

**REPORT OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

**Study of Workload Measures for
Local Departments of Social Services**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 11

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2001**



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

October 25, 2000

TO: The Honorable James S. Gilmore, III

and

The General Assembly of Virginia

The report contained herein is pursuant to House Joint Resolution 554 as passed by the 1999 General Assembly.

The General Assembly directed the Department to conduct, with the assistance of the local departments of social services, a comprehensive study to validate workload measures for local social services programs. The Department contracted with a private consultant firm to conduct the study. All work on the study was done in close collaboration with representatives of local departments.

The report describes the preliminary study findings. The complexity of the study, analysis difficulties in integrating preliminary results with Department data, and the need for assessment and verification of the results prevented the completion of a final report in time to meet the October 2000 study submittal date. The Department continues to work with the consultants and local departments to complete this comprehensive study.

The report cost the Commonwealth of Virginia an estimated \$795,000 to complete. This estimate includes the contracted service cost of Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. and an estimated 2,000 hours of Department staff time to administer the contract, participate in the study design and review, and facilitate collaboration with the local departments of social services.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sonia Rivero".

Sonia Rivero
Commissioner

Study of Workload Measures For Local Departments of Social Services



Virginia Department of Social Services

October 1, 2000

Preface

Authority: House Joint Resolution 554 (1999)

Study Advisory Committee:

***Virginia League of Social Services
Executives***

Earl Blythe, York-Poquoson DSS
Sam Bush, Greenville-Emporia DSS
Susan Clark, Galax DSS
S.E. Culpeper, Newport News DSS
Don Driver, Rockingham-Harrisonburg DSS
Lynda Eubank, Arlington DSS
Donna Foster, Fairfax DSS
Martha Hall, Richmond Co DSS
Dottie Newcomb, Lunenburg DSS
Mary Parker, Accomack DSS
Sarah Snead, Chesterfield-Colonial Heights
DSS

Benefit Programs Organization

Carolyn Gregory-Adams, Greenville-
Emporia DSS
Link Miller, Spotsylvania DSS

***Virginia Alliance for Social Work
Practitioners***

Mary Armentrout, Middlesex DSS
Erma Mason, Williamsburg DSS

***Partnership of Office Services Support
Employees in Social Services***

Rosemary Randall, James City County DSS

Virginia Department of Social Services

Linda Booth, Service Programs
Bill McMakin, Policy and Research
Paul McWhinney, Northern Region
Tom Steinhauser, Benefit Programs
John Vaughn, Information Systems

Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc.

Dennis Zeller
Helaine Hornby
Robin Buskey
Melissa Watts

Acknowledgments: The Department wishes to recognize Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc., the consultant firm that completed the study for the Department, in spite of numerous obstacles, and the representatives of the local departments of social services who served on the Workload Measures Advisory Committee.

Broad Findings: The study is not complete due to delays caused by complexity of the study and analysis, difficulties in integrating preliminary results with Department data, and the necessity to assess and verify results. The Department will continue to work with the consultant and local departments to refine findings and results. When these measures are validated, the Department plans to use results to determine requirements for personnel and operating costs for mandated programs and services.

Table of Contents

	<u>page</u>
Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Study Request and Objectives	1
Background	2
Study Methodology	2
Overview	2
Sampling	3
Time Study Data Collection	4
Data Collection on Staffing Counts	4
Case Counts	5
Study Results	5
Time Study Results	5
Validation of Results	7
Impact of Environmental Factors	8
Staffing Analysis	9
Direct Staffing Resources	9
Supervisory, Clerical, Support, and Administrative Staffing	10
Preliminary Resource Needs	11
Plan for Study Completion	11
<i>Appendix 1: House Joint Resolution 554</i>	13

Executive Summary

Based on House Joint Resolution 554 (1998), the Department of Social Services, in collaboration with local departments of social services, conducted a study of workload measures. To assist with this study, the Department contracted with Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc.

The primary model utilized for this study involved time measurement in 35 of the 122 local departments of social services. Participating direct line social service staff identified cases by case type and maintained detailed daily time logs over a six-week period of time. A major component of the analysis of this time data collection focused on the amount of time necessary to complete work according to policy standards. Although preliminary workload measures standards in terms of hours per month per case by varying case types have been generated, the Department continues to examine and verify these standards.

