STATEWIDE WORKLOAD STUDY

Prepared for:

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
OFFICE OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Prepared by:

HORNBY ZELLER ASSOCIATES, INC.
New York – Maine – Arkansas – Nevada – Pennsylvania

May 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Concerned that its caseworkers did not have sufficient time to meet the basic requirements of their jobs protecting children and serving families, the Office of Children's Services (OCS) provided six months to conduct a statewide workload study. The goal of the project was to determine reasonable workload standards for OCS staff. After a competitive bid for the project, the contract was awarded to Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. (HZA), a national consulting firm specializing in child welfare management. HZA used one subcontractor for portions of this work: MTG Management Consultants located in Seattle, Washington. While HZA brought extensive experience in workload measurement, MTG provided equally extensive knowledge of Alaska and its special environment.

Methodology

Three basic pieces of information are needed to determine whether OCS currently has the capacity to handle its entire caseload appropriately: the time needed to handle a case appropriately, the total time available for case specific work (measured by worker, by unit, by office or for the state as a whole) and the total number of cases assigned to each worker. The first two pieces were collected through the workload study itself using a random moment survey and a time study and the third was calculated from data from ORCA, OCS' client tracking system. For each component, HZA collected information for six weeks from caseworkers and supervisors.

The two major purposes of the random moment survey were to describe how people spend their time so that managers can understand the organization better including the differences among urban, rural and remote settings, and to determine how much time people spend on case-related activities (those in which a specific family could be identified) versus other activities, divided into the broad categories of administration, training and non-work activities such as leave and breaks. To prepare for the random moment survey HZA and MTG held focus groups around the state to define activities performed by staff so they could be captured adequately. OCS staff were divided into five categories: intake, ongoing, generic, licensing and supervisors. Using as the universe all offices in the state and all work time during a six-week period, beginning September 19, 2005 and ending October 28, 2005, random samples of workers and times were drawn. At each sampled time the selected worker was contacted and asked a few questions to determine what he or she was doing at that time. HZA staff recorded the responses using task codes developed for this study.

The second methodology was a time study on a sample of cases designed to reflect the different types of cases that are present in the agency. HZA worked with OCS to define the case types, the ones ultimately used being shown below. The major criteria in selecting case types were, first, that each type might be expected to take a different amount of worker time; second, that there were enough cases of the type to measure that time reliably; and third, that OCS' tracking system, ORCA, was able to identify these cases so that ongoing monitoring of workloads at the worker, office, regional and statewide levels could occur after the study.

Intake Report	Permanency, Group Home/Institution
Information and Referral	Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home
Investigations	Permanency, Trial Home Visit
In-home Services, Court	Permanency, Other
In-home Services, No Court	Licensing, Assessment and Renewal
Permanency, Relative Home	Licensing, Supervision
Permanency, Foster Home	

To develop workload standards, HZA had to go beyond calculating how much time it takes to perform a case now, and to look at how much time it takes when basic policy requirements are met. For purposes of this study, required activities included only those activities required for *every case of a given type every month* or for *every process of a specified type*. HZA and MTG worked with OCS to define what those basic requirements were for each case type and validated the list through the focus groups.

During the time study, data were collected on a sample of cases for the same six-week period as the random moment survey. This portion of the data collection encompassed all staff who touched a sampled case. That is, the staff recorded tasks that were completed specifically for each sampled case such as case planning activities, contact with the family and recording information on the computer.

In the analysis of the time study data, HZA divided all of the case specific time that was recorded between time spent on the "required" activities as defined above, and the time spent on all other case specific activities which were labeled "non-required" activities. For instance, face-to-face contact with the child is a required activity both for every investigation, regardless of how long the investigation takes, and for every child placed in a foster home. Developing a case plan is considered non-required because it does not have to be done for every case every month. However, the time spent doing this activity was included in the time study calculations whenever it was done. The time needed for required activities was calculated as the average time spent on those activities *among those cases where the activities occurred* for that type of case. The analysis then attributes this time to all cases of that type, regardless of whether the case actually experienced the activity during the time study.

The time needed for non-required activities was calculated as the average time spent on those activities *among all cases* of that type. The total time needed to handle a case appropriately was then calculated as the sum of the required and non-required time and was expressed as a case weight.

Findings

Time Available for Working with Cases

The following results are summarized by four broad categories used throughout the study: non-work time, training, administrative time and then time left to work with specific families.

- **Non-work time**, that is, time on sick leave, breaks, vacation, family leave and holidays consumes an average of 16.1 percent of all time, or 25.4 hours per month.

- Subtracting that from 157.5 hours available for per month (after lunch break) leaves 132.1 hours per month for work.

- **Training** time takes 7.9 hours per month on average.

- Subtracting that from 157.5 leaves 132.1 hours per month for work.

- **Administrative time** varies by job category and office size, and those differences needed to be taken into account because it was assumed that the variation is not under the control of the agency.

- Supervisors (at 40.4 hours per month) and licensing workers (at 38.2 hours per month) spend more time on administration than do other types of workers.

- Workers in urban and mid-size regions spend 13.4 hours per month on administration whereas workers in remote areas spend 19.25 hours per month on administration, almost 50 percent more, presumably because the offices are not large enough for clerical support.

- **Case specific time** for supervisors is 84 hours per month and for licensing staff 86 hours per month, the remainder when the other categories are subtracted.

- For workers in urban and mid-size regions, the total time available for case specific work is 111 hours, while for workers in remote areas the time available for case specific work is 105 hours.

How Workers Spend Their Time

While the primary purpose of the random moment survey was to identify the amount of time workers have available for case specific work, the information also provides some insight into the ways staff spend their time and how that differs by type of position and by size of office. Table ES-1 shows all the tasks where at least one type of caseworker reported at least four percent of their time.

Table ES-1 Percents of Time Spent on Most Frequently Performed Tasks			
	Intake	**Ongoing**	**Generic**
Intake Activities	6.1%	0.3%	2.3%
Face-to-Face Contact	11.0%	9.3%	7.0%
Non-face-to-face Contact	5.8%	10.4%	8.8%
Service Arrangement / Provision	1.9%	6.4%	4.1%
Court Preparation	2.0%	3.9%	5.4%
Travel	3.5%	3.3%	5.6%
Computer Documentation	11.5%	6.8%	8.1%

Several points here are noteworthy.

- **Face-to-face contact with clients occurs most frequently among intake workers**, suggesting either that they deal with more families than do other workers (which would be unusual in a public child welfare agency) or that families under investigation are seen more frequently than families receiving services.

- **Generic workers, most of whom are located in small and/or remote areas, are in contact with clients and collaterals less frequently than either of the specialized groups of workers**. In part, this is a function of the number of clients, with many of the workers in remote or mid-size areas having fewer clients than workers in larger areas, but in part it is also a function of spending more time on preparation for court and travel, leaving less for direct client contact.

- **Staff responsible solely for intake functions report spending nearly 70 percent more time in computer documentation than do staff responsible only for case management and service provision**. The relative percentages of time spent on computer work reflect the comparatively heavy front-loading of data in the system which some OCS staff reported during the preparation of the workload study. Generic staff, who carry out both functions, fall in-between.

Time Required to Handle Cases

This section considers how much time is spent on cases of particular types (e.g., child abuse investigation, permanency foster home case) when all activities are accounted for, and how much time is spent when the basic policy requirements are met.

- The most time-consuming case types in OCS are permanency cases with children residing in an "institution" as defined by OCS; the next most time consuming cases are permanency cases with children in a foster home, and then in-home cases with court supervision followed closely by permanency cases with children in group homes.

- Time in Alaska for out of home cases is greater than HZA has seen in other states; closer examination revealed the reason. Alaska counts the family as the case whereas other states count the child when that child is in placement. The higher number in Alaska represents situations when there is more than one child in out-of-home care in the family since caseworkers spend 71 percent more time on those cases than when there is only one child in placement.

Table ES-2 shows the amount of time each case type takes when both the required and non-required activities are summed. The figures are expressed as "case weights" because that is the normal way they are referenced, but they actually represent the number of hours required either each month or for each process. Some of the key findings are as follows:

- The time study demonstrated that it takes workers more time to handle a case when the basic requirements are met than when they are not.

- It was necessary, for the reasons above, to divide permanency cases into those with one child and those with multiple children. The greatest amount of time, or highest case weight, is for permanency cases *with multiple children* in the foster home, group home or institution, requiring 19.9 hours per family.

- The least time consuming case is information and referral (2.29 hours followed by an intake report (3.22 hours)

The following table shows the final case weights.

Table ES-2 Final Case Weights	
Case Type	**Hours per Month or Process**
Intake Report	3.22
Information and Referral	2.29
Investigations	9.30
In-home Services, Court	11.91
In-home Services, No Court	7.57
Permanency, Relative Home, One Child	9.18
Permanency, Relative Home, Multiple Children	15.70
Permanency, Foster Home, One Child	11.65
Permanency, Foster Home, Multiple Children	19.90
Permanency, Group Home or Institution, One Child	11.64
Permanency, Group Home or Institution, Multiple Children	19.90
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	7.18
Permanency, Trial Discharge	8.45
Permanency, Other	7.62
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal	5.83
Licensing, Supervision	1.23

Current OCS Capacity

To determine whether OCS has sufficient staff to handle the cases it currently has, HZA determined the current OCS capacity. The major findings are:

- To meet the workload standards calculated for this study, OCS will require additional staff. Workers overall have greater workloads than they can handle appropriately.

- OCS needs both more authorized social work positions and an even larger number of filled social work positions. Filling vacancies is an important first step that will help to meet the shortfall but will not address the entire need.

- Most of the need at present is in Anchorage which has about one-third of OCS' front-line social work staff but close to one-half of the cases. However, the chart of specific staffing needs by office needs to be recalculated periodically over at least a one-year period before the need for other changes are determined.

Table ES-3 presents a snapshot or point in time view of the current need for additional staff. Cases in which the hours needed are measured by process, i.e., intake, investigations and licensing assessments and renewals, were included if the case began during the month of April 2005. All other cases were counted if they were open as of May 1, 2005. For every case qualifying in one of these ways, the number of hours needed was multiplied by the total number of cases and that result was divided by the number of hours available for case specific work.

| | | | | Table ES-3 | | |
| | | | OCS Staffing and Staffing Needs by Office | | | |
Office Name	Staffing-Authorized	Staffing-Filled	Casework Staffing Needed	Licensing Staffing Needed	Net Staffing Needed-Authorized	Net Staffing Needed-Filled
Anchorage	76	68	82	8	14	22
Aniak	2	1	2	0	0	1
Barrow	3	3	3	0	0	0
Bethel	6	5	10	1	5	6
Craig	2	2	1	0	-1	-1
Delta Jct.	2	2	2	0	0	0
Dillingham	3	3	3	0	0	0
Fairbanks[1]	36	35	25	5	-6	-5
Galena	1	0	0	0	-1	0
Homer	3	3	6	0	3	3
Juneau	17	14	14	3	0	3
Kenai	11	11	13	1	3	3
Ketchikan	6	6	6	0	0	0
King Salmon	2	2	1	0	-1	-1
Kodiak	2	1	2	0	0	1
Kotzebue	3	3	6	0	3	3
Mat-Su	14	14	18	3	7	7
McGrath	1	1	1	0	0	0
Nome	6	5	3	0	-3	-2
Petersburg	1	0	1	0	0	1
Seward	1	1	1	0	0	0
Sitka	1	1	2	0	1	1
St. Mary's	4	1	2	0	-2	1
Unalaska	1	0	0	0	-1	0
Valdez	1	1	1	0	0	0
Authorized, Unassigned	4	0	0	0	-4	0
Total	**209**	**183**	**207**	**21**	**19**	**43**

It should be noted that the staffing figures shown in Table ES-3 represent only those staff who should be carrying cases. Because there are more cases than these staff can

---

[1] The Fairbanks figures include the Interior Bush workers and cases.

now handle, some staff in non-social work titles and some supervisors are in fact responsible for cases. Part of the purpose of the workload study is to determine how many social work positions would be required to end that situation.

It should be stressed that Table ES-3 does not represent a set of recommendations about re-allocation of staff. While the statewide results should be considered sufficiently strong that one can be confident that OCS needs more authorized social work positions and even more people to fill those positions, the number of cases is not likely to be as stable in each office as it is statewide. The number of cases in OCS' offices, especially in the mid-size and remote offices, can change significantly with the addition or subtraction of a handful of families. In fact, if these offices are to have adequate capacity to handle emergencies, they will almost certainly need some slack capacity.

Ultimately, the most appropriate way to determine whether some offices are genuinely over- or under-staffed is to perform these calculations repeatedly over an extended period of time, e.g., one year. That means that OCS should repeat the calculations by counting cases (see Appendix F) and applying the weights each month to identify patterns of under- and over-burden among the offices. Only if the case counts remain stable and the same results are achieved repeatedly, should the results be used for re-allocation.

Recommendations

In response to this study OCS should make a plan for filling existing vacancies and monitoring workloads over time in an effort to increase staff resources as the agency can absorb them. Some aspects of the plan should be:

1)   Fill the positions that are authorized but vacant, shifting the bulk of those positions to Anchorage.

2)   OCS should recalculate the staffing needs by office every month for a year and plot the results by counting cases and applying the weights each month to identify patterns of under- and over-burden among the offices. These data will provide a reliable direction for shifting current staff to better meet the caseload burden where it is shown to exist over time and for targeting new positions that may be authorized on the weight of this study's results.

3)   Once the vacancies are filled, OCS should make an effort to attain additional positions at whatever speed they can be absorbed from both a political and an agency standpoint using the evidence contained in this study. Part of that evidence is the very basic standard used in the study to determine if a case is handled appropriately and the amount of time it takes to handle it appropriately. Those standards are spelled out in Appendix D for each case type.

4)   To produce the most equitable distribution of workload for current staff and cases on an ongoing basis, OCS could also provide supervisors making assignments a workload monitoring program through ORCA, as described in Appendix F. These procedures should help supervisors achieve the proper allocation of cases to existing workers based on the case weights or workload standards established by this study.

The basic motivation of most child welfare administrators who want to measure the workloads of case workers is to ensure that their agencies have at least the capacity to perform as well as they can in achieving positive outcomes for children and families. Capacity in this instance means sufficient human resources to accomplish all of the tasks which need to be done to serve the clientele appropriately. The Alaska Department of Health and Social Services, Office of Children's Services (OCS) sought a workload study which would provide the basis for giving case workers reasonable workloads, allowing them the time they need to achieve positive outcomes for children and families.

Concerned that its caseworkers did not have the capacity to meet the demands of its clientele, OCS provided six months for the conduct of a statewide study. After a competitive bid for the project, the contract was awarded to Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. (HZA), a national consulting firm specializing in child welfare management. HZA used one subcontractor for portions of this work: MTG Management Consultants located in Seattle, Washington. While HZA brought extensive experience in workload measurement, primarily but not exclusively in child welfare, MTG provided equally extensive knowledge of Alaska and its special environment.

OCS appointed an advisory committee to work with the HZA team to design the study, comment on the tools and review the findings. The team includes managers from each region as well as from OCS central office.

This report presents the findings from the workload study, aimed at answering the question of whether OCS has sufficient capacity to handle its existing caseload and at providing workload standards to help allocate work properly among the staff it does have.

Three basic pieces of information are needed to determine whether OCS currently has the capacity to handle its entire caseload appropriately: the time needed to handle a case appropriately, the number of cases assigned to each worker, and the total time available for case specific work. The appropriateness of the workload burden on the agency, or on any individual worker, can be expressed in the following formula:

$$WB = (CT * NC) / AT \text{ where}$$

WB = workload burden, with an appropriate burden equal to one,
CT = the time required to handle a case appropriately,
NC = the number of cases assigned to the worker and
AT = the total time the worker has available for case specific work.

To illustrate with a simplistic example, if a worker has 100 hours per month to spend on case specific work and each case requires ten hours for all the requirements on the case to be met, that worker can reasonably handle no more than ten cases at a time.

