Offender Programs and Services (FOPS) office to manage and provide oversight to adult female programs. FOPS developed a GR, culturally sensitive approach to program and policy development to improve recidivism outcomes for the adult incarcerated and paroled female offenders under the supervision of CDCR. A master plan for female offenders was developed in 2008 with input from the Little Hoover Commission, legislative representatives, nationally recognized experts on female offenders, previously incarcerated females, family members of female offenders, and others (CDCR, 2008). This plan lays the foundation for making evidence-based decisions in creating gender appropriate policy, programs, and practice. In addition, it incorporates the requirements of Penal Code (PC) Section 3430 which identifies the duties of the CDCR regarding female offenders, including the implementation of GR training for staff.

DAPO is implementing the Housing, Employment and Linking services to reduce female recidivism (HEAL) initiative. The HEAL Initiative is a GR approach to reduce female recidivism that was created through a partnership between DAPO and the Division of Rehabilitative Programs (DRP). HEAL is a multi-faceted initiative that incorporates a range of existing CDCR services and new strategies into a coordinated and targeted approach aimed at improving outcomes for female offenders.

HEAL includes existing services targeting female offenders, such as re-entry hubs prior to release from an institution and residential treatment facilities such as the Female Offender Treatment and Employment Program (FOTEP) for females with a history of substance abuse. HEAL also includes a number of new services, such as female-only specialized parole caseloads and GR training for parole agents.

DAPO, through CDCR's Office of Research, requested research support from UC Irvine's Center for Evidence-Based Corrections (CEBC) to evaluate the effectiveness of HEAL. Our evaluation includes technical assistance to the development of GR training curriculum, a literature review on specialized caseloads summarized in a brochure, evaluation of GR training, workload study, prison gate to program door transportation study, and a study of recidivism and reentry outcomes for female offenders. The current report is one of several expected products from the HEAL evaluation.

WORKLOAD STUDY PROCEDURE, AGENT SAMPLE AND DATA

Procedure

Data were collected for five weeks from Friday April 1st through Friday May 6th, 2016. During this time, participating agents submitted forms with a record of their daily activities to CEBC. Forms were submitted at the end of every day worked, including weekends, if agents worked on a Saturday or Sunday.

The form used to collect data was called a Daily Activity Log. The form was developed in collaboration with CDCR and DAPO and is attached as an Appendix. Agents could choose to complete the Daily Activity Log in paper format, scan, and email to UCI, or agents could complete the form electronically using a fillable PDF. The Daily Activity Log contained three sections:

- ✦ Section A was used by agents to record information about themselves and their caseload (name, date, number of male and females on caseload, and the total number of face-to-face parolee contacts that day)
- ✦ Section B captured specific details for up to five face-to-face parolee contacts they had that day (minutes per contact, parolee gender, parolee type, ADA issues, use of a translator, parolee mental health status, contact location, tasks performed, search, urine analysis test, items reviewed, services discussed, parolee driven, and contact outcome)
- ✦ Section C recorded the allocation of time to various activities and hours worked (time spent on additional face-to-face parolee contacts, other types of contacts, drive time, pre-release planning activities, enhanced supervision casework, field operations, programs/referrals, violations/arrests, and miscellaneous; total hours/minutes worked)

Agent sample

A total of 46 agents completed Daily Activity Logs for the workload study. Fifteen agents supervising female-only GR caseloads were termed the GR group. Thirty-one agents supervising regular CPSRM mixed-gender caseloads were termed the control group. The control group was needed to compare the workload of GR agents with regular parole-as-usual agents. Agents who participated in the control group were selected by DAPO to match GR agents as closely as possible (e.g., same gender, same parole unit).

Data

The 46 participating agents submitted a total of 968 Daily Activity Logs during the study. Agents could include details on up to five face-to-face contacts in each log. On average, each log contained details on three contacts. From the 968 logs submitted, there were details on 3,147 face-to-face parolee contacts. In the analysis to follow, we compared the logs and face-to-face contacts of GR agents versus control group agents to see how they were different or the same.