Time study results indicate that direct line workers spend a little over 60 percent of their time (about 104 hours per month) on work associated with specific cases. Workers spend about 5 percent of their time in training, 16 percent in administration, and 16 percent on breaks and leave. Another 3 percent is spent in non-case specific program activities such as recruitment and information and referral.

To derive local staff needs, the model applied the preliminary workload standards to case count data and per worker case work time available per month to derive the number of staff needed to complete work according to policy standards. This number of needed staff was compared to existing local staff positions that are authorized for funding reimbursement to determine the net staffing need.

The study is not complete due to delays caused by complexity of the study and analysis, difficulties in integrating preliminary results with Department data, and the necessity to assess and verify results. The Department is committed to completing this comprehensive study to validate workload measures for local social services programs. When these measures are validated, the Department plans to use results to determine requirements for personnel and operating costs for mandated programs and services.

Workload Measures for Local Departments

Introduction

Study Request and Objectives

In 1999, the Virginia General Assembly, through House Joint Resolution 554, requested, in part:

“That the Department of Social Services, with the assistance of the local departments, be requested to conduct a comprehensive study to validate workload measures for local social services programs and, when they are validated, require their ongoing use to determine necessary appropriations for personnel and operating costs for mandated programs and services. . . . The Department shall complete its work in time to submit its findings and recommendations by October 1, 2000. . . .”

To conduct this complex study, the Department contracted with Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. (HZA), in the fall of 1999 after a competitive bid process. The study called for the achievement of four objectives:

1. Development of validated workload measures for all local programs supported by the Department;
2. Linkage of workload measures to local social services staffing;
3. Definition of a methodology for maintaining validity of workload measures as requirements and/or processes change; and
4. Specification of the requirements for an automated system for workload measures.

To guide this study, the Department and the Virginia League of Social Services Executives collaborated to appoint an Advisory Committee, composed of representatives of local departments of social services and Department staff. This committee met monthly with HZA and reviewed details of the study throughout the process.

The study is not fully complete. This report provides information on the study, including the methodology and preliminary results. The complexity of the study and analysis, difficulties in integrating preliminary results with Department data, and the necessity to assess and verify results have caused delays in producing a final report in time to meet the General Assembly’s time frame. The Department continues to work with the consultants and local departments to refine findings and results to date.

Background

Since the late 1970s, the Department has had a system, known as the caseload standards system, of estimating local workloads and staffing needs. The last comprehensive revision of the caseload standards occurred in 1987. The model distinguished between two broad program types, benefits determination and services delivery, referred to as "benefits" and "services," and established standard times to perform work on activities and cases. It also calculated the number of full-time equivalent staff needed to perform the work under average conditions.

In 1992, the Department revised caseload standards for benefit programs, utilizing a combination of a simulated laboratory and random moment sampling to establish standards. In 1998, the Department updated a portion of the services standards, specifically foster care and adoption, through a General Assembly study.

Major program changes that affect workload have occurred since the model was developed and revised. For service programs, some of the significant legislative and policy changes that have occurred include child protective services audio-taping and the uniform assessment of adult care residents. Employment programs have been redesigned under welfare reform. In benefit programs, comprehensive welfare reform program changes occurred after the development of the model. In addition, new automated systems have significantly impacted work processes for both benefits and services staff.

Study Methodology

Overview

In other states and in Virginia, most social service agencies tend to refer to "caseload" rather than to "workload," but their intent in measuring caseload size is, in fact, to measure workload. Increasingly, caseload models of workload measurement have come to be recognized as inadequate because different types of cases clearly require different levels of effort.

The primary model utilized for this study uses time as the basic unit of measurement. Using time allows all types of cases to be made commensurate with one another when all are measured in terms of the time they require. Local social service staff activity can also be viewed in terms of time. Each staff person has a certain amount of time available and assigning him or her work that requires more time than is available will inevitably result in some of the work not being performed.