The methodologies used for the workload study were a random moment survey and a time study. Prior to beginning data collection, HZA and MTG conducted focus groups throughout the state to identify the types of cases and the range of tasks which would be used. The policy requirements that are used in the time study were developed in conjunction with the advisory committee after careful consideration of OCS policy requirements. Finally, immediately prior to the start of both the random moment survey and the time study, the consultants visited offices throughout the state to train workers in how to conduct the time study.

TOTAL TIME AVAILABLE

The total time available is always the easiest of the three pieces of information to measure. There is no standard to specify how much time workers should have for case specific work, so the assumption is made that whatever time they *currently spend* on case specific work is the time they *have available*. Thus, the measurement only needs to look at what workers actually do.

For the Alaska study, this measurement was accomplished by a random moment survey (RMS). First, OCS staff were divided into five categories: intake, ongoing, generic, licensing and supervisors. Using all offices in the state and all work time during a six-week period, beginning September 19, 2005 and ending October 28, 2005, as the universe, random samples of workers and times were drawn. At each sampled time the selected worker was contacted and asked a few questions to determine what he or she was doing at that time (see Appendix A for the RMS instrument). HZA staff recorded

the workers' time using the Task Codes found in Appendix B. Initially, contacts were made by phone with e-mail follow-up, but after a couple of weeks it became clear that workers were responding more quickly to the e-mails than to the calls, so that became the first mode of contact, with phone follow-up when no response was received. The following table shows the number of workers and times attempted and the number for which responses were received.[2]

| | **Table 1** | | |
| | **Random Moment Survey Contacts** | | |
Worker Type	**Contacts Attempted**	**Contacts Completed**	**Percent Completed**
Intake	1819	1752	96%
Ongoing	1884	1768	94%
Generic	726	689	95%
Licensing	917	890	97%
Supervisors	926	865	93%

While the basic purpose of the RMS was to determine the amount of time workers have available for case specific work, the information gathered during this process also provides a much more detailed view of how workers spend their time.

NUMBER OF CASES ASSIGNED

The number of cases assigned to workers or even being handled by the agency as a whole is constantly changing, so any measurement of the agency's capacity to handle its workload has to select some point in time and measure from there. The answer is likely to differ the next day, although not by much.

Much more important than the specific count of cases, however, is the classification of those cases. Clearly, different types of cases are likely to require different amounts of time. The determination of which cases to group together will ideally be made with three questions in mind: Are the cases in each group likely to require approximately the same amount of time? Are the times required by the cases in each group likely to differ significantly across the groups? and Can the agency's tracking system identify the groups so that workload can be measured on an ongoing basis after the study is complete?

For OCS there was an additional question which needed to be considered, namely, the number of cases in each group. Compared to other states, the overall caseload in Alaska is small, with only about 2000 cases in total open at any one time (not counting intakes and assessments prior to case opening). If too many case types are defined, there will not be sufficient data to allow reliable estimates to be made. For instance, in

---

[2] The number of attempted contacts is somewhat smaller than the number planned, because some workers left the agency and some were listed among the OCS workers but were actually tribal contractors.

a previous study, HZA defined more than 40 different case types for child welfare, but if that number were used in Alaska, there would be an average of only 50 cases of each type, even if every case was sampled and they were evenly distributed among case types.

Ultimately, a limited number of case types were defined, and even for some of those it was impossible to generate any significant numbers in the sample. The complete listing of case types is provided in Appendix C, and the ones actually used are shown below. The most notable point is that OCS' tracking system, ORCA, is able to identify these cases so that ongoing monitoring of workloads at the worker, office, regional and statewide levels can occur after the study.

Intake Report	Permanency, Group Home/Institution
Information and Referral	Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home
Investigations	Permanency, Trial Home Visit
In-home Services, Court	Permanency, Other
In-home Services, No Court	Licensing, Assessment and Renewal
Permanency, Relative Home	Licensing, Supervision
Permanency, Foster Home	

Two methods were used to draw samples of cases for the time study. For the in-home and foster care placement types, HZA drew samples of cases from a data extract from ORCA based on case data as of August 26, 2005, approximately three weeks prior to the start of the study. For intake and assessment cases, as well as for new applications received from prospective foster and adoptive parents, workers were instructed to draw all new cases received during the first few weeks of the workload study into the sample until a sufficient number had been reached, which took approximately three weeks. For each case type, the goal was to achieve a sample of 100 cases across the state. As noted, there are, however, not always that many cases available.

Table 2 Offices Participating in Time Study			
Region	**Urban**	**Mid size**	**Remote**
Northern	Fairbanks	Nome	McGrath Delta Junction
South Central	Mat-su	Bethel Kenai	St. Mary's Valdez Kodiak
Southeast	Juneau	Ketchikan	Craig Petersburg
Anchorage	Anchorage		

Cases were selected from a sample of offices. The sample was designed to reflect both geographic distribution, inclusive of each region, and size distribution, as categorized by the number of workers in an office. Table 2 shows the offices that participated in the component of the study that measured time for a sample of cases.

TIME REQUIRED FOR HANDLING CASES APPROPRIATELY

Once the sample had been selected and the affected staff in each of the selected offices had been trained, data were collected on each of the sampled cases for the same six-week period as was used for the random moment survey. This portion of the data collection encompassed all staff who touched a sampled case, both for cases selected from ORCA and for cases selected by the participating offices and only case specific time was recorded. That is, the staff recorded tasks that were completed specifically for each sampled case such as case planning activities, contact with the family and recording information on the computer.

Upon completion of the six-week data collection, all case specific time from the time study was divided between required and non-required activities. For purposes of this study, required activities included only those activities required for *every case of a given type every month* or for *every event of a specified type.* For instance, face-to-face contact with the child is a required activity both for every investigation, regardless of how long the investigation takes, and for every child placed in a foster home. The list of required activities, or mandated tasks, is shown in Appendix D.

The time needed for required activities was calculated as the average time spent on those activities *among those cases where the activities occurred* for that type of case. The analysis then *attributes this time to all cases* of that type, regardless of whether the case actually experienced the activity during the time study because every case is required to meet the policy standard.

The time needed for non-required activities was calculated as the average time spent on those activities *among all cases* of that type. Implicit in that average is the proportion of cases which experience these activities, i.e., it was assumed there are some cases which receive no attention at all during a given month, and this was assumed to be the appropriate proportion. The total time needed to handle a case appropriately was then calculated as the sum of the required and non-required time.

The final step of the analysis involved connecting the RMS data with the times for each case type and adding the number of cases being handled by the agency. The more complex version of the formula given above is something like the following:

$$WB = (CT_1 * NC_1) + (CT_2 * NC_2) + (CT_3 * NC_3) + (CT_4 * NC_4)... / AT \text{ where}$$

WB = workload burden, with an appropriate burden equal to one,
CT_X = case time, i.e., the time required to handle a case of type X appropriately,
NC_X = the number of cases of type X assigned to the worker and
AT = available time, i.e., the total time the worker has available for case specific work.

The model is almost infinitely flexible in that it permits the burden on an individual worker (and on a unit, an office, a region and the state as a whole) to be calculated, regardless of the mix of cases. Everything is ultimately reduced to a question of time, so all cases are made commensurate with one another. If the result of the equation for a given worker is greater than one, the worker has more cases assigned to him or her than can reasonably be handled, given the available time. If the result is one, the worker has exactly the right workload, and if it is less than one the worker could handle more cases. A comparable calculation can be made for a unit, an office or the state as a whole.

The findings are divided into several sections. The first, how workers spend their time, is descriptive and is drawn from the random moment survey which encompassed all OCS workers and supervisors in the state. The second, time required to handle cases, examines data from the time study relating to the selected sample of cases. The first part of the section discusses how time is currently spent and the second provides information on the time spent when the case met minimum policy standards, that is, when the required activities were carried out. The third section summarizes the application of case weights to workload and discusses how many cases workers can carry. The fourth, current OCS capacity, discusses the number of caseworkers that would be needed to meet the current demand when the minimum policy standards are met.

HOW WORKERS SPEND THEIR TIME

The basic purpose of the random moment survey was to determine how much time workers have to spend on individual cases. As noted above, "how much time workers have to spend on individual cases" means how much time they spend now. The random moment survey captures time spent on case specific activities as well as other types of activities, described below. Ultimately, OCS can alter the amount of time workers have to spend by understanding what else they do and making changes in how those other activities are done. However, the amount of available time may be expected to differ across geographic locations and across workers with differing kinds of responsibility.

Variations by Worker Type and Geography

As described in the methodology discussion above, separate samples were drawn for four types of line workers and another for supervisors. Table 3 shows how each of these groups of staff spend their time, using the broadest possible categories of tasks:

> *Case specific*—which includes tasks such as screening for history of abuse and neglect; conducting face-to-face contact with the child, parents and caregivers; completing structured decision making and conducting home studies for prospective foster and adoptive homes;
> *Administrative*—which includes reviewing policy manuals, attending supervisory meetings and providing community outreach;
> *Training*—which includes preparing for the delivery of and receiving training; and
> *Non-work*—which includes breaks, lunches, vacations, sick time, family leave and any other time spent not working during normal work hours.

Table 3
Percents of Time Spent on Categories of Tasks by Worker Type

	Broad Task Categories				
Worker Type	Case Specific	Administrative	Training	Non-work	Total
Intake	60.4%	8.6%	5.7%	25.2%	100%
Ongoing	67.1%	6.6%	4.4%	21.8%	100%
Generic	63.5%	11.0%	5.1%	20.4%	100%
Licensing	48.7%	22.0%	2.4%	27.0%	100%
Supervisors	47.9%	23.1%	5.2%	23.8%	100%
Total	59.2%	12.4%	4.7%	23.7%	100%

As HZA has found in other studies of child welfare agencies, about 60 percent of a worker's time is available for case specific work, although the percentage does vary considerably across types of staff. Not surprisingly, supervisors spend the least amount of time on cases, but their figure is not very different than that for licensing workers, despite the fact that a licensing "case" was defined, for purposes of this study, to include both prospective and actual foster and adoptive homes.

At the other end of the spectrum, roughly one-fifth to one-fourth of all time appears to be non-work time, including such things as lunch breaks, jury duty and vacation time. This, too, varies across worker type, although the reasons for the variation are somewhat less obvious. On first glance, it would appear that the level of specialization is correlated with the amount of non-work time, with licensing workers using the most, followed by intake workers, and generic workers using the least.

While Table 3 takes account of the worker's functions, Table 4 shows the variation across different types of environments (for lack of a better term, referred to here as "geographic setting"). These are characterized as urban, mid-size and remote. The totals for case specific, administrative, training and non-work activities are, of necessity, identical since the total proportions of time spent on a category of activity remains the same, but clear differences begin to appear when the measurement is broken down among urban, mid-size and remote offices. The least surprising of these is that workers in urban offices spend less time on administrative tasks than do workers elsewhere, presumably because they have more support staff available to them.

Table 4
Percents of Time Spent on Categories of Tasks by Geographic Setting

	Case Specific	Administrative	Training	Non-work	Total
Urban	58.2%	11.3%	5.3%	25.2%	100%
Mid-size	65.3%	13.9%	2.6%	18.3%	100%
Remote	57.1%	15.9%	4.3%	22.7%	100%
Total	59.2%	12.4%	4.7%	23.7%	100%

Perhaps, the most unexpected information in Table 4 is that the amount of case specific time spent in urban and remote areas is quite similar and yet very different from that available in offices located in mid-size areas. In the mid-size areas, staff are showing seven to eight percentage points more time available for case specific activities than they are in mid-size areas. This translates to about 11 more hours available for cases every month than are available in either larger or smaller locales.

On closer inspection, however, the reasons for the differences vary between urban and remote sites. While staff in mid-size offices show the smallest proportion of time devoted to non-work time overall, staff in urban areas appear to use more non-work time and perform fewer administrative functions, and staff in remote areas show relatively less non-work time and perform more administrative functions. The similarity in time available for working on cases may hide, therefore, larger differences.

To understand the geographic differences better, it is necessary to combine the factors shown in Tables 3 and 4. Table 5 begins to do this by showing the differences among offices based on geographic setting when supervisors are excluded from the analysis. Staff in mid-size areas still show the largest proportion of time available for case specific work (about 112 hours per month, compared to 100 hours in urban offices and 106 hours in remote areas), but also the most time spent on administrative work and the least on training and non-work. Again, staff in urban areas show the largest amounts of non-work time.

Table 5
Percents of Time Spent on Categories of Tasks by Geographic Setting
Non-supervisory Staff

	Case Specific	Administrative	Training	Non-work	Total
Urban	59.4%	10.1%	5.1%	25.4%	100%
Mid-size	66.9%	12.6%	1.9%	18.5%	100%
Remote	62.8%	11.5%	5.7%	20.1%	100%
Total	61.0%	10.7%	4.6%	23.7%	100%

Table 6 takes this just a step further by eliminating licensing workers from the analysis, both because their work is substantially different than that of other workers and because no licensing workers were found in remote areas. The same basic trends appear, although the differences among different locales are reduced. On average, casework staff have 107 hours per month to spend on case specific activity.

Table 6
Percents of Time Spent on Categories of Tasks by Geographic Setting
Casework Staff
(Does Not Include Licensing or Supervisors)

	Case Specific	Administrative	Training	Non-work	Total
Urban	62.9%	7.3%	5.7%	24.1%	100%
Mid-size	67.8%	9.2%	2.2%	20.8%	100%
Remote	62.8%	11.5%	5.7%	20.1%	100%
Total	63.7%	8.2%	5.1%	23.0%	100%

In calculating the equivalent figure for licensing workers, the same issues do not appear, largely because nearly all licensing workers are located in urban areas. Only three licensing workers in mid-size areas were part of the RMS and 41 of the 47 responses from that group came from a single worker. Thus, the percentages shown on the "mid-size" line in Table 7 reflect at best a single diligent worker, not a pattern.

Table 7					
Percents of Time Spent on Categories of Tasks by Licensing Workers by Geographic Setting					
	Case Specific	Administrative	Training	Non-work	Total
Urban	46.9%	20.2%	2.7%	30.1%	100%
Mid-size	60.8%	36.0%	0.0%	3.2%	100%
Total	48.7%	22.0%	2.4%	27.0%	100%

Licensing workers show an average of 82 hours per month available for case specific work, which in their case means working with prospective and actual foster and adoptive parents. This is substantially less than the time other workers show, and, if this is an unexpected finding for the agency, OCS may want to do further examination, especially to determine why licensing workers show more non-work time than any other group and nearly as much administrative time as supervisors.

Breaking Down the Details for Caseworkers

While the primary purpose of the RMS was to identify the amount of time available for case specific work, OCS was also interested in knowing more about the details of how caseworkers and other line staff spend their time. The agency particularly wanted to be able to identify any barriers to efficiency and any differences among offices which might be alleviated or taken into account in a case weighting system.

Tables 8 and 10 show the relative frequency of each kind of task, first by the type of worker and then by geographic setting. Tables 11 and 12 carry the analysis further by showing, respectively, the way time is spent by non-supervisory and by casework-only (no licensing workers and no supervisors) staff and how that differs by geographic setting. For purposes of this study, the most useful of these to discuss are probably Tables 8 and 12. A complete breakdown of the frequency of all tasks by type of worker is found in Appendix E.