WORKLOAD STUDY RESULTS

Comparing the face-to-face contacts of GR agents and control group agents

On the Daily Activity Log agents included their name, which we used to place them into either the GR group (agents supervising an all-female caseload) or the control group (agents supervising a regular CPSRM caseload). We compared the face-to-face contacts of GR agents with contacts of the control group to look for similarities and differences. The table below summarizes the major findings from our analysis¹:

- Number of contacts*
- ✘ GR agents did not have more face-to-face contacts with parolees than agents in the control group. The average number of contacts that agents included in each log was the same for the GR group (3.2 contacts per log) and the control group (3.3 contacts per log). Supervising females does not increase the number of face-to-face contacts.
- Length of contact*
- ✘ On average, GR group contacts were almost 5 minutes longer than control group contacts. The average contact length for the GR group was 33.9 minutes, compared with 29.3 minutes for the control group. Supervising females significantly increases the amount of time spent with parolees during a contact.
 - ✘ The gender of the parolee made a difference to contact length. Control group agents spend an average of 36.4 minutes with female parolees compared with 28.8 minutes with male parolees, a difference of about 7 ½ minutes. For GR group agents, the difference in the length of contacts between female and male parolees is less marked (1.9 minutes longer with females) since GR agents spend more time on average with both female and male parolees.
- Parolee characteristics*
- ✘ GR agents had fewer contacts with lifers (10.7% of their contacts, compared with 19.8% for the control group) and more contacts with CCCMS parolees (25.6% of contacts compared with 11.9%).
 - ✘ There was no difference in ADA status (occurring in about 5% of contacts) or whether a translator was used (less than 1% of contacts).
- Contact location*
- ✘ GR agents had fewer contacts at the parole office (43.6% of contacts compared with 48.2% for the control group) and more contacts in the field and residence.
- Agent actions*
- ✘ GR agents conducted searches more often than control group agents (63.3% of contacts compared with 53.2%), and were more likely to perform a drug test (50.7% of contacts compared with 44.6%).
 - ✘ There were no differences in initial/comprehensive interviews (performed

¹ For charts and figures displaying results, please refer to the *Parole Agent Workload Study* report.

in about 6% of contacts), Case Conference Reviews (CCRs; about 2% of contacts), Discharge Reviews (less than 1%), or driving the parolee (about 6% of contacts).

Reviewing items

- ✧ Control group agents reviews goals and progress more often than GR agents (51.6% of contacts compared with 44.0%).
- ✧ GR agents reviewed rewards/incentives more than control group agents (12.3% of contacts compared with 5.5%), and also reviewed financial assistance more often - although this was not very common (5.5% of contacts compared with 1.9%).
- ✧ There were no differences on reviewing needs/COMPAS (about 21% of contacts) or forms (about 10% of contacts).
- ✧ Of the review items that we captured (goals/progress, rewards/incentives, needs/COMPAS, financial aid, forms) agents reported reviewing none of these in about 32% of contacts (no group difference).

Discussing needs

- ✧ GR agents were more likely to discuss housing needs (33.4% of contacts compared with 25.8%), family/parenting needs (29.5% of contacts compared with 15.5%), health/dental needs (9.0% of contacts compared with 3.6%), and mental health issues (20.0% of contacts compared with 11.0%) than control group agents.
- ✧ There were no differences in discussing work/education services with parolees (which occurred in about 48% of contacts) or substance abuse needs (about 23% of contacts).
- ✧ Control group agents were more likely to report discussing no services (23.6% of contacts compared with 18.3% for GR agents).

Contact outcome

- ✧ There were no differences between groups on contact outcome for referrals (referrals occurred in about 14% of contacts), violations/sanctions (just under 3% of contacts), arrests (less than 1% of contacts), or positive recognition (about 50% of contacts).

Comparing time allocation and work hours of GR agents and control group agents

On the Daily Activity Log agents indicated the amount of time they spent on other contacts, nine categories of work activities, and their work day in total. We compared these time allocations of GR agents with control group agents to look for similarities and differences.