Using a model that uses time as its unit of measurement establishes the data collection method, specifically a time study. This time study can determine how much time each type of case requires. The problem with most time studies, however, is that they are much better at revealing how much time is spent on doing the work as opposed to showing how much time should be spent. While the empirical component of the

measurement is essential to ensure that the results are grounded in reality, a normative component is also needed.

In the model used for this study, the normative aspect consists of the measurement and calculation of the time workers actually take to perform their jobs *when they have met some basic policy and practice standards*. The resulting measure retains its empirical character and reflects real work time because it is based on an actual measurement. Simultaneously, because the analysis is limited to cases in which workers have met some or all of the requirements of policy, it guarantees some level of quality in the work that is done and can, therefore, represent the time that is required to perform the work adequately. This study also extended the normative aspect even further to identify a level of work beyond the minimally acceptable, so that the time required to perform higher quality work could also be estimated.

In order for the time study to occur, case types and policy standards had to be identified. With the help of both state and local focus groups, HZA developed a list and definitions for 157 case types. These case types represented those stages in the life of each type of case that were likely to take different amounts of time than other stages. In addition, HZA reviewed Department policies for each program and worked with state policy experts to identify key policy requirements.

The workload measurement used in this study ultimately rests on three pieces of information. These include:

1. Amount of time each type of case requires;
2. Amount of time workers have available to handle cases; and
3. Number of cases of each type that need to be handled.

Multiplying the first element by the third and dividing by the second provides an estimate of the number of staff required to conduct the work of the agency. While the first two elements emerge from the time study, to be discussed below, the third comes from automated sources that maintain case and process count data, which are necessary to calculate workload on an ongoing basis.

Sampling

Thirty-five local departments participated in the time measurement portion of the study. To select these participants, HZA, Department staff and the Advisory Committee developed several criteria. All agreed at an early point that the primary criterion for selection was the support and willingness of the local directors. HZA's experience with workload studies in other states had also indicated that the participation rates of local staff and, therefore the quality of the data, would be heavily influenced by the attitudes of the local directors.

At the same time, it was important to obtain a sample of local departments that would be representative of all local departments. HZA, working with the Department

and the Advisory Committee, developed a matrix that examined size of agency (there are six classes of agency to denote size), region (there are five regions), and urban/rural setting. While HZA's original proposal called for 30 departments to participate, ultimately 35 local departments volunteered and participated in the study. With the sole exception of Fairfax, when a local department volunteered for the study, all line workers in the agency participated in the time data collection. In Fairfax one-third of the workers participated because of its size and that was all the agency felt it could do.

Time Study Data Collection

The time study itself took place over a period of six weeks in each of the 35 participating localities. Some case types require a full month of activity for appropriate measurement, and the six-week time period provided a larger pool of such cases than a one-month study would provide. The first group of localities began recording time on January 24, 2000, and continued through March 3, 2000, while the last group started on February 21, 2000, and ended April 7, 2000.

Participants in the time study utilized two basic forms to capture the information needed. First, those workers who carried primary responsibility for each case used a "face sheet" to record basic case data and the type(s) of case, including the changes in the type(s) over the course of the time study. Thus the face sheet was the tool for capturing information about the case type(s).

The second form used in the time study was the "time sheet." Each participating worker completed one time sheet for each day of the study, recording the primary activity he or she was doing during each 15-minute segment of the day. If that activity involved a case, the worker recorded the case number as well as the case type for which the work was being done (cases often had more than one type simultaneously). If the work did not involve a case, the worker recorded other work-related activity, again in 15-minute increments. Each line worker recorded all work-related time in this manner for six weeks, producing a total of 30 time sheets per worker. "Work-related" time included breaks, lunch, leave time, time on-call, training and administrative tasks, as well as work on cases.

Data Collection on Staffing Counts

The initial source of staffing information was the Local Employee Tracking System (LETS). The downloaded data showed each of the positions reported to the system by locality, including the basic function of the position, the current incumbent, if any, and the full-time equivalent value of the position. On the advice of the Advisory Committee, HZA then mailed this information to each locality for verification and, if necessary, correction. A second survey then collected information on the funding of those positions, since not all of the positions received the normal 80 percent reimbursement provided for in the state-local funding formula.