Table 8
Percents of Time Spent on Types of Case Specific Activities
By Type of Worker

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Intake Activities	6.1%	0.3%	2.3%	0.2%	3.2%	2.6%
Screening	1.9%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.5%	0.9%
Face-to-Face Contact	11.0%	9.3%	7.0%	1.3%	2.0%	7.3%
Non-face-to-face Contact	5.8%	10.4%	8.8%	2.4%	3.5%	6.7%
Structured Decision-making	0.8%	0.3%	1.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%
Other Assessments	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Investigative Decision	1.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.5%	0.5%
Service Planning	2.4%	2.0%	0.7%	0.1%	1.9%	1.6%
Team Meetings	0.9%	2.9%	0.8%	0.3%	1.8%	1.5%
Case Consultation	3.3%	3.8%	2.9%	1.4%	3.8%	3.2%
Case Reviews	0.2%	2.0%	1.3%	0.1%	2.5%	1.2%
Service Arrangement / Provision	1.9%	6.4%	4.1%	1.2%	1.9%	3.4%
Eligibility Information	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Travel	3.5%	3.3%	5.6%	4.8%	0.9%	3.5%
Transportation of Client	0.9%	1.6%	1.4%	0.1%	0.3%	1.0%
Supervised Visitation	0.9%	4.3%	1.8%	0.1%	0.3%	1.8%
Computer Documentation	11.5%	6.8%	8.1%	6.0%	4.3%	7.8%
Paper Documentation	2.8%	2.6%	3.7%	1.1%	0.8%	2.3%
Report Preparation	0.4%	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
Policy Review / Clarification	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Prepare for Court	2.0%	3.9%	5.4%	0.5%	1.8%	2.7%
Participate in Court	1.9%	3.7%	2.2%	0.1%	1.6%	2.2%
Supervisory Tasks	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	1.5%	15.3%	2.6%
Licensing and Monitoring	0.4%	0.7%	1.2%	23.1%	0.3%	4.0%
Clerical	0.8%	0.8%	2.3%	2.7%	0.3%	1.2%
Conflicts / Appeals	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%

Table 8 (cont.) Percents of Time Spent on Non-case Specific Activities By Type of Worker						
	Intake	**Ongoing**	**Generic**	**Licensing**	**Supervisors**	**Total**
General Administration	5.4%	3.7%	4.2%	11.2%	9.9%	6.3%
Community Outreach	0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	1.9%	0.7%	0.6%
Travel	0.5%	0.8%	2.1%	0.6%	1.3%	0.9%
Clerical / Reception	1.1%	0.6%	3.3%	2.7%	1.5%	1.5%
Computers / ORCA	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%
Supervisory Tasks	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	2.9%	8.9%	2.1%
Federal / State Reviews	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Special Studies	0.3%	0.4%	0.8%	1.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Unit Statistics	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Training	5.7%	4.4%	5.1%	2.4%	5.2%	4.7%
Non-work Time	25.3%	21.8%	20.4%	27.0%	23.8%	23.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As noted earlier in this report, spending time on specific cases is not the same as spending time with families and children. In fact, most of the time caseworkers devote to cases is not spent with the families and no type of worker appears to spend more than 20 percent of all time (or more than a third of case specific time) in actual contact, either face-to-face or not, with families and children.

To put the matter differently, even though different kinds of workers spend their time differently, for none of them is face-to-face interaction with a client the most frequent task. For intake workers, the most frequent task is computer documentation, and for ongoing and generic workers it is non-face-to-face contact, about two-thirds of which is with providers and collaterals, rather than with clients. Table 9 shows, for each type of caseworker, all case specific tasks which consume more than four percent of the total time for any classification of worker.

Table 9 Percents of Time Spent on Most Frequently Performed Tasks			
	Intake	**Ongoing**	**Generic**
Intake Activities	6.1%	0.3%	2.3%
Face-to-Face Contact	11.0%	9.3%	7.0%
Non-face-to-face Contact	5.8%	10.4%	8.8%
Service Arrangement / Provision	1.9%	6.4%	4.1%
Court Preparation	2.0%	3.9%	5.4%
Travel	3.5%	3.3%	5.6%
Computer Documentation	11.5%	6.8%	8.1%

Several points here are noteworthy.

- Face-to-face contact with clients occurs most frequently among intake workers, suggesting either that they deal with more families than do other workers (which would be unusual in a public child welfare agency) or that families under investigation are seen more frequently than families receiving services.

- Generic workers, most of whom are located in small and/or remote areas, are in contact with clients and collaterals less frequently than either of the specialized groups of workers. In part, this is a function of the number of clients, with many of the workers in remote or mid-size areas having fewer clients than workers in larger areas, but in part it is also a function of spending more time on preparation for court and travel, leaving less for direct client contact.

- The relative percentages of time spent on computer work reflect the comparatively heavy front-loading of data in the system which some OCS staff reported during the preparation of the workload study. Thus, staff responsible solely for intake functions report spending nearly 70 percent more time in computer documentation than do staff responsible only for case management and service provision. Generic staff, who carry out both functions, fall in-between.

One of the concerns expressed by OCS staff at the beginning of the study was the amount of time workers in remote areas had to wait for the computer system to respond. The list of tasks designed for both the time study and the random moment survey allowed for the recording of waiting time. The results in Table 9 show that generic staff, many of whom are in remote areas, spend more time on the computer than ongoing workers but considerably less than intake workers. Tables 10 through 12 provide a different perspective, showing that workers in remote areas spend less time in computer documentation than do workers in either urban or mid-size offices. As always, however, that result has to be interpreted in light of the caseloads remote office workers have. The percentage of time that is reported is the percentage of the worker's time, not the percentage of time on each case.

	Urban	Mid-size	Remote	Total
Table 10 **Percents of Time Spent on Types of Tasks by Geographic Setting**				
Case Specific Activities				
Intake Activities	2.7%	2.0%	2.9%	2.6%
Screening	0.8%	1.2%	0.5%	0.9%
Face-to-Face Contact	7.3%	8.3%	5.9%	7.3%
Non-face-to-face Contact	6.3%	7.1%	8.2%	6.7%
Structured Decision-making	0.5%	0.3%	1.3%	0.5%
Other Assessments	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Investigative Decision	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Service Planning	1.7%	2.1%	0.8%	1.6%
Team Meetings	1.7%	1.3%	0.8%	1.5%
Case Consultation	3.3%	3.3%	2.6%	3.2%
Case Reviews	1.1%	1.3%	1.6%	1.2%
Service Arrangement / Provision	3.0%	4.9%	3.2%	3.4%
Eligibility Information	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
Travel	2.4%	7.4%	4.4%	3.5%
Transportation of Client	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	1.0%
Supervised Visitation	2.1%	1.4%	0.8%	1.8%
Computer Documentation	7.4%	10.5%	6.8%	7.8%
Paper Documentation	2.3%	2.0%	2.8%	2.3%
Report Preparation	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Policy Review / Clarification	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prepare for Court	2.5%	2.6%	4.3%	2.7%
Participate in Court	2.3%	1.8%	1.8%	2.1%
Supervisory Tasks	2.6%	2.1%	3.0%	2.6%
Licensing and Monitoring	5.1%	1.9%	1.1%	4.0%
Clerical	1.0%	1.8%	1.6%	1.2%
Conflicts / Appeals	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Non-case Specific Activities				
General Administration	6.0%	8.1%	5.5%	6.3%
Community Outreach	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%
Travel	0.5%	1.1%	2.5%	0.9%
Clerical / Reception	1.2%	1.8%	2.9%	1.5%
Computers / ORCA	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%
Supervisory Tasks	1.8%	2.1%	3.6%	2.1%
Federal / State Reviews	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Special Studies	0.7%	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%
Unit Statistics	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Training	5.3%	2.6%	4.3%	4.7%
Non-work Time	25.2%	18.3%	22.7%	23.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

As was the case with the initial tables of this section, the percentages of time spent on various tasks by mid-size offices stand out. Caseworker staff in those offices (i.e., non-licensing, non-supervisory staff) spend larger proportions of their total time on face-to-face contact, on service provision and arrangement, on computer documentation and on general administrative tasks than do workers in either urban or remote sites (see Table 12). The relatively low percentages of time reported by staff in mid-size offices as being spent in non-work activities and even on training might suggest that these results are a function of using percentages, i.e., that the distribution of tasks these staff perform is not really different than that of staff in other offices, if one focuses solely on work time.

Largely, that turns out not to be true. When the same analysis is conducted but both non-work time and training time are deleted, the only area in which there is substantial change in the rankings among the different types of geography is face-to-face contact. Urban workers report a slightly larger percent (14 percent) of their time outside of training and non-work time being spent in direct contact with clients than do workers in mid-size offices (13.4 percent).

It is, perhaps, more illuminating to examine the areas in which the mid-size offices report spending less time than either of the others. While the differences on most items are generally not large, these activities include intake, non-face-to-face contacts, structured decision-making, paper documentation, preparation for court and participation in court hearings. The items where mid-size offices report spending the least time relative to that reported by urban and remote offices are intake and paper documentation. Any connections must be speculative, but one could interpret some of the information to suggest that implementation of ORCA has been more widely accepted and successful in mid-size offices than elsewhere. Staff in mid-size offices report spending less time on intake and more on computer documentation, but both the RMS results and anecdotal information suggest those two should vary proportionally. Moreover, the relative paucity of time spent in mid-size offices on paper documentation might, again speculatively, suggest that staff in those sites have replaced more of their paper documentation with computer documentation than has been done elsewhere.

It is also noteworthy that workers in mid-size offices spend less time on court related activities than do workers elsewhere. In fact, they spend both less time preparing for court and less time participating in hearings. In comparison to urban offices, this probably reflects either greater efficiency on the part of the courts or a better relationship between the agency and the courts. In comparison to the remote offices, however, the difference simply reflects fewer court-related cases per worker in mid-size offices than in the remote offices.

	Urban	Mid-size	Remote	Total
Table 11				
Percents of Time Spent on Types of Tasks by Geographic Setting				
Non-supervisory Staff				
Case Specific Activities				
Intake Activities	2.7%	1.8%	2.7%	2.6%
Screening	0.9%	1.2%	0.6%	0.9%
Face-to-Face Contact	8.0%	8.9%	7.5%	8.1%
Non-face-to-face Contact	6.7%	7.8%	9.2%	7.2%
Structured Decision-making	0.5%	0.3%	1.8%	0.6%
Other Assessments	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Investigative Decision	0.5%	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%
Service Planning	1.7%	1.9%	0.8%	1.6%
Team Meetings	1.6%	1.5%	0.8%	1.5%
Case Consultation	3.1%	3.1%	2.6%	3.1%
Case Reviews	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	1.0%
Service Arrangement / Provision	3.3%	5.0%	3.4%	3.6%
Eligibility Information	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
Travel	2.7%	8.5%	5.3%	4.0%
Transportation of Client	1.0%	1.2%	0.9%	1.1%
Supervised Visitation	2.3%	1.6%	0.9%	2.1%
Computer Documentation	7.9%	11.1%	7.5%	8.4%
Paper Documentation	2.5%	2.2%	3.4%	2.5%
Report Preparation	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%
Policy Review / Clarification	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prepare for Court	2.5%	2.6%	5.6%	2.9%
Participate in Court	2.4%	1.7%	2.3%	2.3%
Supervisory Tasks	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
Licensing and Monitoring	5.7%	2.3%	1.5%	4.6%
Clerical	1.0%	2.1%	2.3%	1.4%
Conflicts / Appeals	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%
Non-case Specific Activities				
General Administration	5.4%	7.9%	4.1%	5.7%
Community Outreach	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%
Travel	0.6%	1.0%	2.1%	0.8%
Clerical / Reception	1.2%	1.8%	3.5%	1.5%
Computers / ORCA	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%
Supervisory Tasks	1.1%	0.8%	0.3%	1.0%
Federal / State Reviews	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Special Studies	0.6%	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%
Unit Statistics	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Training	5.1%	2.0%	5.6%	4.6%
Non-work Time	25.4%	18.5%	20.0%	23.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

	Urban	Mid-size	Remote	Total
Table 12 **Percents of Time Spent on Types of Tasks by Geographic Setting** **Caseworkers Only (Not Including Licensing and Supervisory Staff)**				
Case Specific Activities				
Intake Activities	3.4%	2.0%	2.7%	3.1%
Screening	0.9%	1.4%	0.6%	1.0%
Face-to-Face Contact	9.8%	10.3%	7.5%	9.6%
Non-face-to-face Contact	7.9%	8.8%	9.2%	8.2%
Structured Decision-making	0.5%	0.4%	1.8%	0.7%
Other Assessments	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Investigative Decision	0.6%	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%
Service Planning	2.1%	2.1%	0.8%	1.9%
Team Meetings	1.9%	1.7%	0.8%	1.7%
Case Consultation	3.5%	3.6%	2.6%	3.4%
Case Reviews	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%
Service Arrangement / Provision	3.9%	5.6%	3.4%	4.1%
Eligibility Information	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%
Travel	3.1%	5.0%	5.3%	3.8%
Transportation of Client	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%	1.3%
Supervised Visitation	3.0%	1.8%	0.9%	2.5%
Computer Documentation	8.3%	12.5%	7.5%	8.9%
Paper Documentation	2.8%	2.5%	3.4%	2.8%
Report Preparation	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Policy Review / Clarification	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Court Preparation	3.1%	3.0%	5.6%	3.4%
Court Participation	3.0%	1.9%	2.3%	2.7%
Supervisory Tasks	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%
Licensing and Monitoring	0.6%	0.0%	1.5%	0.6%
Clerical	0.8%	1.4%	2.3%	1.1%
Conflicts / Appeals	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%
Non-case Specific Activities				
General Administration	4.4%	5.1%	4.1%	4.5%
Community Outreach	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%
Travel	0.6%	1.0%	2.1%	0.9%
Clerical / Reception	0.9%	1.0%	3.5%	1.3%
Computers / ORCA	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%
Supervisory Tasks	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%
Federal / State Reviews	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Special Studies	0.2%	0.6%	0.9%	0.4%
Unit Statistics	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Training	5.7%	2.3%	5.6%	5.1%
Non-work Time	24.1%	20.8%	20.0%	23.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Time Available for Working with Cases

There are a number of simple and straightforward ways in which to calculate the time workers have available for cases. One way would be simply to take the total figures from across the state, without regard to variations by type of staff person or geographic setting, and apply them across the board. Another would be to apply the figures as they are broken down by type of worker or geographic setting, or by some combination of the two.

The key question to ask in deciding upon one approach or another has to do with whether any of the variation across worker type and/or geographic setting is a result of factors over which staff (including administrators) have little or no control and which have a noticeable impact on the availability of workers' time. Stated more concretely, it may not be useful to take account of variations in the amount of non-work time reported, but variations in the amount of time reported in administrative activities might need to be attended to if there is some reason to believe that these both have an impact on workers and are beyond their control. Variations in the amount of non-work time reported might occur by chance, might have to do with some offices or classifications of staff using leave inappropriately or might even represent a method for minimizing responses to the time study (it has been known to happen!). Some of these same things could also be true of variations in the amount of administrative time reported. However, there may also be reasons for believing that these variations are systematic, e.g., differences in the levels of clerical and administrative support. Non-work time variation is likely to have a systematic cause only if some offices have staff with extraordinary longevity, while others are populated by relative newcomers. That kind of difference will not, however, last indefinitely.

The following discussion leads to four separate figures regarding the availability of time to work on cases. These are expressed in hours per month:

    1)   for supervisors, 84 hours per month,
    2)   for licensing workers, 86 hours per month,
    3)   for all other workers in either urban or mid-size offices, 111 hours per month and
    4)   for all other workers in remote offices, 105 hours per month.

The remainder of this section describes the reasoning and calculations used to arrive at these numbers.

Non-work and Training Time

While OCS staff officially work, on average, five seven and one-half hour days per week, the random moment survey often picked up lunch times, meaning that the "day"

for which the percentages were figured was longer than seven and one-half hours. While the official lunch period is one hour, the random moment survey results showed 1/16th of total time reported as lunch. This would be equivalent to one-half hour within an eight-hour day. Assuming that this result accurately reflects what workers do, it probably means that many staff opt for a shorter overall day, coming in later or leaving earlier, by taking a shorter lunch.