Additional contacts

- ✧ We saw previously that the number of contacts per log was the same for GR agents as control group agents. However, control group agents on average spent 4.6 more minutes per day on additional face-to-face contacts, over-and-above the maximum of five contacts that could be reported in detail in the log. Control group agents spent 6.9 more minutes per day on other types of contacts (e.g., collateral contacts) than GR agents.

Other work activities

- ✧ We saw previously that referral as a contact outcome was the same for both agent groups. However, GR agents spent more time allocated to programs/referrals than control group agents (24.1 minutes per day compared with 15.8 minutes for control group agents). GR agents spent approximately 35 minutes per day on average longer on miscellaneous activities (e.g., administration, training, OD duties) than control group agents.
- ✧ Control group agents spent approximately 21 minutes more per day on pre-release activities (doing background work for offenders due to be released from custody to parole supervision) than GR agents.
- ✧ There was no difference between the GR and control groups on time allocated to field operations, enhanced casework activities, driving, or violations/sanctions.

Total time on activities

- ✧ We summed the amount of time allocated by agents to the nine categories of work activities. We saw previously that GR agents spent more time on programming/referrals and miscellaneous activities, and less time on pre-release activities, both groups spent the same total amount of time on the nine categories of activities captured during the study. This suggests that agents balance their time; if one particular activity absorbs more time, then agents adjust time spent on other activities.

Work hours per day

- ✧ The average number of hours worked per day was just over 8½ hours (which included 30 minutes of overtime approved for the study).
- ✧ There was no difference between groups.

What factors are associated with longer face-to-face contacts?

We used a statistical technique called a regression analysis to examine factors that were associated with increased length of contact, and thus workload. This method looks at the impact of a particular factor, *controlling for the influence of other factors*. When variables are related to each other (e.g., if females are more likely to be CCCMS and also more likely to have mental health services discussed) a regression analysis would take this into account to examine whether females were still more likely to discuss mental health issues given their mental health status and other related variables².

- Parolee characteristics* ✎ Parolee gender was a significant predictor of contact length. Contacts with female parolees were 13.4% longer than contacts with male parolees on average.
- Contact location* ✎ Controlling for other variables, office contacts typically took 18.1% less time than contacts made at the parolee's residence.
- Agent actions* ✎ Performing an initial interview increased contact length by 162.1% compared to a contact in which no initial interview was performed. Similarly, CCRs took 82.7% longer than contacts with no CCR performed. If an agent was required to drive the parolee to any location, the contact length increased by 127% on average.
- Reviewing items* ✎ Reviewing needs/COMPAS increased the length of contacts by 10.5% (compared to no needs/COMPAS), as did reviewing goals/progress (by 9.4% compared to no goals/progress). Issuing forms during a contact increased contact length by 8%.
- Discussing needs* ✎ Discussing services with regard to housing and mental health increased contact length by approximately 9% each.
- Contact outcome* ✎ Contacts with arrest as an outcome were 67.9% longer than contacts with no arrest. When a violation/sanction occurred, contacts were on average 42.5% longer (than no violation/sanction), and referrals increased contact length by 24.6% (compared to no referrals).
- Additional findings* ✎ Initial interviews with female parolees took 40.3% less time, on average, than initial interviews with male parolees.
 - ✎ Discussing housing and mental health services resulted in longer contacts with female parolees than males (by 14.4% and 16.5% respectively).
 - ✎ For contact outcome, if a female parolee received a violation/sanction then the contact took 44.7% longer than for a male parolee.

² We advise caution when interpreting the percentages presented here, since these are the results of a regression model. The percentages give an indication of the relative increase or decrease in contact length as a result of the factor, having controlled for the influence of other related factors.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary finding of this study is that face-to-face contacts with female parolees take longer than male parolees. Agents spend approximately five minutes more on average per contact interacting with females.

A more subtle result is that GR agents behave differently with parolees than control group agents, reflecting differences in how females and males are supervised. GR agents reviewed more items, discussed a broad range of service needs, tended to have contacts outside the parole unit, and searched and drug tested parolees more frequently, in addition to having longer contacts. We also observed some interaction effects, for example, the finding that it takes longer to discuss certain services or process a violation/sanction with female offenders than male offenders. All agents demonstrated responsivity (for example, by talking to female offenders about family/parenting needs and spending more time with females during face-to-face contacts). This does not mean that the needs of male parolees are not being met, just that male parolees have different needs and interactions with males take less time on average.