Case Counts

The Department derived case counts largely from the information systems, such as ADAPT (Application Benefit Delivery Automation Project), MEDPEND (Medicaid and Auxiliary Grants system), ESPAS (Employment Services System), OASIS (On-line Automated Services Information System), and VACIS (Virginia Client Information System), that serve as the sources of the agency's management information. Since a few of these systems are relatively new, and others have been targeted for elimination, the quality of the information is less than what might be desired. These data represent, however, the best information currently available on how many cases of each type are handled by the local departments. Full implementation of the workload measures system will require significant improvements in the Department's ability to determine the number of cases handled by each local department of social services.

Study Results

Time Study Results

Just over 60 percent of all direct line worker time is devoted to specific cases, with another 2.6 percent of their time devoted to non-case specific time that is still program-related. This latter category includes providing information and referral to potential clients or to the public, providing public education, responding to emergencies for those in the community who are not clients and who never have a case opened, and recruiting foster and adoptive parents, as well as other types of service providers. Training time, which takes up about 2 hours of the average week for workers, is also program related, although no cases are directly involved. This means that a total of 27.1 hours out of every 40-hour week is devoted to program-related activities of some type. The remainder is relatively evenly split between administrative time and leave time. Table 1 reflects the time study findings in broad terms for benefit programs workers.

Table 1		
Time Distribution for Benefit Workers		
	Percent of Time	Hours per Month
Case Specific	60.37%	103.8 Hours ¹
Program-related, Non-case Specific	2.60%	4.5 Hours
Training	4.92%	8.5 Hours
Administration	15.98%	27.5 Hours
Leave	16.13%	27.7 Hours
Total	100.00%	172.0 Hours

The model of workload measurement used in this study measures workload on a monthly basis. The most important figure in Table 1, at least for workload measurement, is the number of hours per month spent in case specific work. The 103.8 hours represents the average time benefit workers have available for working on cases, with service workers

¹ For service workers this figure is 104.0 hours.

having 104 hours. These are the figures to be used for analysis in determining the number of staff needed to handle a given month's workload.

Table 2 provides the second piece of information needed for the calculation of workload -- the amount of time required to handle each type of case. These preliminary figures generally represent the amount of time per month each of these types would require. Non-recurring, event-driven case types, such as CPS investigations, represent the amount of time for the event, and the time is applied in the month the event starts. Both the time required for policy compliance and for a higher quality of work are included in this table. Note that many of the 157 original case types are combined, either because of lack of available case counts or the time study did not produce an adequate number of cases for time estimation. These results are preliminary and more verification is underway.

Table 2 Preliminary Workload Time Standards		
Case Type	Policy Time	Quality Time
Medicaid Eligibility Determination		
Medicaid-SSI	1.12	1.40
Medicaid-Aged, Blind and Disabled	2.18	2.75
Medicaid-Family and Children	1.42	1.59
Medicaid-Medically Indigent Families and CMSIP	1.89	2.66
Medicaid-Long Term Care	3.87	4.99
Medicaid Ongoing/Redetermination		
Medicaid-SSI	0.15	0.17
Medicaid-ABD	0.20	0.22
Medicaid-Family and Children-Eligible/Spend down/Transitional	0.16	0.20
Medicaid Only-Foster Care-Eligible/Spend down	0.09	0.09
Medicaid-Medically Indigent Families	0.18	0.20
Medicaid-Long Term Care-Single/Married-(No) Community Spouse-Eligible/Spend down	0.42	0.46
Other Benefits Programs		
State/Local Hospitalization Eligibility Determination	1.29	2.09
State/Local Hospitalization Ongoing	0.08	0.08
Children's Medical Security Insurance Program (CMSIP) Ongoing/Redetermination	0.14	0.17
Food Stamps Eligibility Determination	2.76	3.46
Food Stamps Ongoing	0.17	0.17
Food Stamps Eligibility Redetermination	2.04	2.44
AFDC-FC (Title IV-E) Eligibility/Ongoing/Redetermination	0.39	0.39
TANF/UP Determination/Payee/Normal/Sanction Determination/Diversionary Assistance	2.75	2.99
TANF-UP/Payee/Normal/Sanction-Ongoing, Redetermination	0.36	0.40
Emergency/General Relief Eligibility Determination	1.49	2.20
General Relief Ongoing/Redetermination	0.19	0.19
Auxiliary Grants Eligibility Determination	1.99	2.73
Auxiliary Grants Ongoing	0.26	0.34
Employment Programs		
VIEW Referral, VIEW Orientation & Initial Assessment	2.26	3.54
VIEW Ongoing	4.69	6.49

