



North Carolina Department of Public Safety

Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Pat McCrory, Governor
Frank L. Perry, Secretary

W. David Guice, Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs of House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee on Justice and Public Safety
Chairs of Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety
Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety

FROM: Frank L. Perry, Secretary
W. David Guice, Commissioner

RE: Report on Probation and Parole


DATE: February 19, 2015

Pursuant to G.S. 143B-707.1(a), *The Department of Public Safety shall report by March 1 of each year to the Chairs of the House of Representatives and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety on caseload averages for probation and parole officers. The report shall include:*

1. *Data on current caseload averages and district averages for probation/parole officer positions.*
2. *Data on current span of control for chief probation officers.*
3. *An analysis of the optimal caseloads for these officer classifications.*
4. *The number and role of paraprofessionals in supervising low-risk caseloads.*
5. *The process of assigning offenders to an appropriate supervision level based on a risk needs assessment.*
6. *Data on cases supervised solely for the collection of court-ordered payments.*

Pursuant to G.S. 143B-707.1(b), *The Department of Public Safety shall report by March 1 of each year to the Chairs of the House of Representatives and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety on the following:*

1. *The number of sex offenders enrolled on active and passive GPS monitoring.*
2. *The caseloads of probation officers assigned to GPS-monitored sex offenders.*
3. *The number of violations.*
4. *The number of absconders.*
5. *The projected number of offenders to be enrolled by the end of the fiscal year. (2013-360, s. 16C.10.)*



**STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY**

**DIVISION OF ADULT CORRECTION AND
JUVENILE JUSTICE
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS
LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON
PROBATION AND PAROLE CASELOADS**

March 1, 2015

**Pat McCrory
Governor**


**W. David Guice
Commissioner**

**Frank L. Perry
Secretary**

N.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Anne L. Precythe, Director
 Tony Taylor, Deputy Director
 Cynthia M. Williams, Assistant Director
 Chris Oxendine, Senior Administrator
 Jay Lynn, Special Population Administrator



Fourth Judicial Division

JD Adm.	Boyce Fortner
Asst JD Adm.	Karey Treadway
JDM Dist 24	Greg Jarrett
JDM Dist 25	Kevin Miller
JDM Dist 26	Tracy Lee
JDM Dist 27	Jackie Murphy
JDM Dist 28	Lori Anderson
JDM Dist 29	Cheryl Modlin
JDM Dist 30	Dallas McMillan

Third Judicial Division

JD Adm.	Brian Gates
Asst JD Adm.	Vacant
JDM Dist 17	David King
JDM Dist 18	Max Gerald
JDM Dist 19A	Catherine Combs
JDM Dist 19B	Scott Brewer
JDM Dist 20	David Calloway
JDM Dist 21	Jonathan Wilson
JDM Dist 22	Sherri Cook
JDM Dist 23	Nancy Gilchrist

Second Judicial Division

JD Adm.	Lewis Adams
Asst JD Adm.	Maggie Brewer
JDM Dist 9	Bobby Dickerson
JDM Dist 10	Rita Dimoulas
JDM Dist 11	Joyce James
JDM Dist 12	Jackie Beal
JDM Dist 13	Mike Frazier
JDM Dist 14	Celeste Kelly
JDM Dist 15	Jeffrey Allen
JDM Dist 16	Debbie Brown

First Judicial Division

JD Adm.	Kim Williams
Asst JD Adm.	Vacant
JDM Dist 1	Ray Griggs
JDM Dist 2	Jami Stohlman
JDM Dist 3	Susan Walker
JDM Dist 4	Travis Joyner
JDM Dist 5	Thurman Turner
JDM Dist 6	Bill Mitchell
JDM Dist 7	Paige Wade
JDM Dist 8	Cynthia Sutton

Updated 1/15

SESSION LAW 2013-360

REPORT ON PROBATION AND PAROLE CASELOADS

SECTION 16C.10.

(a) The Department of Public Safety shall report by March 1 of each year to the Chairs of the House of Representatives and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety on caseload averages for probation and parole officers. The report shall include:

- (1) Data on current caseload averages and district averages for probation/parole officer positions.
- (2) Data on current span of control for chief probation officers.
- (3) An analysis of the optimal caseloads for these officer classifications.
- (4) The number and role of paraprofessionals in supervising low-risk caseloads.
- (5) The process of assigning offenders to an appropriate supervision level based on a risk/needs assessment.
- (6) Data on cases supervised solely for the collection of court-ordered payments.

Introduction

The Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice, Community Corrections is responsible for the supervision of all adult offenders on probation, parole or post-release supervision in North Carolina. Community Corrections also has oversight of the Community Service Work Program (CSWP).