This study also identified factors that were associated with longer contacts. Not surprisingly, contacts were longer (other things being equal) when agents performed initial interviews or CCRs, when they drove the parolee, met in the field or residence as opposed to the parole office, and conducted an arrest or violation. By placing greater demands on agent time, these events are likely to increase their workload. Most of these factors impact agents equally regardless of their study group. For example, initial interviews are performed when parolees are first released to parole and Unit Supervisors manage the dispersal of new releases across agents in a unit to distribute workload evenly. We did find that GR group agents were less likely to meet with parolees at the parole unit, preferring residence or field contacts, which may contribute to longer contacts for GR agents and hence higher workload.

A limitation of this study was small sample size, particularly of the GR group. However, the high participation rate of agents over the five week study period increased the internal validity of the data: most of the agents who began the study consistently participated throughout the study, which means we can be more confident that the data captured is representative of all agents and not just agents who continued to respond. Small sample size was also overcome by capturing data over a five-week period, yielding an extensive data set for analysis of almost 1,000 daily logs containing more than 3,000 parolee contacts.

The study concludes that female parolees are both *more* work and *different* work than male parolees. Female contacts are longer overall, certain tasks are performed more often with female parolees, and certain tasks were shown to take longer with female than male parolees. Other jurisdictions in the United States have adopted a *specialized caseloads* approach to female offenders by reducing caseload sizes; the findings of this study support such an approach.

References

- Gies, S. V., Gainey, R., Cohen, M. I., Healy, E., Duplantier, D., Yeide, M., & Hopps, M. (2012). Monitoring High-Risk Sex Offenders with GPS Technology: An Evaluation of the California Supervision Program Final Report. *Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.*
- Jalbert, S. K., Rhodes, W., Kane, M., Clawson, E., Bogue, B., Flygare, C., & Guevara, M. (2011). A multi-site evaluation of reduced probation caseload size in an evidence-based practice setting. *Washington DC: US Department of Justice.*
- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2005). Evaluation of the Rhode Island probation specialized domestic violence supervision unit. *Final report for National Institute of Justice, grant, (2002-WG).*
- Wolff, N., Epperson, M., Shi, J., Huening, J., Schumann, B. E., & Sullivan, I. R. (2014). Mental health specialized probation caseloads: Are they effective? *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 37(5), 464-472.*