The calculation of the time available for working with cases can begin in either of two ways. One can use eight hours per day as the total or one can use seven and one-half hours and simultaneously subtract lunch times from the relevant percentages. The answer should be the same in either event, and the procedure used here will generally be the second of these, except when the first permits a clearer explanation. This means that the calculation of the amount of time per month each worker has available to work on cases begins with 157.5 hours, 7.5 hours times 21 work days.

As noted earlier, there is wide variation in the amount of non-work time reported by staff of different types and in different types of offices. Licensing workers report 27 percent of all their time being on non-work of various sorts; non-supervisory workers in mid-size offices report less than 19 percent. If, however, there were a rationale behind the variations, one would expect supervisors, who presumably have longer tenures, to show the most leave time and therefore the most total non-work time. In fact, supervisors exhibit almost exactly the average of all reporting staff.

HZA's recommendation in the calculation of the amount of time available for working on specific cases is, therefore, to apply the actual average of all non-work time to all offices and all levels and types of staff. After lunch is omitted from the figure, 16.1 percent of all time is non-work and that is equal to 25.4 hours per month. When that is subtracted from the original 157.5 hours, 132.1 hours per month remain.

Training time should be handled in a similar manner. While there is some variation, it appears to be randomly distributed. Licensing workers show very little training time; mid-size offices show almost equally little and have few licensing workers.

Overall, 4.7 percent of the total RMS time was spent in training activities. This has to be applied against the eight-hour day, producing 7.9 hours per month. Thus, prior to calculating the impact of administrative activities, every staff person, regardless of position or location, has 124.2 hours per month.

Administrative and Case Specific Time

Within the 124 hours remaining after the above calculations, all tasks are divided into case specific and administrative. The question that has to be answered in order to give a reasonable estimate of time available to work on cases is whether the differences among the different workers and offices should be taken into account.

For supervisors the answer appears simple. Their job is sufficiently different than that of caseworkers that they should have a different estimate of available case time than should other staff. When the time for training activities and non-work has been subtracted, supervisors spend 67.5 percent of their remaining time on individual cases. Multiplied by 124.2, this results in an estimate of 84 hours per month that supervisors have for case specific work.

The data suggest that licensing workers should also be considered to be in a different category. They spend about the same amount of time on administrative activities as do supervisors. Again, after subtracting the training and non-work time, licensing workers spend 68.9 percent of their time on case specific activities. Multiplied by 124.2, this results in an estimate of 86 hours per month for case specific work.

The final question is whether there are differences among either worker types or offices which warrant considering some or all categories separately. While there are differences in the amount of administrative time spent by different kinds of workers, the more systemic difference appears to be by office type. Non-supervisory, non-licensing staff in urban areas devote 10.4 percent of their non-training work time to administrative activities; staff in mid-size areas 11.9 percent; and staff in remote areas 15.5 percent. The overall percentage is 11.4 percent. The smaller the office, the more time is spent on administrative activities.

This suggests that some adjustment should be made for remote offices to take account of their lack of administrative support. This is independent of what may appear later in the examination of case specific work, where one may also find that clerical staff in urban and mid-size offices perform some of the functions that caseworkers perform in remote areas.

There are many ways an adjustment might be made, but perhaps the simplest, and the one recommended here, is to use the average percent of non-training, actual work time (10.8 percent) workers in urban and mid-size offices spend on administrative activities for both of those types of offices and the proportion of time spent in administrative activities (15.5) by workers in remote offices for their estimate. Thus, for workers in urban and mid-size offices, the amount of time available for case specific work would equal 111 hours (124.2 hours times 89.2 percent). For workers in remote areas, that time would equal 105 hours (124.2 hours times 15.5 percent).

These estimates of time available for case specific work represent the capacity of caseworkers to handle cases. If the total time required to handle the cases assigned to them is greater than the time available, they cannot reasonably be expected to handle all of the work within policy guidelines. On the other hand, if they have more time available than their assignments require, they could handle additional cases. It is to the time required for cases that attention now needs to be turned.

Time Required to Handle Cases

Time Currently Spent on Cases

Any estimate of the time required to handle cases in conformity with agency policy has to begin with an analysis of how much time is actually spent on cases at the present. While one may not assume that the time currently spent on each case is what is needed, it does provide an empirical basis for making the estimate of the time required.

Table 13 shows the time spent by any OCS staff person on cases of different types as that time was reported in the time study.

Table 13 Actual Time Spent per Case[3]	
Case Type	**Hours per Month or Process**
Intake Report (P)[4]	2.29
Information and Referral (P)	1.68
Investigations (P)	6.39
In-home Services, Court (M)	10.04
In-home Services, No Court (M)	5.44
Permanency, Relative Home (M)	8.51
Permanency, Foster Home (M)	12.38
Permanency, Group Home (M)	10.00
Permanency, Institution (M)	12.62
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home (M)	4.77
Permanency, Trial Discharge (M)	7.03
Permanency, Other (M)	6.14
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal (P)	3.53
Licensing, Supervision (M)	1.23

There are several things to note about the table. First, the estimates do not break down the time into as many case types as were used in the time study. This was because there were too few cases to make reliable estimates for several of the case types, including investigations with placement, supervised independent living, runaways, ICPC (both types) and all of the licensing categories except for supervision. Any time there were fewer than 25 cases for a given case type, that type was merged with others. In making these mergers, HZA attempted to combine case types which were similar in some way that would affect how much time was spent on the cases. Investigations with placement obviously were most like other investigations, while

---

[3] These estimates exclude time spent in specifically supervisory functions, although they do count time spent by supervisors on other tasks.
[4] A "P" in parenthesis indicates that the time is the number of hours per process, e.g., an investigation for abuse or neglect, while an "M" indicates that time is the number of hours per month.

supervised independent living, runaways and ICPC all involved permanency cases in which the amount of time spent would be expected to be less than that spent on other permanency cases. Licensing assessments and renewals were deemed all to be more like one another than they were to be like licensing supervision.

In merging case types, the time for all of the cases merged into a single type was used to make the estimate of how much time OCS spends on each case type. Thus, in a normal investigation, i.e., an investigation without placement of a child, OCS will generally spend less than 6.39 hours. The estimate for all investigations is that high because the time spent on investigations with placement, although relatively infrequent, brings the average up.

The second thing to note is that some of the times represent hours per month, while others represent hours per process. The case types for which the hours represent a process rather than a month are intake report, information and referral, investigation and licensing, assessment and renewal.

An investigation may take only a day or two or it may take a month. The requirements for completing the investigation are, however, spelled out in terms of the process, not in terms of time. For permanency cases, in contrast, the requirements to see the child and the parent represent monthly commitments, so the estimates represent hours per month.

In comparing these estimates to what HZA has found in other states, some appear roughly equivalent, while others appear high. The permanency times especially seem higher than what is found in other states, sometimes by as much as 50 to 100 percent. While this is somewhat consistent with the finding that workers in Alaska have more time to spend on cases than do workers elsewhere (given similar caseloads, workers who have more time to spend on cases in general will spend more time on each case), it bears further scrutiny.

To begin to explore why the permanency times are higher in Alaska than elsewhere, Table 14 presents the same findings as above, while excluding staff who do not carry cases. This was done by eliminating the reported time of workers with titles which are never case carrying. Since some titles are used for both case carrying and non-case carrying positions, there is still some representation of time which is not attributable to case carrying staff, but the resulting estimates provide a better picture of the time case carrying staff devote to each case.

Table 14 Actual Time Spent per Case Case Carrying Titles Only	
Case Type	**Hours per Month or Process**
Intake Report	2.29
Information and Referral	1.68
Investigations	6.32
In-home Services, Court	10.01
In-home Services, No Court	5.32
Permanency, Relative Home	8.27
Permanency, Foster Home	11.47
Permanency, Group Home	9.62
Permanency, Institution	11.89
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	4.63
Permanency, Trial Discharge	6.59
Permanency, Other	5.37
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal	3.60[5]
Licensing, Supervision	1.25

As is evident from comparing Tables 13 and 14, non-case carrying staff have very little effect on the total time spent on cases. In general, when time is spent on the case, it is time which is attributable to either the primary caseworker or to someone else in a casework position.

If the relatively high figures on time spent on cases are not attributable to support staff, it may be due to the peculiarities of the state of Alaska itself. In particular, one would expect that time spent on cases in more remote regions might be higher than the time spent on the same types of cases elsewhere. Table 15 shows the breakdown of times per case type by urban, mid-sized and remote offices. Some of these estimates need to be approached with caution because of small numbers, and any estimate which relies on fewer than 25 cases is indicated by an asterisk. In addition, intake reports and information and referral are omitted because those activities should not vary by geographic setting.

---

[5] The licensing cases show increased times because in some cases the only person reporting time on the case was a non-case carrying staff person. Thus, those cases, which involved very little reported time at all, dropped from the sample and the average time devoted to the case rose.

Table 15 Actual Time Spent per Case By Geographic Location	
Case Type	**Hours per Month or Process**
Investigations – All	**6.39**
Urban	7.59
Mid-size	4.30
Remote	5.34*
In-home Services, Court – All	**10.04**
Urban	9.43*
Mid-size	7.44*
Remote	18.33*
In-home Services, No Court – All	**5.44**
Urban	4.86
Mid-size	3.76*
Remote	7.29*
Permanency, Relative Home – All	**8.51**
Urban	8.79
Mid-size	6.80*
Remote	8.68*
Permanency, Foster Home – All	**12.38**
Urban	12.35
Mid-size	10.93
Remote	14.72*
Permanency, Group Home – All	**10.00**
Urban	16.07
Mid-size	12.00*
Remote	2.49*
Permanency, Institution – All	**12.62**
Urban	11.15
Mid-size	16.32*
Remote	23.71*
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home – All	**4.77**
Urban	6.21
Mid-size	1.54*
Remote	0.00*
Permanency, Trial Discharge – All	**7.03**
Urban	6.12
Mid-size	13.94*
Remote	3.57*

Table 15 (cont.) Actual Time Spent per Case By Geographic Location	
Case Type	**Hours per Month or Process**
Permanency, Other – All	**6.14**
Urban	5.28
Mid-size	1.65*
Remote	10.98*
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal – All	**3.53**
Urban	3.53
Mid-size	-
Remote	3.54*
Licensing, Supervision – All	**1.23**
Urban	1.24
Mid-size	1.49*
Remote	0.83*

While none of the remote areas provide sufficient cases of any one type to provide a reliable estimate, the types of cases in which remote areas have the largest number of cases, i.e., in-home cases with no court order and cases with children in foster homes, show significantly more time than do those same types of cases in other areas. Perhaps just as interestingly, cases in mid-sized offices often appear to receive less time per case than do those in other offices, whether urban or remote. Given the findings from the random moment survey discussed previously, that again reflects the fact that caseloads are, in general, higher in mid-sized offices than they are elsewhere.

However, the additional time spent by remote areas vanishes, when all of the case types other than intake and licensing are considered together, with each type of case weighted to reflect its proportion to the whole population. Urban area cases receive the most time, remote the second most and mid-size the least. The differences are, however, not so large as to suggest systemic differences, with one hour per month or process between urban and remote and less than three-quarters of an hour between remote and mid-size.

A second possibility for the explanation of the relatively high amounts of time has to do with the Alaska Native/Native American status of some of the cases. Given the requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), one would expect some differences in the amount of time required between native cases and non-native cases. Table 16 displays those results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Case Type</th><th colspan="4">Hours per Month or Process</th></tr>
<tr><th>Urban</th><th>Mid-size</th><th>Remote</th><th>All</th></tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr><td colspan="5">Table 16
Actual Time Spent per Case
By Alaska Native/Native American Status</td></tr>
<tr><td>Investigations – All</td><td>7.59</td><td>4.30</td><td>5.34*</td><td>6.39</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>4.63*</td><td>9.25*</td><td>5.56*</td><td>6.40*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>7.91</td><td>2.85</td><td>5.29*</td><td>6.39</td></tr>
<tr><td>In-home Services, Court – All</td><td>9.43*</td><td>7.44*</td><td>18.33*</td><td>10.04</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>9.57*</td><td>8.79*</td><td>16.71*</td><td>10.77*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>9.39*</td><td>5.82*</td><td>20.76*</td><td>9.60*</td></tr>
<tr><td>In-home Services, No Court – All</td><td>4.86</td><td>3.76*</td><td>7.29*</td><td>5.44</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>3.97*</td><td>3.00*</td><td>3.33*</td><td>3.65*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>5.96*</td><td>5.03*</td><td>9.94*</td><td>7.35*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Relative Home – All</td><td>8.79</td><td>6.80*</td><td>8.68*</td><td>8.51</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>7.99</td><td>7.23*</td><td>11.31*</td><td>8.84</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>9.60</td><td>5.94*</td><td>4.33*</td><td>8.11</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Foster Home – All</td><td>12.35</td><td>10.93</td><td>14.72*</td><td>12.38</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>12.07</td><td>10.96*</td><td>13.11*</td><td>11.99</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>12.62</td><td>10.89*</td><td>16.11*</td><td>12.76</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Group Home – All</td><td>16.07</td><td>12.00*</td><td>2.49*</td><td>10.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>12.04*</td><td>17.52*</td><td>4.98*</td><td>9.69*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>20.10*</td><td>3.71*</td><td>-</td><td>10.31*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Institution – All</td><td>11.16</td><td>16.32*</td><td>23.71*</td><td>12.62</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>9.28*</td><td>15.79*</td><td>8.02*</td><td>10.87</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>12.12</td><td>17.07*</td><td>55.09*</td><td>13.77</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home – All</td><td>6.21*</td><td>1.54</td><td>-</td><td>4.77</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>7.53*</td><td>2.15*</td><td>-</td><td>6.81*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>5.14*</td><td>1.29*</td><td>-</td><td>3.55*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Trial Discharge – All</td><td>6.12</td><td>13.94*</td><td>3.57*</td><td>7.03</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>3.71*</td><td>11.34*</td><td>3.64*</td><td>4.89</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>7.76</td><td>15.12*</td><td>3.56*</td><td>8.19</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanency, Other – All</td><td>5.28</td><td>1.65*</td><td>10.98*</td><td>6.14</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>4.77*</td><td>1.16*</td><td>13.32*</td><td>8.37*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>5.43*</td><td>1.99*</td><td>1.65*</td><td>4.79</td></tr>
<tr><td>Licensing, Assessment and Renewal – All</td><td>3.53</td><td>-</td><td>3.54*</td><td>3.53</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>1.60*</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>1.60*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>3.68</td><td>-</td><td>3.54*</td><td>3.67</td></tr>
<tr><td>Licensing, Supervision – All</td><td>1.24</td><td>1.49*</td><td>0.83*</td><td>1.23</td></tr>
<tr><td>Native</td><td>2.89*</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>2.89*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-native</td><td>1.18</td><td>1.49*</td><td>0.83*</td><td>1.17</td></tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there are some exceptions to the pattern, in general it would appear that handling native cases requires somewhat less time than does handling non-native cases. This is confirmed by considering all of the case types other than intake and licensing, which shows that non-native cases receive about one-half hour more attention each month or process than do native cases. On one level this is surprising, because the requirements of ICWA would tend to make one believe that more time would be spent on native cases. However, it is also true that ICWA requirements promote kinship placements and both in Alaska and in other states, child welfare agencies generally spend less time on kinship cases than they do on others.

Looking more closely at Table 13, the times which appear most out of line with studies in other states are the most frequent permanency cases, i.e., relative homes, foster homes, group homes and institutions. In most previous studies, the unit of analysis for these cases was the child, but in Alaska the case is considered to be the family, so some of the cases involve multiple children. It should be expected that cases involving multiple children in out-of-home settings would require more time, particularly when those children are placed in different settings. Table 17, which includes children in pre-adoptive homes since these are also out-of-home, shows that this is indeed the case.