Community Corrections currently employs 2,134 certified positions. The Division supervises approximately 103,400 offenders on probation, parole or post-release supervision and oversees 10,219 unsupervised offenders in CSWP for a total offender population of 113,619. Judicial service coordinators manage CSWP cases and process probation cases out of court, while DCC probation and parole officers provide case management to offenders under its supervision.

In June of 2011 the Justice Reinvestment Act was signed into law (SL 2011-192). This change significantly impacted Community Corrections field operations and will ultimately affect the size of caseloads in the future. Among other things, JRA lessens the distinction between Community and Intermediate punishment to allow for a greater use of responses for high risk behavior and expands post release supervision to all felons; nine month supervision period for class F-I felons and increases supervision period for B1-E felons from nine months to 12 months.

The agency has implemented the use of evidence based practices (EBP) for supervision of offenders. Part of the evidence based practice strategy is the use of a risk and needs assessment to compute supervision levels for offenders based on their individual criminogenic needs and risks of rearrest. The assessment process places offenders in one of five levels which determine appropriate supervision methodologies to facilitate completion of supervision and establishes minimum responses to noncompliance. The justice reinvestment law codified the use of our validated risk and needs assessment tool while establishing a caseload size of 60 high to moderate risk offenders per officer. Community Corrections has adjusted the supervision duties placed with probation officers to attempt to meet this caseload goal.

Current Caseload Averages (as of January 2015)

Community Corrections uses five levels of supervision to manage offenders; the levels are numbered one to five. Level one (L1) offenders have the highest risks and criminogenic needs and have the most restrictive supervision contact requirements along with the most severe responses to noncompliance. Offenders in the L4 and L5 populations possess the lowest levels of risks and needs, are in the least restrictive supervision levels and may be eligible for Offender Accountability Reporting (OAR) via a computer or mail-in report.

The table below represents division caseload averages based upon mixed supervision levels. Averages also represent all probation/parole officer positions as if there were no vacancies or extended employee absences (i.e., military leave, extended medical leave, etc)


Probation Officer Caseloads by Division			
Division	Caseload Avg. (if all positions filled)	Current Staff	Offenders
Division 1	55	424	22,978
Division 2	53	511	26,733
Division 3	54	499	28,813
Division 4	51	432	22,294
Statewide	54	1,866	100,818

The following table applies the Real World Factor (RWF) and shows the effect of vacancies and extended absences on caseloads. Department statistics show averages of 13% of officer positions are unable to carry caseloads daily due to varying reasons. These reasons include vacancies due to staffing turnover, on the job injuries, illness/medical leave, military leave, and new hire status; all of which impact the statutory goal causing a “Real World” caseload average that exceeds approximately 60 offenders per officer.

Probation Officer Caseloads by Division*			
Division	Real World Factor (RWF) Avg.	Current Staff	Offenders
Division 1	61	424	22,978
Division 2	61	511	26,733
Division 3	60	499	28,813
Division 4	56	432	22,294
Statewide	60	1,866	100,818

*Judicial District caseload averages are shown in Appendix A

As a result of the Justice Reinvestment law changes the post release population continues to grow. The chart below shows the monthly post release entries over the last two years. This continual growth rate will have an impact on future caseloads.



Analysis of Optimal Caseloads

Session Law 2011-192 - Justice Reinvestment Act became effective in December of 2011. The caseload goal was updated to read: “caseloads for probation officers supervising persons who are determined to be high or moderate risk of rearrest as determined by the Division's validated risk assessment should not exceed an average of 60 offenders per officer.” The Justice Reinvestment legislation also requires mandatory supervision of felons who in the past were not supervised. Additional officer positions were awarded by the legislature for fiscal years '13-14 and '14-15 to help meet the resources needed to supervise offenders and to prevent the caseloads from exceeding the National Institute of Corrections recommended and Justice Reinvestment legislation requirement of no more than 60 offenders per officer. Community Corrections continues to alter workload distribution to meet the revised caseload goal. All offenders are leveled based on their individual risk and needs assessment.

Community Corrections has completed the task of identifying those offenders who are at a high or moderate risk of rearrest. We have also adjusted supervision practices to reach the caseload goal described above in the JRA statute and to mirror the recommended workload of NIC. Language from the American Probation and Parole website describes a method of deciding on an average caseload size:

“Not every offender needs the same type or amount of supervision. To be effective and efficient, there must be varying amounts of supervision provided to offenders. The more serious or higher priority cases are assigned a greater level of supervision, meaning that the officer will be expected to have more frequent contact with that offender. Lower priority cases demand less time of the caseload officer.”¹