Table 2 Preliminary Workload Time Standards		
Case Type	Policy Time	Quality Time
VIEW-UP Ongoing	6.33	6.93
VIEW Transitional	0.41	0.41
FSET (Referral and Active)	1.05	1.05
FSET (Inactive, Employment, Sanction)	0.45	0.45
Services Programs		
CPS Intake Report	0.94	0.94
CPS Family Investigation/Family Assessment/Out of family Child Abuse Investigation/Other Out of Family Child Abuse Investigation	9.55	11.01
Court-ordered Services to Children, Adoptive Searches	6.85	6.85
Services to Children at Risk without Court Order	6.16	6.16
Ongoing CPS/Pre-Placement Prevention/Reunification Services	4.81	7.75
Foster Care-First 75 Days	10.22	11.42
Foster Care-Return Home/Place with Relatives/Adoption	9.44	10.17
Foster Care-Permanent Foster Care	7.83	7.97
Foster Care-Independent Living	8.49	9.69
Foster Care-Continue Foster Care	8.74	8.88
Adoptive and Resource Home Studies, Supervision and Approval	1.49	1.49
Post Adoption	2.40	2.40
Child Day Care Services	1.98	2.42
Adult In Community Investigation, Long Term Care Facility Or Institution Investigation	6.54	6.54
Ongoing Adult Protective Services	5.29	5.29
Adult Services Ongoing	2.16	3.46
Pre-Admission Screening	2.79	2.79

Where the policy and quality times are equal, there was either no measurable policy or quality standard for that type of case and the actual time spent on that type of case is used, or there were too few cases meeting the quality standards to calculate a separate quality estimate.

Validation of Results

HZA used preliminary results from the time study to compare with results of the Department's random moment survey (RMS), collected for the purposes of allocation of federal funds. In general the results appear to be sufficiently close and do not raise any major issues. There are two principal differences, however. First, the time study appears to show higher percentages of time for ongoing benefit cases and lower counts of benefit redetermination cases. Second, and perhaps related, the time study seems to show relatively less time spent on services and relatively more time spent on benefits and employment.

These differences are not large and may be the result of the way workers report their time. For instance, the RMS instructions tell workers to count a case in redetermination status only when a regularly scheduled redetermination occurs. Since many of the same activities occur when the case experiences a change during an ongoing status, it is entirely possible that many workers view and report this as a

redetermination for RMS. Some of the same confusion could have occurred during the time study, even though the definitions of when a status started and ended were specified in detail.

HZA also compared preliminary results to earlier workload studies in Virginia. In the eight years since the most recent benefits study was conducted in 1992, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) has replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program and most, if not all, of the categorical rules connecting welfare receipt to eligibility for other programs have disappeared. Thus, comparisons of this study's results are not comparable to old studies.

Where some comparisons could be made, for Medicaid case types, the present time study generally shows reduced times for eligibility determination and increased times for both ongoing and redetermination cases. For food stamps, the time estimated for both eligibility determinations and redeterminations is higher while the time estimated for ongoing cases is in the same range as the 1992 update. In comparing the preliminary results in services, preliminary results show child protective investigations taking less time than in the 1987 study, a finding which will be explored further, while most of the adult services categories show more time being spent now than in earlier years.

Impact of Environmental Factors

One of the concerns outlined in the design of the project was the possibility that workloads differed across localities due to environmental factors. Working with the Department and the Advisory Committee, HZA identified external factors that could cause differences in workload, be beyond the control of the local department, and might impact the time required to handle a case. Based on the results of a survey of all 122 local departments of social services, HZA collected statistical data from various sources on the factors local departments cited. Once all of the time study data were analyzed, correlations between measures of the environmental factors and the time required for various types of cases were tested to determine if any of these factors actually had a demonstrable effect. The intent was to determine if the workload "credited" to some localities should be higher than that "credited" to others because of differences in local circumstances.