Table 17 Actual Time Spent per Case Basic Permanency Case Types		
Case Type	Hours per Month for One Child	Hours per Month for Multiple Children
Permanency, Relative Home	6.59	11.13
Permanency, Foster Home	9.17	16.39
Permanency, Group Home	10.52*	9.49*
Permanency, Institution	9.00	18.12
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	4.18*	5.76*

The only exception to the rule involves cases in which the child in the most restrictive setting, the setting used to establish the family case type, was in a group home, but both here and for the pre-adoptive homes, there were fewer than 25 cases to analyze, so the results may not be reliable.

When all of the above case types are averaged, proportionate to their frequencies in the population, cases with one child receive an average of 8.37 hours per month, while cases with multiple children receive an average of 14.32 hours per month, a difference of 71 percent. This number will figure in the final weights to be assigned.

Time That Should Be Spent on Cases

The general expectation of a workload study in child welfare is that the time required to handle a case in conformity with policy will be greater than the average time currently spent on cases. While it is mathematically possible for the results to come out differently, that assumption comes from experience and reflects a belief that there are cases which are not currently handled in accordance with policy because staff do not have the time available to do so.

As noted in the description of the methodology, all of the time spent on cases was divided into two types: time which reflects activities required by policy either every month or for every process (e.g., every investigation) and all other time. The former is referred to as "required time" and the latter as "non-required time," although some of the activities are certainly required to handle the individual needs of the children and families being served, just not on a monthly basis or not for every family

The basic formula for calculating the amount of time which should be spent on a case is to add the actual average non-required time to the average time required for each of the activities which are required for that type of case. In calculating the latter, the average times spent on the activities are used, but only for those cases which show that activity.

To obtain a sufficient number of cases for these analyses, case types were combined when the time required for an activity could reasonably be expected to be the same, regardless of case type. For instance, in calculating the time staff need to make a face-to-face home visit with a child in an out-of-home setting, all of the permanency case types were used, except for trial home discharge, while to calculate the time staff need to make a face-to-face home visit with a child living at home, the in-home case types and trial home discharge cases were used.

Table 18 shows the times workers spent on activities which are required for one or another case type. Not all of the activities are required for every case type, and in some instances some of the activities are alternatives to one another, e.g., during an investigation there must be a face-to-face contact with the child either in the home or not in the home. Appendix D shows the activities required for each case type.

Table 18 Average Time for Required Activities	
Activity	**Hours per Month or Process**
Safety Assessment, Investigation	0.68
Screen for Child Abuse and Neglect, Intake	0.42
Screen for Child Abuse and Neglect, Other	0.65
Screen for Criminal History	0.35
Home Face-to-face with Child, Investigation	1.16
Home Face-to-face with Child, In-home	1.43
Home Face-to-face with Child, Out-of-home	1.26
Non-home Face-to-face with Child, Investigation	1.34
Non-home Face-to-face with Child, In-home	1.21
Non-home Face-to-face with Child, Out-of-home	2.20
Home Face-to-face with Parent, Investigation	1.07
Home Face-to-face with Parent, In-home	0.99
Home Face-to-face with Parent, Out-of-home	0.96
Home Face-to-face with Foster Parent	0.95
Non-home Face-to-face with Foster Parent	1.12
Face-to-face with Other Placement Provider	1.32
Non-face-to-face with Child	0.73
Non-face-to-face with Foster Parent	0.98
Non-face-to-face with Other Placement Provider	0.65
Locate Placement Provider	1.62
Licensing Home Visit/Study	1.25
ORCA Recording, Intake	0.58
ORCA Recording, Investigation	0.77
ORCA Recording, In-home	0.54
ORCA Recording, Out-of-home	0.77
ORCA Recording, Licensing	0.65

The final piece of the puzzle is the amount of non-required time workers currently spend on cases. Table 19 shows those figures by case type and Table 20 shows the total time required to handle each type of case appropriately.

Table 19
Non-required Time Spent per Case

Case Type	Hours per Month or Process
Intake Report	2.22
Information and Referral	1.71
Investigations	5.27
In-home Services, Court	9.94
In-home Services, No Court	5.15
Permanency, Relative Home	7.08
Permanency, Foster Home	10.56
Permanency, Group Home	7.94
Permanency, Institution	10.45
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	3.54
Permanency, Trial Discharge	6.25
Permanency, Other	5.47
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal	3.26
Licensing, Supervision	1.23

Table 20
Time Required to Handle Cases Appropriately

Case Type	Actual Hours per Month or Process	Required Hours per Month or Process
Intake Report	2.29	3.22
Information and Referral	1.68	2.29
Investigations	6.55	9.30
In-home Services, Court	10.32	11.91
In-home Services, No Court	5.77	7.57
Permanency, Relative Home	8.89	10.72
Permanency, Foster Home	12.66	14.20
Permanency, Group Home	12.66	11.58
Permanency, Institution	12.62	14.09
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	5.45	7.18
Permanency, Trial Discharge	7.89	8.45
Permanency, Other	5.77	7.62
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal	3.78	5.83
Licensing, Supervision	1.23	1.23[6]

---

[6] The time required to for licensing supervision is the same as the time actually spent because there are no required activities during the period when no assessment or renewal is occurring.

As noted above, the time estimates for the basic permanency cases need to be modified to account for the number of children involved. There were too few cases to break down the results further than a division between one child and two children, so differing times were calculated just for those two categories.

In calculating the required time for different numbers of children, the basic methodology was to calculate the amount of time required for one child and then to adjust that time for multiple children by multiplying it by 1.71, i.e., increasing it by 71 percent. There were two few group home cases with multiple children in care, so these were merged with institutional cases. In addition, children in adoptive homes are, by policy, their own case after termination, so no additional weight needs to be assigned for multi-child cases.

Table 21 Time Required to Handle Cases Appropriately		
Case Type	Hours per Month for One Child	Hours per Month for Multiple Children
Permanency, Relative Home	9.18	15.70
Permanency, Foster Home	11.65	19.90
Permanency, Group Home or Institution	11.64	19.90

The final case weights, i.e., times required to handle cases appropriately, are shown in Table 22.

Table 22 Final Case Weights	
Case Type	**Hours per Month or Process**
Intake Report	3.22
Information and Referral	2.29
Investigations	9.30
In-home Services, Court	11.91
In-home Services, No Court	7.57
Permanency, Relative Home, One Child	9.18
Permanency, Relative Home, Multiple Children	15.70
Permanency, Foster Home, One Child	11.65
Permanency, Foster Home, Multiple Children	19.90
Permanency, Group Home or Institution, One Child	11.64
Permanency, Group Home or Institution, Multiple Children	19.90
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	7.18
Permanency, Trial Discharge	8.45
Permanency, Other	7.62
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal	5.83
Licensing, Supervision	1.23

SUMMARY: APPLICATION OF CASE WEIGHTS TO WORKLOAD

Part of the utility of case weights is that they reduce workload estimates to a matter of time, so all types of cases are commensurate with one another. One can calculate the workload of a worker, a unit, an office, a region or of the state as a whole, regardless of the mix of cases involved.

It is, however, easier to understand the implications of the case weights, if some examples are presented. Starting with the number of hours available to different kinds of workers, Table 23 shows the number of each case type which can be handled appropriately, if a worker is handling only one type of case. For process based case types, this represents the number of cases of the type which can be handled during one month, since the calculations are based on the hours available to workers in a single month.

	Table 23	
	Number of Cases of a Single Type Which Can Be	
	Handled Appropriately	
	Specialized Caseloads	

Case Type	Urban/ Mid-size	Remote
Intake Report	34	32
Information and Referral	48	46
Investigations	12	11
In-home Services, Court	9	9
In-home Services, No Court	15	14
Permanency, Relative Home, One Child	12	11
Permanency, Relative Home, Multiple Children	7	7
Permanency, Foster Home, One Child	10	9
Permanency, Foster Home, Multiple Children	6	5
Permanency, Group Home or Institution, One Child	10	9
Permanency, Group Home or Institution, Multiple Children	6	5
Permanency, Pre-adoptive Home	15	15
Permanency, Trial Discharge	13	12
Permanency, Other	15	14
Licensing, Assessment and Renewal	15	15
Licensing, Supervision	70	70

CURRENT OCS CAPACITY

More importantly than allowing OCS to measure its current capacity, the results of the
time study permit the agency to do so on an ongoing basis. While it is possible to
measure workload as frequently as on a daily basis, it is generally more reasonable to
do so on a monthly basis. The only question has to do with when to count cases. HZA
usually recommends that cases whose time is calculated on a monthly basis be counted
as of a given day and that cases whose time is calculated on a process basis be counted
during the month in which the relevant case type began. While some of both types will
not have represented any work burden for much of the month, there will be others
which have lingered from the previous month, and generally these two will balance
each other over time.

To estimate the potential impact of the study findings, HZA examined the OCS caseload
to determine how many additional workers, if any, would be needed to provide every
worker with a reasonable workload. Cases in which the hours needed are measured by
process, i.e., intake, investigations and licensing assessments and renewals, were
included if the case began during the month of April 2006. All other cases were

counted if they were open as of May 1, 2005. Despite the fact that these dates represented a period about six months after the time study, they were used because they permitted OCS to correct some of the data in ORCA which made obtaining counts of some of the case types difficult if not impossible.

For every case qualifying in one of these ways, the number of hours needed was multiplied by the total number of cases and that result was divided by the number of hours available for case specific work. Table 24 shows the results by office.

Office Name	Staffing-Authorized	Staffing-Filled	Casework Staffing Needed	Licensing Staffing Needed	Net Staffing Needed-Authorized	Net Staffing Needed-Filled
Anchorage	76	68	82	8	14	22
Aniak	2	1	2	0	0	1
Barrow	3	3	3	0	0	0
Bethel	6	5	10	1	5	6
Craig	2	2	1	0	-1	-1
Delta Jct.	2	2	2	0	0	0
Dillingham	3	3	3	0	0	0
Fairbanks[7]	36	35	25	5	-6	-5
Galena	1	0	0	0	-1	0
Homer	3	3	6	0	3	3
Juneau	17	14	14	3	0	3
Kenai	11	11	13	1	3	3
Ketchikan	6	6	6	0	0	0
King Salmon	2	2	1	0	-1	-1
Kodiak	2	1	2	0	0	1
Kotzebue	3	3	6	0	3	3
Mat-Su	14	14	18	3	7	7
McGrath	1	1	1	0	0	0
Nome	6	5	3	0	-3	-2
Petersburg	1	0	1	0	0	1
Seward	1	1	1	0	0	0
Sitka	1	1	2	0	1	1
St. Mary's	4	1	2	0	-2	1
Unalaska	1	0	0	0	-1	0
Valdez	1	1	1	0	0	0
Authorized, Unassigned	4	0	0	0	-4	0
Total	**209**	**183**	**207**	**21**	**19**	**43**

Table 24
OCS Staffing and Staffing Needs by Office

---

[7] The Fairbanks figures include the Interior Bush workers and cases.

It should be noted that the staffing figures shown in Table 24 represent only those staff who should be carrying cases. Because there are more cases than these staff can now handle, some staff in non-social work titles and some supervisors are in fact responsible for cases. Part of the purpose of the workload study is to determine how many social work positions would be required to end that situation.

Not surprisingly, most of the need for additional staff is in Anchorage. At present, about one-third of OCS' front-line social work staff are in Anchorage, but close to one-half of the cases are there. That suggests that additional staff are needed in Anchorage, just to make the workload there the same as it elsewhere. The need is, however, greater than that required for simple equity, since workers overall have greater workloads than they can handle appropriately.

Some offices also show that they are over-staffed, either in authorized positions or in filled positions, or both. It should be stressed, however, that Table 24 does not represent a set of recommendations about re-allocation of staff. While the statewide results should be considered sufficiently strong that one can be confident that OCS needs more authorized social work positions and even more people to fill those positions, the number of cases is not likely to be as stable in each office as it is statewide. The number of cases in OCS' offices, especially in the mid-size and remote offices, can change significantly with the addition or subtraction of a handful of families. In fact, if these offices are to have adequate capacity to handle emergencies, they will almost certainly need some slack capacity.

Ultimately, the most appropriate way to determine whether some offices are genuinely over-staffed is to perform these calculations repeatedly over an extended period of time, e.g., one year. That means that OCS should repeat the calculations by counting cases (see Appendix F) and applying the weights each month to identify patterns of under- and over-burden among the offices. Only if the case counts remain stable and the same results are achieved repeatedly, should the results be used for re-allocation.

In response to this study OCS should make a plan for filling existing vacancies and monitoring workloads over time in an effort to increase staff resources as the agency can absorb them. Some aspects of the plan should be:

1)   Fill the positions that are authorized but vacant, shifting the bulk of those positions to Anchorage.

2)   OCS should recalculate the staffing needs by office every month for a year and plot the results by counting cases and applying the weights each month to identify patterns of under- and over-burden among the offices. These data will provide a reliable direction for shifting current staff to better meet the caseload burden where it is shown to exist over time and for targeting new positions that may be authorized on the weight of this study's results.

3)   Once the vacancies are filled, OCS should make an effort to attain additional positions at whatever speed they can be absorbed from both a political and an agency standpoint using the evidence contained in this study. Part of that evidence is the very basic standard used in the study to determine if a case is handled appropriately and the amount of time it takes to handle it appropriately. Those standards are spelled out in Appendix D for each case type.

4)   To produce the most equitable distribution of workload for current staff and cases on an ongoing basis, OCS could also provide supervisors making assignments a workload monitoring program through ORCA, as described in Appendix F. These procedures should help supervisors achieve the proper allocation of cases to existing workers based on the case weights or workload standards established by this study.

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
OFFICE OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

RANDOM MOMENT SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Sampled Date: _____   Sampled Worker: _____

Sampled Time: _____   Office: _____

Phone: _____   Extension: _____

Date of Call	*Contact Made*	*Contact Not Made*
_ _ / _ _ / _ _	❒	❒
_ _ / _ _ / _ _	❒	❒
_ _ / _ _ / _ _	❒	❒
_ _ / _ _ / _ _	❒	❒

Script:
Hello, my name is _____. I am calling from Hornby Zeller Associates as part of the Statewide Workload Study we are conducting on behalf of the Office of Children's Services. I would like to ask you a couple of questions as part of the Random Moment Survey.

(If first call)

1. Are you working on a case right now?

    ❒ Yes
    ❒ No

2. (If yes) What is the case name and number?

    Case Number   Case Name
    _____   _____

3. What task are you performing? _____

(If not first call)

We tried to call you at hh:mm on mm/dd/yy, but you were not available then.
1. Were you working on a case at that time?

       ❒ Yes
       ❒ No

2.   (If yes) What is the case name and number?

Case Number   Case Name

_____   _____

3.   What task are/were you performing? _____

APPENDIX B

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
OFFICE OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES
WORKLOAD STUDY

TASK CODES AND DEFINITIONS

The number preceding each of the following definitions is the code to use during the time study when recording an activity. A separate document contains codes for case types. Task codes are divided into four large groupings:

1000:	Case Specific Activities
2000:	Administration
3000:	Training
4000:	Non-work time

OCS staff will record only the case specific activities. The other codes will be used as part of the random moment survey to be conducted by the researchers.

Part 1.   Case Specific Task Codes

1001 - 1004.   Intake Activities
Includes reviewing initial referrals and requests for services.

> *1001.   Receive Allegations or Request for Services* – Includes receiving and reviewing the complaint or request for services, obtaining the referral number, informing client of rights and responsibilities, and verifying that the agency has jurisdiction. May include face-to-face contact with client.

> *1002.   Request Welfare Check* – Includes filing a request for a collateral (i.e., school, clinic, health aide, police officer, tribe administrator) to visit the home to check on the child and family.

> *1003.   Provide Information and Referral* – Includes time spent providing information and referral at the time of intake.

> *1004.   Obtain Supervisory Review and Approval of Intake* – Includes supervisor's review of priority designation, investigative caseloads and follow-up.

1011 - 1013.   Screening
Includes identifying and reviewing available paper and electronic files regarding anyone in the family.

> *1011.   Screen for History of Abuse and Neglect*– Includes checking the state's central registry for child abuse and neglect.