By adopting this model of supervision, our goal is to allow officers to carry one of four types of caseloads to include high risk (L1-L2), high to moderate risk (L2-L3) low risk (L4-L5) and all risk (L1-L5) offenders. All risk (L1-L5) caseload types are small in number and are reserved for rural areas where resources and offender population do not allow for the other types of caseloads. Research shows that supervision of offenders with similar risk and needs factors will allow officers an opportunity to accurately address the criminogenic needs of offenders on their caseloads. The following accounts for optimal caseload size according to the American Probation Parole Association:

“The workload model is based on differentiation among cases. Under the workload approach time factors into the weight that a case receives in assigning it to an officer and for accounting for its contribution to the officer’s total responsibilities. For example, a case with a high priority would require 4 hours per month equaling 30 as a total caseload. Medium priority would require 2 hours per month equaling 60 as a total caseload. Low priority would

¹ http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?WebCode=VB_FAQ#14

require 1 hour per month equaling a total caseload of 120. This is based upon an officer having 120 hours per month to supervise offenders. The balance of the hours counting for leave, collateral duties, etc.”²

Community Corrections probation officers have transitioned to a similar model of supervision and have been assigned their caseload templates based on available resources and offender population in each county. The goal assigned to each template is shown in the chart below.

Caseload Goal Templates			
High Risk (L1-L2)	High-Moderate Risk (L2-L3)	Low Risk (L4-L5)	All Risk (L1-L5)
40	60	120	60

Using the NIC literature and researching trends within our existing offender population, Community Corrections made a public safety decision to establish the high risk caseload number at 40 due to the nature of the offenders in the population; allowing officers more time to work closely with each person on their caseload and adequately address the needs of the offenders. These caseloads are comprised of offenders with identified serious and persistent mental illnesses, sex offenders and those with the highest risks of rearrest.

Projections/Populations Report

(Rehabilitative Programs & Services Research & Decision Support Analysis, DPS)

The Office of Rehabilitative Programs and Services RP&S (formerly Office of Research and Planning) began making projections for the community supervised population in 1994 when the Structured Sentencing Act was implemented. For many years the projected end of fiscal year populations and resource needs were reported by the number of offenders supervised by three classes of officers, determined by the offender’s assignment to intensive, intermediate or community level punishment.

The RP&S Research & Decision Support Analysis unit (RDS) uses a statistical model to project the supervised population and resource needs based on aggregate data trends. The five-year population projections are based on information provided by the North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission (SPAC), staffing patterns provided by the Section of Community Corrections, and data from the Offender Population Unified System (OPUS) prepared by the unit.

An increase in the number of officer positions (175) during FY2013-2014 and into FY2014-2015 suggests the Section will be able to achieve supervision goals in most areas in the short-term.

² http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?WebCode=VB_FAQ#14

However, if staffing behavior remains constant these new hires will not likely be able to immediately carry a full caseload and Community Corrections will be short in covering the “real-world” relief factor, and we project a need for 59 officers to fully implement supervision goals.

The caseload templates combined with projected population and expected officer resources produces average caseloads of 60 offenders. However by the end of FY2016-2017, average caseloads will likely increase beyond those targeted in the supervision templates and the statutorily preferred 60 per officer. Based on these projections, officer need (80) will outpace the number of additional officers requested by the Section (76) for the current session’s biennium budget (i.e., FYs 2015-2016 and 2016-2017).

Population Projections and Resource Needs

The analysis shows that probation/parole officer resources remain below the level required to meet supervision caseload goals. The table below shows the projections for the end of year population, the current position resources, and the projected staffing needs required to supervise the population for each year of the projection period.

Population & Probation/Parole Officer Projections

Fiscal Year	Projected End Of Year Supervision Population On June 30	Required Officer Resources	Current & Projected Officer Resources	Additional Officer Resources Needed
FY 14-15	103,400	1,944	1,885	59
FY 15-16	103,400	1,944	1,885	59
FY 16-17	104,443	1,965	1,885	80
FY 17-18	105,478	1,983	1,885	98
FY 18-19	106,533	1,998	1,885	113

Chief Probation Parole Officer Caseloads

The chief probation parole officer (CPPO) is the first-line supervisor who manages the field units within the counties. In 2004, the National Institute of Corrections issued a technical assistance report that recommended a ratio of seven certified officers to one CPPO. The average probation officer to chief ratio statewide is currently 7:1. However, there are some districts that exceed the 7:1 ratio and as new probation officer positions are received, new CPPOs are also required to supervise these positions. *Appendix B represents the CPPO to officer ratio in each county.*

Paraprofessionals

In 2009, upon completion of the Office of State Personnel study, the State Personnel Commission recommended one class of probation officer as well as a judicial services coordinator (JSC) class. The judicial services coordinator position was a title reassignment from existing community service coordinators. These positions are responsible for court intake processing of both supervised and unsupervised cases, community service placement of both supervised and unsupervised offenders,

monitoring of all community service hours as well as reporting unsupervised cases back to the court for disposition. The position reduces the number of officers needed to assist in court processing. Because there are not enough JSCs statewide to effectively cover all courtrooms, probation officers in some areas are still required to aid in court processing. There are currently 227 JSC positions statewide that carry an average caseload of 104 offenders each.