Appendix: Copy of the Daily Activity Log

UCI WORKLOAD STUDY									
DAILY ACTIVITY LOG									
Instructions: Complete sections A, B, and C.									
Scan/Email this form daily to workloadstudy1@uci.edu									
SECTION A - Information about you and your caseload									
Agent Name: _____ (first and last name)									
Date of these activities: _____ (MM/DD/YYYY)									
How many parolees on your caseload are female? _____ male? _____									
How many face-to-face contacts with parolees did you have this day? _____ (include all of them, not just the first five)									
SECTION B - Contact Detail for first FIVE contacts only									
INSTRUCTIONS FOR SECTION B: Record details of first five face-to-face contacts with parolees.									
Parolee # 1									
Minutes for this contact:	minutes		(include any time spent transporting parolee)						
Parolee Gender:	Male	Female							
Parolee Type:	CPSRM	EID	Re-Entry	Interstate	ACP	Lifer	Other (specify):		
ADA Issues Present?	Yes	No				Translator used?		Yes	No
MH Status	None	CCCMS	EOP	MDO					
Performed the following:	None	Initial /comp interview		Case conf review		Discharge review			
Location:	Residence	Office	Field	Other (specify):					
Search:	None	Plain view	Cursory	Compre-hensive	Other (specify):				
UA Test:	None	Refused	Negative	Positive	Specimen sent to lab?		Yes	No	
Reviewed/Issued: (all that apply)	None	Goals/ progress	Rewards/ incentives	Crim needs/ COMPAS	Fin. Aid/ assistance	Forms	Other (specify):		
Services Discussed: (all that apply)	None	Housing	Fam/Parent	Work/Educ	Health/ dental	Mental health	Subs Abuse	Other (specify):	
Drove parolee to: (all that apply)	None	Home	Work	School	Program	Jail/court	Other (specify):		
Outcome (all that apply):	None	Referral	Violation/ Sanction	Arrest	Positive recognition	Other (specify):			
Parolee # 2									
Minutes for this contact:	minutes		(include any time spent transporting parolee)						
Parolee Gender:	Male	Female							
Parolee Type:	CPSRM	EID	Re-Entry	Interstate	ACP	Lifer	Other (specify):		
ADA Issues Present?	Yes	No				Translator used?		Yes	No
MH Status	None	CCCMS	EOP	MDO					
Performed the following:	None	Initial /comp interview		Case conf review		Discharge review			
Location:	Residence	Office	Field	Other (specify):					
Search:	None	Plain view	Cursory	Compre-hensive	Other (specify):				
UA Test:	None	Refused	Negative	Positive	Specimen sent to lab?		Yes	No	
Reviewed/Issued: (all that apply)	None	Goals/ progress	Rewards/ incentives	Crim needs/ COMPAS	Fin. Aid/ assistance	Forms	Other (specify):		
Services Discussed: (all that apply)	None	Housing	Fam/Parent	Work/Educ	Health/ dental	Mental health	Subs Abuse	Other (specify):	
Drove parolee to: (all that apply)	None	Home	Work	School	Program	Jail/court	Other (specify):		
Outcome (all that apply):	None	Referral	Violation/ Sanction	Arrest	Positive recognition	Other (specify):			

Parolee # 3										
Minutes for this contact:	minutes		(include any time spent transporting parolee)							
Parolee Gender:	Male	Female								
Parolee Type:	CPSRM	EID	Re-Entry	Interstate	ACP	Lifer	Other (specify):			
ADA Issues Present?	Yes	No				Translator used?		Yes	No	
MH Status	None	CCCMS	EOP	MDO						
Performed the following:	None	Initial /comp interview		Case conf review		Discharge review				
Location:	Residence	Office	Field	Other (specify):						
Search:	None	Plain view	Cursory	Compre- hensive	Other (specify):					
UA Test:	None	Refused	Negative	Positive	Specimen sent to lab?		Yes	No		
Reviewed/Issued: (all that apply)	None	Goals/ progress	Rewards/ incentives	Crim needs/ COMPAS	Fin. Aid/ assistance	Forms	Other (specify):			
Services Discussed: (all that apply)	None	Housing	Fam/Parent	Work/Educ	Health/ dental	Mental health	Subs Abuse	Other (specify):		
Drove parolee to: (all that apply)	None	Home	Work	School	Program	Jail/court	Other (specify):			
Outcome (all that apply):	None	Referral	Violation/ Sanction	Arrest	Positive recognition	Other (specify):				
Parolee # 4										
Minutes for this contact:	minutes		(include any time spent transporting parolee)							
Parolee Gender:	Male	Female								
Parolee Type:	CPSRM	EID	Re-Entry	Interstate	ACP	Lifer	Other (specify):			
ADA Issues Present?	Yes	No				Translator used?		Yes	No	
MH Status	None	CCCMS	EOP	MDO						
Performed the following:	None	Initial /comp interview		Case conf review		Discharge review				
Location:	Residence	Office	Field	Other (specify):						
Search:	None	Plain view	Cursory	Compre- hensive	Other (specify):					
UA Test:	None	Refused	Negative	Positive	Specimen sent to lab?		Yes	No		
Reviewed/Issued: (all that apply)	None	Goals/ progress	Rewards/ incentives	Crim needs/ COMPAS	Fin. Aid/ assistance	Forms	Other (specify):			
Services Discussed: (all that apply)	None	Housing	Fam/Parent	Work/Educ	Health/ dental	Mental health	Subs Abuse	Other (specify):		
Drove parolee to: (all that apply)	None	Home	Work	School	Program	Jail/court	Other (specify):			
Outcome (all that apply):	None	Referral	Violation/ Sanction	Arrest	Positive recognition	Other (specify):				
Parolee # 5										
Minutes for this contact:	minutes		(include any time spent transporting parolee)							
Parolee Gender:	Male	Female								
Parolee Type:	CPSRM	EID	Re-Entry	Interstate	ACP	Lifer	Other (specify):			
ADA Issues Present?	Yes	No				Translator used?		Yes	No	
MH Status	None	CCCMS	EOP	MDO						
Performed the following:	None	Initial /comp interview		Case conf review		Discharge review				
Location:	Residence	Office	Field	Other (specify):						
Search:	None	Plain view	Cursory	Compre- hensive	Other (specify):					
UA Test:	None	Refused	Negative	Positive	Specimen sent to lab?		Yes	No		
Reviewed/Issued: (all that apply)	None	Goals/ progress	Rewards/ incentives	Crim needs/ COMPAS	Fin. Aid/ assistance	Forms	Other (specify):			
Services Discussed: (all that apply)	None	Housing	Fam/Parent	Work/Educ	Health/ dental	Mental health	Subs Abuse	Other (specify):		
Drove parolee to: (all that apply)	None	Home	Work	School	Program	Jail/court	Other (specify):			
Outcome (all that apply):	None	Referral	Violation/ Sanction	Arrest	Positive recognition	Other (specify):				
TOTAL MINUTES FOR SECTION B (all five contacts)										