> *1012.   Screen for Criminal History*– Includes initiating a check of law enforcement records to determine whether the applicant has a criminal history.

> *1013.   Screen for Service History*– Includes determining whether the family/household/applicant is known to the program or to other social services programs and/or has a known SSN and reviewing any electronic or paper files found during the search.

1101 – 1137.   Contacts
Includes making investigative and case management contacts with children, families, collaterals and providers.

> ***Face-to-Face Contact in the Home***
Includes contacts both in the home of the parents or in the foster home.

> *1101.   With child*
> *1102.   With parent, legal guardian, or Indian custodian*
> *1103.   With both parent and child*

1104.	With collaterals
1105.	With tribe or village representative
1106.	With foster parent
1107.	With child and foster parent
1108.	With others

Face-to-Face Contact Not in the Home

Includes contacts in the office, the car, a non-foster home substitute care setting and any place other than the person's home or foster home.

1111.	With child
1112.	With parent, legal guardian, or Indian custodian
1113.	With both parent and child
1114.	With collaterals
1115.	With tribe or village representative
1116.	With foster parent
1117.	With child and foster parent
1118.	With other placement provider
1119.	With child and other placement provider
1120.	With others

Non Face-to-Face Contact Not in the Home

Includes telephone, e-mail, voice mail and fax as well as time spent attempting to make contacts via telephone, and retrieving voice mail messages.

1131.	With child
1132.	With parent, legal guardian, or Indian custodian
1133.	With collaterals
1134.	With tribe or village representative
1135.	With foster parent
1136.	With other placement provider
1137.	With others

1201 - 1209.   Structured Decision Making

Includes time spent using and completing the tools in structured decision-making at all stages of the case. The work includes the time recording the structured decision making results in ORCA.

1201.	Initial screening
1202.	Response priority
1203.	Safety assessment
1204.	Protective Capacity and Needs
1205.	Future Risk of Abuse and Neglect (FRAN)
1206.	Case Open Guideline Matrix
1207.	Child and family reappraisal-in-home
1208.	Child and family reappraisal-out-of-home
1209.	Reunification decision

1211 - 1212.   **Other Assessments**
Includes time spent using and completing the tools for other structured assessments, including the time recording the results in ORCA.

1211.   *Life skill assessment (Ansell Casey)*
        Includes completing the Ansell Casey Life Skills Assessment to determine the need for services to prepare the youth for independent living, even if the permanency goal is reunification or adoption.

1212.   *Other assessments not covered in Structured Decision Making*

1220.   **Investigative Decision**
Includes time spent making a decision at the conclusion of an investigation and recording it.

1301 - 1305.   **Service Planning**
Includes developing and updating case plans and recording information.

1301.   *Develop Case Plan* – Includes setting goals, tasks, and objectives; identifying needed services, potential service providers, goals, and time frames; and preparing a written plan document.

1302.   *Develop Concurrent Plan* – Includes identifying alternative permanency goals as a contingency for the existing plan.

1303.   *Update Case Plan* – Includes modifying goals, tasks, and objectives; identifying needed services, potential service providers, goals, and time frames; and preparing a modified written plan document.

1304.   *Update Concurrent Plan* – Includes modifying alternative permanency goals as a contingency for the existing plan.

1305.   *Review Case Plan with Supervisor* – Includes discussion with supervisor about the case plan, either in a one-on-one or a group session.

1311 – 1313.   **Team Meetings**
Includes team meetings at the beginning, middle or end of the case for the purpose of decision-making or review such as Team Decision Making, Permanency Staffings, Therapeutic Meetings, and Family Group Decision Making. The meetings may or may not include family members.

1311.   *Preparation Time* – Includes contacting people to attend meetings; arranging for space; reviewing the case alone, with the supervisor, family members or professionals.

1312.   *Waiting Time* – Code here only if no other work is done while waiting. When using waiting time to perform other tasks such as writing case notes, use the task code of the actual activity.

1313.   *Participation in Consultations or Team Meetings* – Includes Team Decision Meetings, Permanency Staffings, Therapeutic Meetings, Family Group Decision Making and IEP meetings.

1321 – 1325.   Case Consultation
Includes time for staff to seek and/or obtain guidance on a case. Consultation is coded according to whom you are consulting with, as follows:

1321.   *With Management* – Director, Assistant Director, Administrator, Senior Supervisor or other upper management.

1322.   *With Supervisor*

1323.   *With Co-worker*

1324.   *With Provider* – Includes homemaker, family aide, community specialist, services provider, counselor, physician, day care provider and/or transportation provider.

1325.   *With Others* – Includes attorneys.

1331 – 1333.   Case Reviews
Includes case reviews for the purpose of decision-making or review such as Child and Family Six Month Conference, Permanency Planning Conference, Placement Decision Conference and Out-of-Preference (ICWA) Review. The conferences/reviews may or may not include family members.

1331.   *Preparation Time* – Includes contacting people to attend conferences/reviews; arranging for space; reviewing the case alone, with the supervisor, family members or professionals.

1332.   *Waiting Time* – Code here only if no other work is done while waiting. When using waiting time to perform other tasks such as writing case notes, use the task code of the actual activity.

1333.   *Participation in Case Reviews or Conferences* – Includes Family and Children Early Conferences, Child and Family Six Month Conferences, Permanency Planning Conferences, Placement Decision Conferences and Out-of-preference (ICWA) Reivews.

1341 - 1346.   Service Arrangement or Provision
Includes searching, arranging for or directly providing services to children and families.

1341.   *Locate Placement Provider*—Includes searching for a temporary or more permanent placement for a child and completing contacts, applications or paperwork for admission.

1342.   *Help Client Obtain Services*—— Includes searching, applying for and accessing such services as ATAF, Medicaid, energy assistance, and low-

income housing including identifying resource, making contacts, and helping with applications.

1343.   *Refer to or Arrange for Therapeutic and Remedial Services*—Includes locating and arranging for services such as counseling, substance abuse treatment, medical treatment and education services and completing referrals and applications for services.

1344.   *Making Requests for Funds and Vouchers* – Includes completing vouchers for clothing, special needs, transportation and phone cards.

1345.   *Resolve Conflicts*– Includes helping to resolve conflicts between the provider and client.

1346.   *Provide Services*– Includes direct counseling of the child or adult who is the primary focus of the case, homemaker services and other services provided directly by OCS staff.

1350.   Collecting Eligibility Information
Includes contacting families or others to collect information and documentation that would make a child and/or family eligible for Title IV-E, Medicaid or other reimbursement to the state.

1361 – 1363.   Travel

1361.   *Arrange travel* – Includes time arranging and preparing for traveling to the contact site.

1362.   *Conduct travel* – Includes actual travel time, including time spent waiting for buses, trains or planes.

1363.   *Post-travel documentation* – Includes completing paperwork associated with travel and reimbursement.

1370.   Transportation of Client

Includes transportation provided for a client when no substantive conversation regarding the case occurs. Waiting time between dropping the client off at the appointment and providing the return ride should be coded here. When using waiting time to perform other tasks such as writing case notes, use the task code of the actual activity.

1381 – 1382.   Supervised Visitation
 Includes activities associated with preparing for and carrying out supervision of visits between parents and children in out-of-home placement.

1381.   *Arrange for Visits* – Includes arranging logistics of the visit when the caseworker or other OCS staff will be present to supervise the visit.

1382.   *Supervise Visits* – Includes actual visit time while caseworker or other agency staff person is observing.

1401 – 1405.   Computer Documentation
Includes all case documentation in ORCA or other systems not covered in previous codes.

1401.   *Record Information in ORCA* – Recording information on a case directly into the computer system.

1402.   *Conduct Inquiries on the Computer* – Obtaining information from information systems and other DHSS or OCS sources to determine case status or for other information needs related to a case, but not including initial screening.

1403.   *Complete Forms in Preparation for Computer input.*

1404.   *Request and Wait for Help Desk Support* – Includes case specific data entry assistance; Help Desk and tickets.

1405.   *Down time/Waiting Time during Case Specific Task* – Includes time spent waiting for the computer to respond while performing case specific input or inquiry.

1411 – 1416.   Paper Documentation
Includes all case documentation not covered in previous codes which are completed manually (i.e., paper form). (Do not use codes for any computer updates.)

1411.   *Case Notes* – Includes completing, dictating or transcribing case notes.

1412.   *Forms* – Includes all forms such as social profile, histories and updates related to issues of dependency, neglect and termination of parental rights. Also includes forms related to determination of eligibility and financial forms.

1413.   *References* – Obtaining references for prospective foster or adoptive parents or other providers or caregivers.

1414.   *Correspondence* – Includes all correspondence about the case including all notifications regarding or related to investigation.

1415.   *Incoming Communications*– Includes examining reports, and other reviews in order to determine case requirements. Includes police and court reports, private petitions, and written reports of maltreatment. Does not include initial intake documentation.

1416.   *Translation* – Providing written or oral language translation (including sign language) for staff or other agencies.

1421 – 1422.   ***Report Preparation***

> *1421.*   *Adoption Progress Report* – Completing an adoption progress report for a child.

> *1422.*   *Other Reports* – Includes any other case specific reports not covered elsewhere, e.g., does not include court reports.

1430.   ***Policy Review and Clarification***
Includes examining OCS manuals and other standards in order to determine which policies apply to a specific case.

1501 – 1508.   ***Prepare for Court Hearings***
Includes preparation activities including preparing legal documents.

> *1501.*   *Consult with Attorney/Attorney General* – Includes briefing attorney, briefing by attorney, obtaining information, or providing information for court hearings.

> *1502.*   *Consult with Specialist or Supervisor*

> *1503.*   *Prepare Information* – Includes review of case records and any other data collection or analysis needed for court documents and court participation.

> *1504.*   *Prepare Report to Court* – Including preparing proposed adoption report and other reports such as CPS, Foster Care, Guardianship or parental evaluation as well as predisposition reports, permanency reports, affidavits, reports for termination of parental rights and compelling reason reports.

> *1505.*   *Complete Legal Documents* – Includes preparation of petitions and other legal documents, except for court reports and notifications.

> *1506.*   *Conduct Paternity Search* – Includes activities involved in establishing paternity and searching for missing and unknown parents. Activities may include requesting and assisting with a paternity test (DNA test).

> *1507.*   *Discovery* – Includes tasks gathering, purging, copying and sanitizing documentation for other parties for court hearings.

> *1508.*   *Prepare and Send Notifications*

1511 – 1513.   ***Participate in Court Hearings***
Includes time going to court, participating in hearings and recording results.

> *1511.*   *Pre-court Meeting* – Includes time discussing the case with participants, including family members, service providers, guardians ad litem, tribal representatives and legal counsel, prior to the start of the court hearing.

> 1512. *Court Hearing and Court-related Meetings* – Includes time while hearing is in progress. Also includes negotiation and/or mediation time.
>
> 1513. *Waiting Time* – Code here only when no other work is done while waiting. When using waiting time to perform other tasks such as writing case notes, use the task code of the actual activity.

1521 – 1525.   Supervisory Tasks

Includes time spent on case-specific activities by a supervisor or by a worker temporarily performing the role of the supervisor.

> 1521. *Assign a Worker to a Case*
>
> 1522. *Approve/Authorize Case Action*
>
> 1523. *Consult with Worker*
>
> 1524. *Review Cases*
>
> 1525. *Confer with Recipient*

1601 – 1609.   Licensing and Monitoring

Includes assessing, approving, licensing and monitoring providers of out-of-home services, for relative (licensed and un-licensed), non-relative and facility foster care providers as well as day care providers regardless of which staff member provides them. See non-case specific tasks for recruitment activities not involving a specific provider or child.

> 1601. *Provide Information/Accept Application* – Includes time spent in assisting an applicant with completing forms to be approved or licensed for out-of-home placement.
>
> 1602. *Provider Orientation* – Includes time spent providing orientation to an individual prospective provider. See non-specific tasks for group orientations not involving a specific provider.
>
> 1603. *Conduct Home Visit/Home Study* – Includes all visits required for a home study and related activities such as assessing home for compliance with standards and writing up the results.
>
> 1604. *Interview References* – Includes time spent interviewing persons acquainted with the prospective provider to determine latter's suitability as a provider of out-of-home services. This can be done face-to-face or by telephone.
>
> 1605. *Train Individual Provider* – Includes arranging, monitoring and delivering training to foster care providers as well as providing ongoing support.
>
> 1606. *Resolve Conflicts* – Includes helping to resolve conflicts, between families and providers, and providing follow-up to reported conflicts.

1607. *Check on Complaints and Potential Licensing Violation* – Includes activities in response to a complaint of a licensing violation.

1608. *Develop and Monitor Corrective Action* – Includes working with providers to develop and monitor correction action plans.

1609. *Update Information for Licensing Renewal* – Includes updating information initially collected during application and assessment process.

1701 – 1707. Clerical
Includes time spent on case specific clerical activities.

1701. *Filing* – Includes filing administrative paperwork, case records and other documentation.

1702. *Typing/Word Processing* – Includes typing and/or word-processing forms, letters, memos or other work where the information has already been recorded in another hard copy form. If the task is that of typing information for the first time, it would be recorded under the most appropriate activity code above.

1703. *Photocopying* – Includes photocopying or microfilming materials or waiting to photocopy or microfilm.

1704. *Mailing/Faxing* – Includes preparing correspondence on the case for mailing, but does not include the actual writing or typing.

1705. *Purging* – Includes activities such as identifying qualifying cases and relevant documents for purging, and completing the tasking of purging case documentation.

1706. *Redacting* – Includes expunging and editing case specific documents to protect the confidentiality of clients or others involved with the agency.

1707. *Shredding* – Includes shredding case specific documents.

1801 – 1807. Conflicts, Appeals and Grievances
Includes receipt and review of request for appeal or grievance (presented in writing or by other means), setting up and attending conference/hearing, developing summary of facts, and sending out notification of action letters.

1801. *Provide Information* – Provide applicant or client with written rights of appeal or grievance, written appeal or grievance policy, and other information in written or oral form.

1802. *Conflict Resolution* – Includes helping to resolve conflicts, establish corrective actions and providing follow-up to reported conflicts prior to reaching the formal grievance stage.

1803.   *Schedule Conference or Hearing* – Includes setting date and time for conference, arranging meeting space, and notifying applicant/ client.

1804.   *Develop Summary of Facts*

1805.   *Attend Conference/ Hearing* – Includes waiting for applicant/ client, participating in face-to-face or telephone conference, and documenting conference.

1806.   *Conduct Follow-up Activity after Conference/ Hearing* – Includes updating the file and setting date and time for follow-up activities.

1807.   *Document Final Disposition of Conference/ Hearing* – Includes recording information in ORCA.

Part 2.   Administration

2001 – 2007.   General Administration

> *2001.   Check E-mail – Includes reviewing and responding to non case specific e-mail messages.*

> *2002.   Review Policy Manual Updates*

> *2003.   Attend Supervisory or Other Administrative Meetings – Includes meetings that are not related to a specific case. This includes unit, departmental, and committee meetings.*

> *2004.   Complete Reports and Records – Includes completing mileage reports, time sheets, or other reports of an administrative nature that are not related to a specific case.*

> *2005.   Conduct planning, Caseload Management, Scheduling, and Time Management Activities*

> *2006.   Orientation for Group of Service Applicants – Includes weekly or monthly meetings in which groups of new recipients or clients are oriented to the program in which they are seeking benefits.*

> *2007.   Maintain Office, Equipment and Vehicles – Includes arranging for or providing maintenance on vehicles and equipment.*

2101 - 2106.   Community Outreach
Includes time spent on non-case related community contacts, such as time devoted to community presentations, resource development, advisory boards, and multidisciplinary committees. Also includes time spent on staging events for the community or for groups of providers, including foster and adoptive parents.