Seven data entry specialists are responsible for data entry and seven lead judicial services specialists supervise judicial services coordinators in selected areas. These positions are located in Wake, Forsyth and Mecklenburg counties. The lead judicial services specialist position was developed to relieve the number of community service employees reporting directly to the chief probation/parole officer thereby reducing the staff to chief ratio. Because these are not certified positions, they are not used to help monitor the lower risk supervised offender population.

The Process of Assigning Supervision Levels via Risk/Needs Assessment

DACJJ developed the Risk/Needs Assessment (RNA), which adopts an existing instrument, Offender Traits Inventory, as the risk tool, and uses an in-house tool as the needs instrument. These instruments are used to manage the offender population, starting with the assignment of a supervision level based on the offender's risk and needs. The Department consulted with the Council of State Government for professional critique and feedback when developing the instrument. Additionally, the UNC School of Social Work assisted with peer review and validation of the assessment. Each question was validated and any necessary adjustments occurred during this period.

The Division has completed policy revisions, training, and has developed automated tools to assist with case management and planning. Community Corrections has begun to implement evidence based practices which are research proven methods of successful offender supervision. The Risk/Needs Assessment addresses the first principle of evidence based practices – assess actuarial risk. In the fall of 2010, Community Corrections began supervision by level of risk and need and continues to supervise offenders according to these levels. As a matter of policy select offenders are supervised at a higher level regardless of the assessment outcome. This includes sex offenders, domestic violence offenders, certain DWI offenders, and documented gang offenders. The Department's non-compliance response grid uses information from the assessment to suggest minimum responses to violations based on the offender's assessed supervision level. Information identified through the risk and needs assessment also guides officers in making referrals for cognitive intervention, mental health and substance abuse treatment.

Supervision of Collection Cases

A small number of supervised probation cases have no special condition of probation other than monetary conditions. A snapshot of the offender population in January 2015 shows that a total of 206 offenders have only court-ordered monetary condition in addition to the regular conditions of probation. These offenders are usually eligible for the Offender Accountability Reporting (OAR)

program which allows low risk offenders to utilize technology to report remotely by computer or mail-in report to their officer and does not require face to face contact unless necessary. ***Appendix C shows the number of offenders by district.***

SECTION 16C.10

(b) The Department of Public Safety shall report by March 1 of each year to the Chairs of the House of Representatives and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety on the following:

- (1) The number of sex offenders enrolled on active and passive GPS monitoring.
- (2) The caseloads of probation officers assigned to GPS-monitored sex offenders.
- (3) The number of violations.
- (4) The number of absconders.
- (5) The projected number of offenders to be enrolled by the end of the fiscal year.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING/USE OF GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEMS FOR SEX OFFENDERS

Session Law 2006-247 (H1896) required the Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice (formerly DOC) to establish a sex offender monitoring program using a continuous satellite-based monitoring system to monitor sex offenders in the community. Offenders subject to monitoring include those under probation, parole, or post-release supervision and certain offenders who have completed their periods of supervision or incarceration but are subject to lifetime tracking pursuant to statute.

Number of Sex Offenders Enrolled

[N.C.G.S.14-208.40](#) establishes three categories of offenders subject to GPS monitoring:

1. Any offender classified as a sexually violent predator, is a recidivist or was convicted of an aggravated offense (Mandatory GPS);
2. Any offender who has committed an offense involving the physical, mental, or sexual abuse of a minor and requires the highest possible level of supervision and monitoring based on a DOC risk assessment (Conditional GPS); and
3. Any offender who is convicted of [G.S. 14-27.2A](#) or [G.S. 14-27.4A](#).

All three categories require that the offender be convicted of a reportable conviction and be required to register as a sex offender.

Of the 176 sex offenders enrolled in the electronic monitoring program during fiscal year 2013-2014, all were monitored via active GPS.

- 65 were assigned to the conditional program (36.9%)
- 111 were assigned to the mandatory program (63.1%)

The table below represents the number of new offenders enrolled on GPS for FY 2013-2014. The majority (75.6%) of offenders enrolled in the electronic monitoring program were supervised offenders (133 offenders). The remaining offenders were un-supervised (43 offenders).