The environmental factors used for testing included:

1. Illiteracy rates as measured by a lack of high school completions;
2. Size of the immigrant population;
3. Unemployment rate;
4. Population density; and
5. Poverty rate.

In calculating the impact of the environmental factors on the time required to handle a case, the only statistically significant findings showed that the level of the

immigrant population had a small negative impact on the time required for Medicaid eligibility determination for the Aged, Blind and Disabled, i.e., the larger the immigrant population the less time these determinations took. This result was contrary to the expectation that it would take longer to handle immigrant cases and could not be explained.

These factors were excluded in the preliminary development of workload measures, since their impacts were small and could not be replicated for more than one or two case types. When new census data becomes available, these environmental factors could show an impact and may need to be reconsidered.

Staffing Analysis

Direct Staffing Resources

The model used relies on estimates of the time required to handle cases; therefore, all estimates of staffing needs are derived from the need for direct worker time. There are different approaches to determine which existing staff positions to count in local departments. The study identified six possibilities:

1. All staff positions in the local departments, regardless of how they are funded or whether the Department has authorized them;
2. All Department authorized positions;
3. All filled Department authorized positions;
4. All positions the Department has authorized for reimbursement at a minimum of an 80 percent federal/state rate; and
5. All filled positions the Department has authorized reimbursement at a minimum of an 80 percent federal/state rate; and

The preliminary analyses conducted for this study have examined the above ways of defining existing staff, except for the first. That level was omitted because the Department does not have a reliable means of determining how many staff might be included. Table 3 shows four levels of full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing resources on a statewide basis, focusing only on direct line staff.

Authorized	Authorized and Filled	Authorized and Approved for 80/20 Funding	Authorized, Approved for 80/20 Funding and Filled
5,045	4,543	4,106	3,830

relationship was not straightforward. In general, smaller localities have lower proportions of non-direct worker staff than do other local departments, but the largest departments tend to have fewer administrative and support staff than do the next largest agencies. Table 4 shows the average ratios for each grouping of staff to direct workers in all local departments.

Direct Workers	5045	Ratio
Supervisors	656	1 : 7.69
Administrators	1035	1 : 4.87
Clerical	1213	1 : 4.16
Support	366	1 : 13.78

One area that the study is examining closely is the ratio of supervisors to workers. The old caseload standards system used a ratio of 1 supervisor for every 6 workers. As indicated by the ratio in the table above, local departments do not meet this standard. While not all programs have supervisory ratios incorporated into national standards, at least some do. In child welfare, for instance, the Child Welfare League of America recommends a ratio of 1:5. In a survey of states on ratios, HZA found that Pennsylvania and Maryland both maintain supervisory ratios of 1:6 for eligibility workers, while Florida has a supervisor and a lead worker for each 7 eligibility workers. Georgia's ratios range from 1:6 to 1:9, while Oregon uses a 1:12 for eligibility workers and moved from 1:12 to 1:6 for child welfare several years ago. In services, a ratio of 1:6 appears appropriate based on the complex casework decisions that impact lives of at-risk children, families and adults. The Department is considering that same ratio for benefit programs, as well, as a means of providing local departments with adequate supervisory review of work to reduce errors and ensure accountability.

To determine how to take account of the remaining non-direct line staff, the Department is considering using the existing ratios of direct workers to each of the other categories of staff. The current ratios differ with the size of the locality, but there is little basis within the workload study for arguing for either more or fewer non-direct line workers than are currently utilized by the agencies. The old caseload standards system did not have any ratio for support staff (e.g., case aides), viewing them as a partial trade-off for direct line workers.

The Department plans to assess these ratios further. Ratios in Table 3 differ from the standards used in the old caseload standards system as fewer clerical staff and more administrative staff are required. Given the changes related to automation since the earlier studies, these differences appear to be appropriate. Automated offices may rely to a lesser degree on clerical staff but they will also need more high-level technical staff, primarily to support the automated systems.