> *2101.   Preparation – Includes lining up speakers and facilities, preparing press releases, contacting the media, and preparing mailings.*

> *2102.   Provide Community Training and Education – Includes meeting with educators, steering committees, advisory committees and boards.*

> *2103.   Job Development – Includes meeting with area employers or attending job fairs for the purpose of building community contacts and increasing potential job placement possibilities.*

> *2104.   Participate in Outreach other than Community Training/Education or Job Development*

2105.   *Aftermath* – Paying expenses, processing travel vouchers, analyzing
             evaluations and pursuing reimbursement.

2106.   *Provide Information and Referral*

2201.   Travel
Includes all out-of-office travel time for any work-related purpose that is not related to a specific
case (e. g., attending meetings, training or conferences). Includes time arranging, preparing for
and traveling.

2301 - 2304.   Clerical, Reception, Telephones

2301.   *Clerical* – Includes typing, filing, mail handling, and photocopying not
             related to a specific case in the worker's own caseload.

2302.   *Reception* – Includes time logging arriving clients and visitors, and
             notifying workers of arrivals.

2303.   *Telephones* – Includes time answering non-case specific telephone calls
             and transferring callers to the appropriate personnel.

2304.   *Hotline Phone System* – Includes time spent staffing the hotline number.

2401.   Computers and ORCA
Includes time spent learning how to navigate ORCA, waiting for Help Desk or Tech Support or
correcting a problem within the system.

2501 - 2510.   Supervisory Tasks
Includes time spent on non-case specific activities by the supervisor or by a worker filling in for a
supervisor.

2501.   *Perform Group Supervision* – Includes reviewing new policies and case
             practice initiatives.

2502.   *Conduct Meetings* – Includes administrative meetings, unit meetings,
             meetings with management or other OCS meetings.

2503   *Schedule Worker Time and Leave*

2504.   *Update Information in ORCA*

2505.   *Monitor Time Sheets, Expense Vouchers, and Similar Records*

2506.   *Screen and Interview Job Applicants*

2507.   *Conduct Performance Evaluations*

2508.   Counsel Staff (e. g., personnel problems, conflicts, and complaints)

2509.   Process Grievances

2510.   Conduct Disciplinary Action

2601.   Federal and State Reviews and Communication
Includes time spent contacting non-OCS state, federal, or local government agencies to collect or provide information or for purposes of policy clarification (other than regarding a specific case, where the appropriate contact code should be used instead). Includes work for or with legislative committees. Includes preparing for a federal review.

2701.   Special Studies
Includes all time spent on special projects or surveys (e. g., time study and other projects).

2801.   Unit Statistics
Includes time spent on setting quantifiable goals, developing or examining unit statistics and non-case specific quality assurance.

2901.   On-Call
 Includes time spent either near a phone or while wearing a pager outside regularly scheduled hours for OCS. Actual time worked during on-call periods is applicable to specific task areas.

Part 3.   Training

3001 - 3008.   ***Training and Staff Development***

3001.   *Train Staff* – Preparing for and providing formal training programs, including new and on-going worker training. Code time spent training interns under 3002.

3002.   *Train and Supervise Interns*

3003.   *Train Providers (foster care, adoptive parents and other care providers)* – Delivering programs to current and potential providers.

3004.   *Receive Training for New OCS Positions* – Includes training for job upgrades or interviewing for new positions within the agency (TONE).

3005.   *Receive Training (other than for new OCSS positions)* – Includes time spent in formal training programs (whether related to policies, procedures, or job specific skills. On the job training should not be included but instead should be coded under the appropriate case related task.

3006.   *Receive Training on ORCA* (other than TONE)

3007.   *Professional Reading* - Time spent in background reading of journals and other professional literature.

3008.   *Interact with Professional Organizations* – Includes attending conferences and ordering books or other materials.

Part 4.   Non-work Time

4001 – 4007.   **Lunch, Holiday, Vacation and Other Leave Time**

4001.   *Breaks.*

4002.   *Lunch.*

4003.   *Sick Leave* – Authorized time taken off due to illness or for a doctor's appointment.

4004.   *Vacation and Other Leave* – Includes leave such as annual vacation, personal, administrative, emergency, holiday, military service and jury duty.

4005.   *Flex Time* – Includes official time taken off to compensate for overtime worked.

4006.   *Personal Time* – Time (other than breaks or lunch) not otherwise classified.

4007.   *Unauthorized or Disciplinary Leave*

APPENDIX C

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
OFFICE OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES
WORKLOAD STUDY

CASE TYPES AND DEFINITIONS

PROTECTIVE SERVICES INQUIRIES AND REPORTS

Begins with receipt of a written or verbal allegation of child abuse or neglect or a request for information or services and ends with the decision that the report will be screened in and assigned to an investigator; that the agency will provide information and referral only; that the agency will determine need for services; or that no action will be taken.

101   Screening/Intake Report

An inquiry containing an allegation of abuse or neglect.

102   Information and Referral or Service Request

An inquiry requesting information (including how to obtain a license) or help with a family problem.

PROTECTIVE SERVICES INVESTIGATIONS

Begins with the assignment of the investigation/assessment and ends with the decision of whether to open the case for services.

201   Basic Investigation

An investigation during which no child is removed from the home.

202   Investigation with Emergency Removal

An investigation during which at least one child is removed from the home.

Begins after the determination of the need for ongoing services and the case is opened with the child not placed in care and ends when the case is closed or when the child is placed in care.

301   Ongoing Child Protective Services with Custody

Services provided to families where the child remains in the home and at least one child has been placed in the legal (but not physical) custody of the agency. This case type is also known as Court-ordered Supervision Cases in some jurisdictions. This case type may also be used to signify children remaining in the home who have at least one sibling removed from the home.

302   Ongoing Child Protective Services without Custody

Services provided to families where the child remains in the home and the child has not been placed into the custody of the agency.

PERMANENCY (INCLUDING FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION)

Begins when the agency takes physical custody of a child and ends when the child is returned home, adopted, receives a legal guardian, reaches legal majority or is emancipated. The case type changes as the child moves from one type of placement to another.

401   Relative Home

Services provided to children in agency custody who are residing in a relative's home, whether or not a foster care payment is made.

402   Foster Home

Services provided to children in agency custody who are residing in a non-relative foster home.

403   Group Home

Services provided to children placed in a facility such as a group home, therapeutic home or shelter.

404   Institution, including Residential Child Care Facilities and Hospitals

Services provided to children placed in a facility requiring intensive services such as a hospital or residential treatment facility or to children placed by court order in a medical or mental health facility. This placement type should not be used for children placed into a hospital on a temporary basis (i.e., surgery, emergency medical care).

405   Pre-adoptive Home

Services provided to children with a permanency goal of adoption who are placed with prospective adoptive parents.

406   Supervised Independent Living

Services provided to children in an Independent Living arrangement supervised by the local department.

407   Runaways, AWOLS, Whereabouts Unknown

Services provided when a foster child runs away or his/her whereabouts are otherwise unknown. Ends with the earlier of: 1) location of the child; or 2) termination of agency legal custody. If this status continues for more than six months after the child ran away, the status changes to "On-going child protective services with custody."

408   Trial Home Visit

Services provided to children who are returned home but remain in agency custody. However, if this status continues for more than six months after the child's physical return home, the status changes to "On-going child protective services with custody."

410   ICPC Placement (Alaska is receiving state)

Begins when the local department receives a request to assume supervision of the child and ends with the earliest of: 1) termination of custody or jurisdiction by the sending state; 2) return of the child to the sending state; 3) the child's majority; 4) finalization of the child's adoption; or 5) award of legal guardianship to the caretaker. This service code takes precedence over other applicable codes.

411   ICPC Placement (Alaska is sending state)

Begins when the local department requests an out-of-state placement and ends with the earliest of: 1) termination of custody or jurisdiction by the local department; 2) return of the child to Alaska; 3) the child's majority; 4) finalization of the child's adoption; or 5) award of legal guardianship to the caretaker. This service code takes precedence over other applicable codes.

The "case" in the following case types is the prospective or current foster or adoptive family rather than the client.

501   Emergency Foster Provider Assessment

Begins with the receipt of the request for emergency placement into an unlicensed home and ends with the earliest of: 1) emergency approval of the provider; 2) denial of the provider; or 3) withdrawal of the request.

502   Relative Assessment

Begins with the request to be placed with a relative, regardless of desire to serve as an unlicensed provider, and ends with the earliest of: 1) approval; 2) denial; or 3) withdrawal of the request.

503   Foster Provider Assessment

Begins with the receipt of the application and ends with the earliest of: 1) approval of the provider; 2) denial of application; or 3) withdrawal of the application. Foster providers for purposes of licensing will include family foster homes, shelters and group homes.

504   Foster Provider Renewal

Begins one month prior to the due date of the renewal of an existing foster provider (includes relative and non-relative foster providers) and ends with the earliest of: 1) renewal; 2) denial of the renewal; or 3) withdrawal of the provider from the program.

505   Foster Provider Supervision

Begins with the licensing or renewal of the provider and ends with the earliest of: 1) the provider's withdrawal from the program; 2) closure of the home by the agency; or 3) one month prior to the due date of the renewal.

506   Adoptive Home Study and Approval

Begins with the receipt of the application or the identification of a prospective adoptive family for a child in agency custody and ends with the earlier of: 1) the decision to approve or deny the application; or 2) the withdrawal of the family's application.

507   Residential Child Care Facility Assessment

Begins with the receipt of the application of a residential child care facility for licensing and ends with the earlier of: 1) the decision to approve or deny the application; or 2) the withdrawal of the application.

508   Residential Child Care Facility Renewal

Begins one month prior to the due date of the renewal of a licensed residential child care facility and ends with the earliest of: 1) renewal; 2) denial of the renewal; or 3) withdrawal of the provider from the program.

CASE TYPES AND MANDATED TASKS[8]

Protective Services Inquiries and Reports

101   Screening/Intake Report

        1011:   Screen for history of abuse and neglect

        1401:   Record information in ORCA

102   Information and Referral or Service Request

        1401:   Record information in ORCA

Protective Services Investigations

201   Basic Investigation

        1101, 1103 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home
                or
        1111, 1113, 1117 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with the child *not* in the home

        1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

        1012:   Screen for criminal history

        1203:   Conduct a safety assessment

        1401:   Record information in ORCA

202   Investigation with Emergency Removal

        1101, 1103 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home
                or

        1111, 1113, 1117 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with the child *not* in the home

        1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

        1012:   Screen for criminal history

        1203:   Conduct a safety assessment

---

[8] The three-digit numbers represent case type codes, while the four-digit numbers represent the task codes to be used in the time study.

1341:   Locate placement provider

1401:   Record information in ORCA

Ongoing Services – In Home

301   Ongoing Child Protective Services Cases with Custody **and**
302   Ongoing Child Protective Services Cases without Custody

    1101, 1103 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home

    1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

    1401:   Record information in ORCA

Ongoing Services – Permanency (Including Foster Care and Adoption)

401   Relative Home **and**
402   Foster Home **and**
403   Group Home **and**
404   Institution **and**
405   Pre-adoptive Home

    1101, 1103 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home
                             or
    1111, 1113, 1117 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with the child *not* in the home

    1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

    1106 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the foster parent in the home
                             or
    1116 or 1117:   Face-to-face contact with the foster parent *not* in the home
                             or
    1118 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with other placement provider *not* in the home
                             or
    1135:   Non face-to-face contact with the foster parent
                             or
    1136:   Non face-to-face contact with other placement provider

    1401:   Record information in ORCA

406   Supervised Independent Living

    1101 or 1103:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home
                             Or

1111, 1113, 1117 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with the child *not* in the home

    1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

    1401:   Record information in ORCA

407   Runaways, AWOLS, Whereabouts Unknown

    1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

    1401:   Record information in ORCA

408   Trial Home Visit

    1101 or 1103:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home
                or
    1111, 1113, 1117 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with the child *not* in the home

    1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

    1401:   Record information in ORCA

409   ICPC Placement (Alaska is receiving state)

    1101, 1103 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the child in the home
                or
    1111, 1113, 1117 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with the child *not* in the home

    1106 or 1107:   Face-to-face contact with the foster parent in the home
                or
    1116 or 1117:   Face-to-face contact with the foster parent *not* in the home
                or
    1118 or 1119:   Face-to-face contact with other placement provider *not* in the home
                or
    1135:   Non face-to-face contact with the foster parent
                or
    1136:   Non face-to-face contact with other placement provider

    1401:   Record information in ORCA

410   ICPC Placement (Alaska is sending state)

    1131:   Non face-to-face contact with the child

    1102:   Face-to-face contact with the parent, legal guardian or Indian custodian in the home

1135:		Non face-to-face contact with the foster parent
	or	
1136:		Non face-to-face contact with other placement provider

1401:   Record information in ORCA

Foster and Adoptive Provider Licensing/Approval

501   Emergency Foster Provider Assessment **and**
502   Relative Assessment

1602:   Conduct a home visit

1011:   Screen for History of Abuse and Neglect

1012:   Screen for Criminal History

1401:   Record information in ORCA

503   Foster Provider Assessment **and**
504   Foster Provider Renewal **and**
506   Adoptive Home Study and Approval **and**
507   Residential Child Care Facility Assessment

1603:   Conduct home visit/home study

1011:   Screen for History of Abuse and Neglect

1012:   Screen for Criminal History

1401:   Record information in ORCA

505   Foster Provider Supervision

None

508   Residential Child Care Facility Renewal

1603:   Conduct home visit/home study

1401:   Record information in ORCA

Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type					
	Intake	**Ongoing**	**Generic**	**Licensing**	**Supervisors**	**Total**
Case Specific Activities						
Intake Activities						
Receive Allegations	5.29%	0.20%	1.75%	0.10%	2.02%	2.10%
Request Welfare Check	0.26%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%
Provide I & R	0.46%	0.05%	0.58%	0.10%	0.11%	0.25%
Obtain Approval of Intake	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.06%	0.19%
Screening						
Screen for CA/N History	1.03%	0.05%	0.12%	0.19%	0.32%	0.40%
Screen for Criminal History	0.56%	0.20%	0.00%	0.48%	0.11%	0.31%
Screen for Service History	0.31%	0.10%	0.12%	0.10%	0.11%	0.16%
Face-to-face in Home						
with Child	1.18%	1.16%	1.05%	0.10%	0.00%	0.83%
With Parent	1.85%	1.11%	0.82%	0.00%	0.21%	0.99%
With Parent and Child	1.23%	1.06%	0.35%	0.29%	0.00%	0.75%
With Collaterals	0.00%	0.10%	0.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%
With Tribal Representative	0.00%	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
With Foster Parent	0.10%	0.41%	0.12%	0.10%	0.00%	0.18%
With Child and Foster Parent	0.21%	0.35%	0.23%	0.10%	0.00%	0.21%
With Others	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%
Face-to-face Not in Home						
With Child	2.93%	1.92%	1.75%	0.10%	0.11%	1.66%
With Parent	0.98%	1.01%	1.05%	0.00%	0.53%	0.78%
With Parent and Child	0.51%	0.30%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%
With Collaterals	0.82%	0.30%	0.58%	0.48%	0.42%	0.53%
With Tribal Representative	0.21%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%
With Foster Parent	0.10%	0.10%	0.12%	0.00%	0.11%	0.09%
With Child and Foster Parent	0.00%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type						
With Other Placement Provider	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.10%	0.21%	0.06%
With Child and Other Placement Provider	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
With Others	0.82%	0.81%	0.00%	0.00%	0.32%	0.52%
Non-face-to-face With Child	0.15%	0.51%	0.82%	0.00%	0.11%	0.31%
With Parent	2.10%	2.58%	2.46%	0.10%	0.85%	1.81%
With Collaterals	1.90%	2.08%	2.11%	0.48%	1.06%	1.64%
With Tribal Representative	0.31%	0.35%	0.23%	0.10%	0.11%	0.25%
With Foster Parent	0.46%	2.03%	1.17%	1.25%	0.53%	1.14%
With Other Placement Provider	0.10%	1.52%	0.58%	0.19%	0.42%	0.64%
With Others	0.77%	1.37%	1.40%	0.29%	0.42%	0.90%
Structured Decision-making Initial Screening	0.41%	0.05%	0.12%	0.00%	0.11%	0.16%
Safety Assessment	0.15%	0.05%	0.94%	0.19%	0.00%	0.21%
Protective Capacity and Needs	0.05%	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%
Future Risk of Abuse and Neglect	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
Child and Family Re-appraisal in Home	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
Reunification Decision	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
Other Assessments Not in SDM	0.05%	0.15%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%
Investigative Decision	1.03%	0.15%	0.70%	0.10%	0.53%	0.52%
Service Planning Develop Case Plan	1.33%	0.56%	0.35%	0.00%	0.96%	0.73%
Update Case Plan	0.62%	1.22%	0.12%	0.00%	0.74%	0.65%
Update Concurrent Plan	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.01%
Review Plan with Supervisor	0.36%	0.25%	0.12%	0.00%	0.21%	0.22%
Team Meetings Preparation Time	0.10%	0.46%	0.58%	0.00%	0.42%	0.30%