Enrollments by Month

Month FY 13/14	Conditional	Mandatory	Total
July	8	4	12
August	4	9	13
September	9	14	23
October	2	10	12
November	4	6	10
December	6	7	13
January	3	14	17
February	5	9	14
March	5	7	12
April	6	9	15
May	10	12	22
June	3	10	13
Totals	65	111	176

Caseloads of Probation Officers Assigned to GPS Monitored Sex Offenders

Due to the relatively small numbers of offenders under GPS supervision, Community Corrections utilized existing resources to aid in the supervision of GPS sex offender cases. These officers specialize in the supervision of sex offenders, including those who do not have the GPS requirements. Factors such as geography, the number of different offender types, their admission rates to supervision, and the number of officer resources impact decisions concerning local case management practices.

Two officers work in the GPS administrative office and handle the GPS lifetime-tracking offender population. This population consists of certain sex offenders who are no longer active under Community Corrections' authority, but who were legislatively mandated to be tracked for the remainder of their lives. These officers handle cases statewide, and as of January 31, 2015 were responsible for monitoring 325 sex offenders.

Violations

During fiscal year 2013-2014, 34 of the new enrollees were charged with a total 242 violations (19.3%). There were three (3) violations for absconding.

Below is a table of the type and number of violations committed by program enrollees during the fiscal year.

Violations by Offenders Enrolled during FY 13-14

Violation	Number	Percent	Offenders with Violation
POSITIVE DRUG	85	35.1%	5
FTC - SEX ABUSE TREATMENT PGM	37	15.29%	2
CURFEW VIOLATIONS	34	14.05%	8
FAILURE TO PAY PSF	15	6.20%	13
FTC - SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT	6	2.48%	3
POSSESS CONTR SUB/ILLEGAL DRUG	5	2.07%	2
FTC - RESIDE AS APPROVED	4	1.65%	4
FAILURE TO REPORT	4	1.65%	4
FAILURE TO PAY CI	4	1.65%	3
LEFT COUNTY W/O PERMISSION	4	1.65%	3
FTC NOT SOCIALIZE W/PERSONS<18	4	1.65%	3
ABSCONDING W/WARRANT	2	0.83%	2
FAIL TO NOTIFY - RES CHANGE	2	0.83%	2
MISD - CONVICTION/PC	2	0.83%	2
POSS FIREARM/DEADWEA/EXPL	2	0.83%	2
POSSESS ALCOHOL	2	0.83%	2
FAIL TO COMPLY SBM	2	0.83%	2
FREQUENT DRUG PLACES	2	0.83%	1
ABSCONDED SUPERVISION	1	0.41%	1
FTC - NO NETWKNG SITE W/MINORS	1	0.41%	1
FAIL TO COMPLETE COMM. SERV.	1	0.41%	1
FTC - EHA/EM	1	0.41%	1
REFUSE TO SUBMIT - WARR SEARCH	1	0.41%	1
SEX OFFENDER VIOLATION	1	0.41%	1
FELONY - CONVICTION/PC	1	0.41%	1
FAIL TO ANSWER INQUIRES	1	0.41%	1
CONTACT W/DRUG USERS	1	0.41%	1
FTC - REGISTER AS SEX OFFENDER	1	0.41%	1
FTC - NOT ALONE W/MINOR	1	0.41%	1
CONTACT W/SEX OFFENDERS	1	0.41%	1
FTC - SEX OFFENDER CONTROL PGM	1	0.41%	1
OTHER	13	5.37%	12

Absconders and Exits from GPS during fiscal year 2012-2013

During the fiscal year, no offenders enrolled in the electronic monitoring program were removed from satellite based monitoring due to absconding. There were 23 offender exits from GPS during the fiscal year. Most (11) of these exits resulted from completion of the monitoring requirement. There were 8 offenders who moved out-of-state, were returned to their home state or were deported. The courts removed 2 offenders from monitoring.

Exits from SBM during FY 13-14

Exit Type	Offender Exits from GPS	Percent Exits
Completed	11	47.8%
Moved/Deported	8	34.7%
Court Order	2	8.7%
Administrative	1	4.4%
Unknown	1	4.4%
Totals	23	100%

Offender Enrollment Projections

The Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice's Section of Rehabilitative Programs and Services provided assistance with the enrollment projections. The tables below show year-end population projections for the GPS program for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16:

PROJECTED POPULATION FOR GPS SUPERVISION

Type of Offender	FY 2014-2015	FY 2015-2016
Mandatory GPS	571	641
Conditional GPS	318	357
Totals	889	998

Approximately 476 of those offenders are projected to have no community supervision requirement during FY 2014-15, while 534 offenders are projected to have no community supervision requirement during FY 2015-16. The projections are based on the laws in effect as of June 30, 2014 and do not take into account any future legislation affecting GPS supervision.

Community Corrections continues to assess its practices, policies and procedures as it moves toward full implementation of evidence based practices with all offenders. The agency will continue to assess caseload types and size, as it continues to review and improve supervision strategies.