SECTION C - Other Activity		
INSTRUCTIONS FOR SECTION C: Record all other time spent during your workday that is not captured in Section B.		
Activity Type	Examples	Minutes
Additional face-to-face contacts with parolees	If you have more than five contacts with parolees for this activity day, enter the time spent on additional parolee contacts not already reported in Section B. Include time you spent transporting the parolee.	
Other types of contacts	If you had other types of contacts, enter the number of minutes you spent on other contacts such as telephone calls, collateral contacts, PACT and other group meetings, law enforcement contacts, etc.	
Drive Time	Number of minutes you spent driving today excluding time already captured transporting parolees in Section B or 'other types of contacts' above.	
Pre-Release Planning Activities	All pre-release activities prior to first contact with parolee, such as reviewing forms, obtaining pre-release documents, verifying CLLR, preparing/issuing reporting instructions, obtaining CSRA scores, obtaining signatures on forms, completing final RPS packets, activities concerning residency verification, ROS documentation, ERMS, DEC's check, etc.	
Enhanced Supervision Casework	Additional work that is directly attributable to a parolee's status as enhanced supervision but is not captured in contact detail such as reviewing information packets, case specs, investigations, etc.	
Field Operations	Include activities such as surveillance, community outreach, law enforcement outreach, medical clearance, joint law enforcement operations, field identification, evidence collection, etc.	
Programs and Referrals	Include activities such as liaisons with programs, facilitating orientation meetings, discussing progress with program provider, etc.	
Violations, Sanctions, Arrests, Warrants, and Reviews	All activities relating to parole violations not captured in Section B. Includes initiating cases, investigations, case conferences with US, identifying remedial sanctions, completing PVDMI, preparing violation reports, completing 1500 & 1502, scanning court documents, tracking court revocation dates, monitoring hearing schedule, attending court, entering data into PVDTS, follow-up on remedial sanctions, updating SOMS, tracking warrants, Discharge Reviews, Case Reviews, DEC's, etc.	
Other	Include all other activities not captured elsewhere. Officer of the day duties, staff meetings, time completing paperwork/ documentation. Incoming, outgoing and interstate compact TIR, updates to SOMS/COMPAS, ROS updates, face sheet updates, training, and any other miscellaneous/administrative duties.	
TOTAL MINUTES FOR SECTION B		
TOTAL MINUTES FOR SECTION C		
30 MINUTES OF OVERTIME FOR COMPLETING THIS LOG		30
TOTAL MINUTES FOR WORKDAY (sum of Section B, Section C, plus 30 minutes overtime)		
Should match the total time reported on your 998 under regular hours worked and/or overtime hours		