When results are finalized and costs are developed, the Department plans to translate these ratios into direct line worker costs. For example, using the data

presented, for each direct line worker needed, the estimate of the fiscal impact will assume a need for:

1. 0.17 supervisors;
2. 0.24 clerical staff;
3. 0.21 administrative staff; and
4. 0.07 support staff.

Preliminary Resource Needs

Using the preliminary results, HZA analyzed the number of workers needed across the state by case type to permit local departments of social services to meet the preliminary policy standards and quality standards using various staffing counts collected for the study. Table 5 shows calculations of need for the four methods of counting the number of direct line staff, both by policy and quality standards, the latter of which would permit local staff to perform at a higher level.

Table 5		
Preliminary Staffing Needs		
Existing Staffing Level	Policy	Quality
<i>Benefit Programs</i>		
Based on Current Positions Authorized for Reimbursement	715	1,360
Based on Current Positions Authorized for Reimbursement and Filled	919	1,564
Based on Total Authorized Positions	172	818
Based on Total Authorized Positions Filled	472	1,117
<i>Service Programs</i>		
Based on Current Positions Authorized for Reimbursement	809	1216
Based on Current Positions Authorized for Reimbursement and Filled	881	1,288
Based on Total Authorized Positions	412	819
Based on Total Authorized Positions Filled	615	1,022

Plan for Study Completion

The Department plans to analyze these preliminary results in more depth, including the workload standards that are emerging, the case counts gathered, and the staffing numbers and ratios that were collected. These preliminary results require more analysis and dialogue with local and program experts, as well as HZA.

The Department plans to build a capacity as soon as possible for producing information from its automated information systems in order to capture current, ongoing case counts. A challenge of this study is the development of appropriate counts of cases. In some instances, the ways that the Department maintains its data does not match the ways in which the case types were defined for the workload measurement study. For example, there are no counts for case types involving redeterminations of eligibility except in food stamps. Similarly, there are no counts of day care eligibility determinations, although this work represents a substantial burden for the local departments. The shift from an old automated information system to a new one in child

welfare resulted in unreliable counts of cases of families receiving ongoing services following a child protective services investigation.

In addition to further analysis of preliminary results, the development of an automated mechanism for counting cases on an ongoing basis is essential. This will minimally require:

1. Development of new reporting capacities for the data emerging from each of the Department's automated systems; and
2. Incorporation of all cases into some automated system in a way that users can determine each case's status at any given point in time.

The Department, in collaboration with local departments of social services, is committed to completing this comprehensive study to validate workload measures for local social services programs. When these measures are validated, the Department plans to use results to determine requirements for personnel and operating costs for mandated programs and services.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA – 1999 SESSION

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 554

Requesting the Department of Social Services, with the assistance of the local departments, to conduct a comprehensive study to validate workload measures for local social services programs and, when they are validated, require their ongoing use to determine necessary appropriations for personnel and operating costs for mandated programs and services.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 5, 1999

Agreed to by the Senate, February 22, 1999

WHEREAS, since fiscal year 1988 there has not been a base budget increase for the administrative costs incurred by Virginia's local departments of social services for the delivery of mandated programs and services for the federal and state governments; and

WHEREAS, as a result, all inflationary costs of doing business for the past 11 years have been borne by the localities; and

WHEREAS, based on a survey of all 122 local departments of social services, localities contributed over \$90 million in unmatched funding during the most recent fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly in 1998 requested a study of foster care and adoption needs in the local departments and this survey identified a deficit of 172 social workers and 29 supervisors which have a cost of \$8.6 million; and

WHEREAS, it is generally agreed that if other similar programs were evaluated, similar shortages would be noted; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the General Assembly study, the League of Social Services Executives conducted an independent study across all programs and determined that there is a need for 2,828 additional staff; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Department of Social Services, with the assistance of the local departments, be requested to conduct a comprehensive study to validate workload measures for local social services programs and, when they are validated, require their ongoing use to determine necessary appropriations for personnel and operating costs for mandated programs and services.

All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance to the Department for this study, upon request.

The Department shall complete its work in time to submit its findings and recommendations by October 1, 2000, to the Governor and the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents.