APPENDIX A – CASELOADS BY DISTRICT

(as of January 31, 2015)

District	Caseload Avg. (if all positions filled)	Real World Factor (RWF) Avg	Current Staff	Offenders	District	Caseload Avg. (if all positions filled)	Real World Factor (RWF) Avg	Current Staff	Offenders
1	58	62	34	1,862	17	54	55	39	2,218
2	51	56	29	1,686	18	50	61	100	5,645
3	52	57	60	3,292	19A	52	59	82	4,272
4	56	63	30	1,570	19B	59	69	51	3,297
5	53	57	75	3,809	20	56	61	50	2,894
6	57	59	34	1,763	21	52	58	67	3,987
7	56	66	105	5,944	22	52	60	81	4,694
8	61	66	57	3,052	23	55	60	29	1,806
Div 1 Totals	55	61	424	22,978	Div 3 Totals	54	60	499	28,813
District	Caseload Avg. (if all positions filled)	Real World Factor (RWF) Avg	Current Staff	Offenders	District	Caseload Avg. (if all positions filled)	Real World Factor (RWF) Avg	Current Staff	Offenders
9	56	59	35	1,790	24	53	53	22	1,201
10	48	59	121	6,157	25	54	59	60	3,020
11	51	62	55	3,151	26	52	61	126	6,636
12	49	61	67	3,149	27	49	59	99	5,053
13	54	68	48	2,608	28	51	58	44	2,209
14	56	60	86	4,211	29	48	55	48	2,507
15	56	57	41	2,449	30	46	50	33	1,668
16	54	64	58	3,218	Div 4 Totals	51	56	432	22,294
Div 2 Totals	53	61	511	26,733	Statewide	54	60	1,866	100,818

Note: Does not include 2,582 active offenders on central office administrative caseloads.

Projected Caseloads by District & Template										
District	Officer Caseload Pattern						Average Caseload*			
	L0toL5	L1TOL2	L1toL3	L2toL3	L3toL5	L4toL5	High	H-M	Low	All
01	10	0	15	0	0	3	--	57	164	52
02	3	0	19	0	0	4	--	53	120	40
03	3	28	0	17	0	9	43	55	113	55
04	3	6	7	4	0	4	47	58	123	55
05	0	42	0	17	0	8	43	57	126	--
06	17	0	10	0	0	2	--	59	108	57
07	0	35	24	17	0	17	43	58	123	--
08	0	27	3	11	0	8	43	58	131	--
09	30	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	59
10	0	63	0	26	0	16	42	60	119	--
11	0	24	9	12	0	7	42	59	127	--
12	0	29	0	15	0	8	44	61	119	--
13	0	18	5	10	0	8	44	60	132	--
14	0	45	0	20	0	8	43	61	143	--
15	0	25	3	10	0	6	39	54	117	--
16	0	25	0	16	0	9	45	59	142	--
17	0	23	0	13	0	4	41	53	149	--
18	0	54	0	24	0	14	44	63	122	--
19A	0	39	0	22	0	11	43	61	116	--
19B	0	18	16	7	0	9	42	62	123	--
20	5	20	0	15	0	7	43	60	114	62
21	0	44	0	17	0	8	44	62	122	--
22	7	32	6	21	0	12	42	59	110	54
23	8	0	17	0	0	3	--	60	120	51
24	15	4	0	0	4	0	40	55	--	55
25	0	25	0	18	0	8	41	57	123	--
26	0	61	0	29	0	19	42	61	121	--
27	0	44	0	31	0	12	41	59	117	--
28	0	24	0	9	0	5	44	60	126	--
29	5	16	12	3	6	3	38	56	130	55
30	12	9	4	0	8	1	39	50	88	50
Totals Average	136	780	150	384	18	233	42	58	126	57

* Average reflects caseloads if all positions were filled

APPENDIX B – OFFICER TO CPPO RATIO - Tables show officer to chief PPO ratio by unit

Division One Officer to CPPO Ratio					
County	Unit	Ratio	County	Unit	Ratio
Dare	5010A	7:01	Halifax	5060A	7:01
Pasquotank, Camden	5010B	7:01	Northampton	5060C	6:01
Chowan, Gates	5010C	6:01	Bertie	5060D	7:01
Currituck, Dare	5010D	8:01	Hertford	5060E	8:01
Pasquotank, Perquimans	5010E	6:01	Halifax	5060F	6:01
Beaufort	5020A	7:01	Edgecombe	5070A	8:01
Martin	5020B	8:01	Wilson	5070B	7:01
Beaufort	5020C	7:01	Nash	5070C	8:01
Wash/Hyde/Tyr	5020D	7:01	Edgecombe, Nash	5070D	6:01
Craven	5030A	7:01	Wilson	5070E	8:01
Craven	5030B	8:01	Nash, Edgecombe	5070F	7:01
Carteret	5030C	6:01	Pitt	5070G	9:01
Carteret	5030D	7:01	Pitt	5070H	2:1 JSC Unit
Onslow	5030E	6:01	Pitt	5070I	10:01
Onslow	5030F	6:01	Pitt	5070J	9:01
Onslow	5030G	6:01	Pitt	5070K	8:01
Onslow	5030H	6:01	Wilson	5070L	7:01
Craven /Pam	5030I	8:01	Nash, Edge	5070M	6:01
Sampson	5040A	7:01	Pitt	5070N	9:01
Duplin, Jones	5040B	8:01	Lenoir	5080A	7:01
Duplin	5040C	8:01	Lenoir	5080B	7:01
Sampson	5040D	7:01	Greene	5080C	6:01
New Hanover	5050A	2:1 JSC Unit	Wayne	5080D	8:01
New Hanover	5050B	9:01	Wayne	5080E	7:01
New Hanover	5050C	8:01	Wayne	5080F	8:01
Pender	5050D	7:01	Wayne	5080G	7:01
New Hanover	5050E	8:01	Lenoir	5080H	7:01
New Hanover	5050F	8:01	DIV AVG.		7:01
New Hanover	5050G	9:01			
New Hanover	5050H	9:01			
New Hanover	5050I	8:01			
Pender	5050J	7:01			

Division Two Officer to CPPO Ratio						
County	Unit	Ratio		County	Unit	Ratio
Franklin	5090A	9:1		Brunswick	5130A	8:1
Warren, Vance	5090B	8:1		Bladen	5130B	8:1
Vance	5090C	7:1		Columbus, Bladen	5130C	8:1
Granville	5090D	9:1		Columbus, Bladen	5130D	8:1
Wake	5100A	7:1		Brunswick	5130E	8:1
Wake	5100B	3:1 JSC Unit		Brunswick	5130F	8:1
Wake	5100C	8:1		Durham	5140A	7:1
Wake	5100D	8:1		Durham	5140B	7:1
Wake	5100E	7:1		Durham	5140C	7:1
Wake	5100F	8:1		Durham	5140D	7:1
Wake	5100G	8:1		Durham	5140E	8:1
Wake	5100H	8:1		Durham	5140F	8:1
Wake	5100I	8:1		Durham	5140G	JSC Unit
Wake	5100J	8:1		Durham	5140H	7:1
Wake	5100K	8:1		Durham	5140I	7:1
Wake	5100L	8:1		Chatham	5140J	7:1
Wake	5100M	8:1		Orange	5140K	6:1
Wake	5100N	8:1		Orange	5140L	7:1
Wake	5100O	8:1		Durham	5140M	8:1
Wake	5100P	8:1		Alamance	5150A	8:1
Harnett	5110A	8:1		Alamance	5150B	8:1
Johnston	5110B	5:1 JSC Unit		Alamance	5150C	7:1
Lee	5110C	6:1		Person	5150D	6:1
Johnston	5110D	7:1		Person, Caswell	5150E	5:1
Harnett/Johnston	5110E	9:1		Alamance	5150F	8:1
Johnston	5110F	7:1		Scotland	5160A	8:1
Lee, Harnett	5110G	6:1		Hoke	5160B	7:1
Johnston	5110H	7:1		Scotland/Hoke/Robeson	5160C	4:1 JSC Unit
Cumberland	5120A	8:1		Robeson	5160D	7:1
Cumberland	5120B	8:1		Robeson	5160E	7:1
Cumberland	5120C	2:1 JSC Unit		Robeson	5160F	7:1
Cumberland	5120D	8:1		Robeson	5160G	6:1
Cumberland	5120E	8:1		Robeson	5160H	6:1
Cumberland	5120F	8:1		Hoke	5160I	6:1
Cumberland	5120G	8:1				
Cumberland	5120H	8:1				
				DIV AVG.		7:1

Division Three Officer to CPPO Ratio					
County	Unit	Ratio	County	Unit	Ratio
Rockingham	5170A	6:01	Richmond	5200A	6:01
Rockingham	5170B	5:01	Anson	5200B	7:01
Surry	5170C	7:01	Richmond	5200C	7:01
Stokes	5170D	8:01	Stanly	5200E	8:01
Surry	5170E	6:01	Union	5200F	8:01
Rockingham	5170F	7:01	Union	5200G	7:01
Guilford	5180A	7:01	Union	5200H	7:01
Guilford	5180B	7:01	Forsyth	5210A	7:01
Guilford	5180C	8:01	Forsyth	5210B	8:01
Guilford	5180D	8:01	Forsyth	5210C	7:01
Guilford	5180E	6:01	Forsyth	5210D	7:01
Guilford	5180F	9:01	Forsyth	5210E	7:01
Guilford	5180G	8:01	Forsyth	5210F	8:01
Guilford	5180H	8:01	Forsyth	5210G	8:01
Guilford	5180I	7:01	Forsyth	5210H	8:01
Guilford	5180J	8:01	Forsyth	5210I	7:01
Guilford	5180K	8:01	Alexander	5220A	8:01
Guilford	5180L	8:01	Iredell	5220B	9:01
Guilford	5180M	8:01	Iredell	5220C	9:01
Cabarrus	5191A	8:01	Davidson	5220D	7:01
Cabarrus	5191B	8:01	Davidson	5220E	7:01
Cabarrus	5191C	8:01	Davidson	5220F	8:01
Rowan	5191D	9:01	Iredell	5220G	9:01
Rowan	5191E	9:01	Davie	5220H	7:01
Rowan	5191F	9:01	Davidson	5220I	8:01
Rowan	5191G	9:01	Iredell	5220J	9:01
Cabarrus	5191H	8:01	Wilkes	5230A	7:01
Rowan	5191I	8:01	Wilkes	5230B	8:01
Rowan/Cabarrus	5191J	6:01	Ashe, Alleghany	5230C	7:01
Randolph	5192A	7:01	Yadkin	5230D	7:01
Randolph	5192B	7:01			
Montgomery	5192C	6:01			
Randolph	5192D	8:01			
Moore	5192E	9:01			
Moore	5192F	9:01			
Randolph	5192G	8:01			

Division Four Officer to CPPO Ratio					
County	Unit	Ratio	County	Unit	Ratio
Madison, Yancey	5240A	8:01	Gaston	5270A	8:01
Watauga	5240B	7:01	Gaston	5270B	8:01
Avery, Mitchell	5240C	7:01	Gaston	5270C	8:01
Caldwell	5250A	7:01	Gaston	5270D	5 (JSC)
Caldwell	5250B	6:01	Gaston	5270E	8:01
Burke	5250C	6:01	Cleveland	5270F	8:01
Catawba	5250D	7:01	Lincoln	5270G	7:01
Catawba	5250E	8:01	Cleveland	5270H	8:01
Catawba	5250F	9:01	Cleveland	5270I	8:01
Burke	5250G	10:01	Gaston	5270J	8:01
Burke, Catawba	5250H	8:01	Lincoln	5270K	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260A	5 (JSC)	Cleveland	5270L	8:01
Mecklenburg	5260B	8:01	Buncombe	5280A	8:01
Mecklenburg	5260C	8:01	Buncombe	5280B	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260D	8:01	Buncombe	5280C	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260E	8:01	Buncombe	5280D	6:01
Mecklenburg	5260F	8:01	Buncombe	5280E	6:01
Mecklenburg	5260G	8:01	Buncombe	5280F	5 (JSC)
Mecklenburg	5260H	5 (JSC)	Buncombe	5280G	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260I	8:01	Rutherford	5290A	6:01
Mecklenburg	5260J	7:01	McDowell	5290B	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260K	8:01	Henderson	5290C	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260L	8:01	Transylvania, Henderson	5290D	7:01
Mecklenburg	5260M	8:01	Polk, Henderson	5290E	6:01
Mecklenburg	5260N	8:01	Rutherford	5290F	6:01
Mecklenburg	5260O	7:01	Rutherford, McDowell	5290G	8:01
Mecklenburg	5260P	8:01	Haywood	5300A	6:01
			Swain, Jackson, Macon	5300B	7:01
			Cherokee, Graham	5300C	7:01
			Macon, Clay, Cherokee	5300D	7:01
			Haywood, Jackson	5300E	6:01
			DIV AVG.		7:01

Ratios show the number of certified staff to CPPO. Some units identified as judicial services units process probation cases out of court and are staffed with only judicial services coordinators (JSCs). Other units with smaller ratios have a mix of PPOs and JSCs; PPOs are the only staff shown in the ratio.

APPENDIX C– SUPERVISED COLLECTION CASES

Snapshot as of January 2015

Monetary Conditions Only		
District	Offenders	Percent
ISC	12	5.8%
01	3	1.5%
02	2	1.0%
03	7	3.4%
04	6	2.9%
05	9	4.4%
06	4	1.9%
07	14	6.8%
08	6	2.9%
09	4	1.9%
10	7	3.4%
11	5	2.4%
12	3	1.5%
13	3	1.5%
14	4	1.9%
15	2	1.0%
16	6	2.9%
17	3	1.5%
18	13	6.3%
19A	5	2.4%
19B	7	3.4%
20	5	2.4%
21	13	6.3%
22	13	6.3%
23	0	0.0%
24	3	1.5%
25	14	6.8%
26	7	3.4%
27	11	5.3%
28	6	2.9%
29	6	2.9%
30	3	1.5%
Totals	206	100.0%