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type						
Waiting Time	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
Participation	0.77%	2.43%	0.23%	0.29%	1.27%	1.18%
Case Consultation						
With Management	0.15%	0.20%	0.23%	0.00%	0.21%	0.16%
With Supervisor	1.49%	1.52%	1.17%	0.68%	1.38%	1.32%
With Co-worker	0.92%	0.91%	0.47%	0.68%	1.38%	0.89%
With Provider	0.15%	0.81%	0.58%	0.10%	0.11%	0.38%
With Others	0.51%	0.35%	0.47%	0.00%	0.74%	0.41%
Case Reviews Preparation Time	0.00%	0.56%	0.47%	0.10%	0.64%	0.33%
Participation	0.15%	1.47%	0.94%	0.00%	1.91%	0.86%
Service Arrangement or Provision Locate Placement Provider	0.67%	1.77%	1.64%	0.96%	0.64%	1.15%
Help Client Obtain Services	0.41%	1.62%	0.82%	0.10%	0.42%	0.77%
Refer to or Arrange Therapeutic Services	0.51%	1.32%	1.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.67%
Make Requests for Funds or Vouchers	0.21%	1.11%	0.35%	0.10%	0.64%	0.53%
Resolve Conflicts	0.00%	0.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%
Provide Services	0.10%	0.30%	0.35%	0.00%	0.21%	0.19%
Collect Eligibility Information	0.05%	0.25%	0.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%
Travel Arrange	0.46%	0.81%	0.94%	0.19%	0.53%	0.59%
Conduct	2.98%	2.48%	4.21%	4.63%	0.42%	2.89%
Document	0.05%	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%
Transportation of Client	0.92%	1.57%	1.40%	0.10%	0.32%	0.96%
Supervised Visitation Arrange	0.41%	1.72%	1.52%	0.10%	0.11%	0.84%
Supervise	0.46%	2.68%	0.23%	0.00%	0.21%	0.98%
Computer Documentation Record in ORCA	10.22%	5.87%	6.67%	4.63%	3.61%	6.72%
Conduct Inquiries	0.82%	0.66%	0.94%	0.68%	0.42%	0.71%
Complete Forms for Input	0.41%	0.20%	0.35%	0.39%	0.00%	0.28%

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type						
Request/Wait for Help Desk Support	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	0.03%
Down Time / Wait Time	0.05%	0.05%	0.12%	0.29%	0.11%	0.10%
Paper Documentation Case Notes	1.44%	0.61%	1.75%	0.10%	0.32%	0.87%
Complete Forms	0.51%	1.22%	0.70%	0.68%	0.42%	0.75%
Obtain References	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
Write Correspondence	0.56%	0.51%	0.70%	0.19%	0.00%	0.43%
Receive Incoming Communications	0.21%	0.25%	0.47%	0.10%	0.11%	0.22%
Report Preparation Adoption Progress Report	0.00%	0.10%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
Other Reports	0.36%	0.41%	0.58%	0.00%	0.11%	0.31%
Policy Review and Clarification	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.01%
Prepare for Court Hearings Consult with Attorneys	0.10%	0.51%	0.12%	0.19%	0.21%	0.25%
Consult with Specialist or Supervisor	0.05%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%
Prepare Information	0.31%	0.81%	2.22%	0.19%	0.64%	0.73%
Prepare Report to Court	0.41%	1.52%	1.87%	0.00%	0.64%	0.89%
Complete Legal Documents	0.98%	1.06%	0.94%	0.00%	0.21%	0.74%
Conduct Paternity Search	0.10%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
Prepare and Send Notifications	0.05%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%
Participate in Court Hearings Pre-court Meeting	0.46%	0.46%	0.47%	0.00%	0.11%	0.34%
Court Hearing	1.28%	3.19%	1.64%	0.10%	1.49%	1.73%
Waiting Time	0.15%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%
Supervisory Tasks Assign Cases	0.05%	0.35%	0.00%	0.58%	4.78%	0.87%
Approve Case Action	0.05%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.42%	0.09%

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type						
Consult with Worker	0.05%	0.05%	0.00%	0.68%	6.26%	1.01%
Review Cases	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.39%	3.72%	0.61%
Confer with Client	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.11%	0.01%
Licensing and Monitoring Provide Information / Accept Applications	0.00%	0.05%	0.12%	4.82%	0.11%	0.78%
Conduct Provider Orientation	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.04%
Conduct Home Visit	0.05%	0.51%	0.00%	5.98%	0.00%	1.08%
Interview References	0.05%	0.10%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.12%
Train Individual Provider	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.11%	0.04%
Resolve Conflicts	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%	0.11%	0.22%
Check on Complaints	0.05%	0.00%	0.12%	1.83%	0.00%	0.31%
Develop and Monitor Corrective Action	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%	0.00%	0.10%
Update Information for Renewal	0.15%	0.00%	0.94%	7.62%	0.00%	1.33%
Clerical Filing	0.26%	0.30%	1.29%	1.83%	0.21%	0.64%
Typing	0.26%	0.25%	0.35%	0.39%	0.00%	0.25%
Photocopying	0.00%	0.10%	0.12%	0.29%	0.00%	0.09%
Mailing	0.36%	0.10%	0.47%	0.10%	0.11%	0.22%
Purging	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
Shredding	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.01%
Conflicts, Appeals and Grievances Provide Information	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.03%
Conflict Resolution	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.03%
Schedule Conference or Hearing	0.00%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%
Develop Summary of Facts	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type						
Administrative Activities						
General Administration Check e-mail	1.69%	1.06%	1.52%	3.76%	3.29%	2.03%
Review Policy Updates	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.48%	0.11%	0.10%
Attend Supervisory or Administrative Meetings	2.52%	2.08%	0.70%	2.89%	4.78%	2.53%
Complete Reports and Records	0.41%	0.20%	0.58%	1.06%	0.74%	0.52%
Plan, Schedule, etc.	0.36%	0.30%	0.58%	2.60%	0.42%	0.73%
Conduct Orientation for Service Applicants	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.11%	0.04%
Maintain Office or Equipment	0.41%	0.05%	0.70%	0.39%	0.42%	0.34%
Community Outreach Preparation	0.05%	0.05%	0.00%	0.68%	0.00%	0.13%
Provide Training / Education	0.10%	0.05%	0.12%	0.48%	0.32%	0.18%
Job Development	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%	0.00%	0.04%
Participate in Other Outreach	0.05%	0.25%	0.00%	0.58%	0.42%	0.24%
Provide Information and Referral	0.05%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%
Travel	0.46%	0.81%	2.11%	0.58%	1.27%	0.90%
Clerical, Reception, Telephones Clerical	0.62%	0.41%	2.69%	2.12%	1.06%	1.11%
Telephones	0.51%	0.20%	0.58%	0.58%	0.42%	0.43%
Computers and ORCA	0.21%	0.05%	0.23%	0.68%	0.21%	0.24%
Supervisory Tasks Perform Group Supervision	0.10%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.16%
Conduct Meetings	0.05%	0.05%	0.00%	0.29%	1.91%	0.34%
Schedule Worker Time or Leave	0.00%	0.05%	0.12%	0.00%	0.53%	0.10%
Update ORCA Information	0.31%	0.10%	0.12%	0.19%	0.32%	0.21%

	Intake	Ongoing	Generic	Licensing	Supervisors	Total
Percents of Time on Specific Tasks by Worker Type						
Monitor Time Sheets, Expense Vouchers, etc.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	0.03%
Screen and Interview Applicants	0.31%	0.30%	0.00%	2.12%	3.29%	0.96%
Conduct Performance Evaluations	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	1.38%	0.21%
Counsel Staff	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.32%	0.06%
Federal and State Reviews	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.04%
Special Studies	0.26%	0.35%	0.82%	1.93%	0.64%	0.67%
Produce Unit Statistics	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.03%
Training Activities						
Train Staff	0.15%	0.05%	0.00%	0.29%	0.64%	0.19%
Train and Supervise Staff	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.11%	0.04%
Train Providers	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.03%
Receive New Staff Training	0.31%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	0.18%
Receive Other Training	4.77%	3.65%	4.91%	0.96%	3.50%	3.70%
Receive Training on ORCA	0.36%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.11%	0.15%
Interact with Professional Organizations	0.15%	0.56%	0.00%	0.68%	0.53%	0.38%
Non-work Activities						
Breaks	0.92%	1.11%	1.40%	1.25%	1.17%	1.12%
Lunch	6.31%	5.92%	6.90%	7.71%	7.11%	6.60%
Sick Leave	3.95%	2.94%	2.92%	4.34%	6.37%	3.92%
Vacation or Other Leave	11.86%	9.97%	5.97%	11.86%	7.22%	9.91%
Flex Time	1.08%	1.16%	0.70%	1.16%	1.06%	1.07%
Personal Time	1.18%	0.76%	2.46%	0.77%	1.17%	1.15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The description in this appendix is designed to allow OCS to replicate the procedures HZA used to estimate the agency's workload burden as of December 1, 2005. Specifically, the procedures described here identify the cases to be counted by the case type and by the primary worker to whom the cases are assigned.

Once those steps have been accomplished, calculation of the workload burden is quite straightforward, following the formulae provided in the text of this report. Specifically, one counts the cases of each type assigned to the worker, multiplies the final case weights by the number of cases of that type and divides that result by the number of hours the worker has available for case specific work. If the answer is greater than one, the worker is over-burdened; if it is less than one, the worker can reasonably have more cases assigned to him or her.

Essentially the same procedure can be used for calculating the workload burden of a unit, an office, a region or the state as a whole. The only difference is that after obtaining counts of each case type and multiplying by the final case weights, one divides the result by the total of all hours all of the relevant workers have available for case specific work. The answers should be interpreted in the exactly same way, i.e., a result equal to one means that the unit, office or region has exactly the right workload burden.

As noted in the main text of this report, HZA recommends that, for high level executive purposes, workload burdens be calculated on a monthly basis. A single month's result may not provide an adequate picture, especially in Alaska, because the relatively small numbers of cases in many offices may result in wide fluctuations from one month to the next. Repeated calculations will permit more consistent patterns to be identified.

It should also be noted, however, that exactly the same calculations can, if OCS so desires, be made available to supervisors on an ad hoc basis to assist them in making casework assignments. While a monthly calculation for executive purposes would most appropriately be generated as a production report, information showing a supervisor the workload burden of each caseworker in the unit on any given day would most appropriately be produced as an on-line report the supervisor could access at will. However, should OCS decide to develop this capacity, both administrators and supervisors should remember that the case weights are based on averages and cannot provide precise and infallible estimates of actual workload burden in the real world. Two cases of the same type, receiving the same case weight, can represent widely varying actual demands on the caseworker's time because of factors not isolated and accounted for in the time study. Thus, these calculations can be an aid to supervisors but they cannot replace the supervisors' professional judgment.

Identification of Case Type Populations

Intake Reports

1) From the CPS_Report table, select all CPS reports received between the beginning of the previous month (called the "month begin" in what follows) and the end of the previous month (called the "month end" in what follows).[9]

2) Using the Assignments table, first select all worker assignments to responsibilities involving Intakes (worker assignment category = 3), then within that group the primary workers (worker assignment role = 1), within that group either referral or CPS reports (assignment group = 4 or 5, respectively), and finally assignment start dates between the month begin and the month end and not involving workers identified as "ORCA". If more than one case assignment for a single report results from this procedure, retain information only on the most recent assignment.

3) Associate the information from the first step (about the report) with the corresponding worker from the second step.

Information and Referral

HZA does not have the data needed to count the information and referral calls, and to that extent the estimates of current capacity are somewhat understated. Presumably, the process is similar to that of counting intake reports, except the data reside in a different table.

Investigations

1) Using the Investigations and CPS_Report tables, select all investigations associated with CPS reports, and from these, retain those investigations with an investigation begin date between the month begin and the month end. The investigation completion date should be either unpopulated or later than the month begin.[10]

2) Associate the investigations identified in the first step with information about workers, based on corresponding assignments dated on or after the date investigations began.

3) If more than one assignment is made for a single investigation, retain only the most recent one.

---

[9] For an on-line report which gives real-time results, the beginning of the month should be the date one month previous to the date the report is generated and the end should be the current date.
[10] For an on-line report OCS may wish to require simply that the investigation completion date be unpopulated, so that only currently open investigations are counted.

Ongoing Cases (In-home and out-of-home, each as specifically described)

Case types for intake and investigations were identified for whole families. While the whole family in ongoing cases will eventually be given a single case type designation, each child is given a designation first and then a rule is applied to assign complex cases, i.e., cases in which more than one case type appears, to specific types.

1) **All Types** – Using the Case_Group table, select all currently open cases (date case closed unpopulated or later than the month end) except those showing adoptive subsidy, guardianship subsidy or other inappropriate designations (case type not should not be equal to 1, 7 or 17).

2) **All Types** – Using the Case_Part table, associate cases identified in the preceding step with corresponding case participants who are active (status = 'A'), not collaterals (collateral flag = 'N'), and less than 19 years of age as of the month end date.

3) **All Types** – Using the Assignments table, identify all corresponding worker information associated with the preceding cases where the assignment start date equals or post-dates the date case opened, the assignment category designates a case (= 1) and workers identified as "ORCA" are not involved. Retain information only on those records reflecting open, primary worker assignments (assignment end date is unpopulated and assignment role = 1), retaining only the latest of such assignments if more than one appears.

4) **In-home Services – Court, In-home Services – No Court, Permanency – Relative Home, Permanency – Foster Home, Permanency – Group Home or Institution, ICPC Placement, Receiving** – Using Episode table information on out-of-home services provided, create flags identifying in-home and certain out-of-home case types as follows. First, all information on out-of-home services is selected (episode type not equal to 2). From the remaining records, designate the following types: Permanency – Relative Home (placement setting code = 35), Permanency – Foster Home (placement setting code – 36) and Permanency – Group Home or Institution (placement setting code = 37 or 38). However, if any of the children in these records has an ICPC Status equal to 'Y,' that child should be temporarily designated as ICPC Placement, Receiving, and that category will be merged later into "Permanency – Other."

If the child has neither a placement setting of 35, 36, 37 or 38 nor an ICPC status of "Y," the legal status needs to be checked. If the legal status (from the Case_Part table) is equal to 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 or 20, the child

is designated as In-home – Court. If the child's legal status is not equal to one of those codes, the child receives a preliminary designation as In-home – No Court. Given the fact that some of the latter cases represent open investigations and others, unreported closings (judging from the Case_Group table), the latter cases are then narrowed further, as follows.

First, using the Investigation table, any of the remaining cases associated with an open investigation (based on an investigation completion date which is either unpopulated or later than the month end) are eliminated. Next, any of the remaining cases with closing dates on or prior to the month end as reported in the Case_Closure table are eliminated. (If more than one closing date appears for the same case-opening episode, the latest is used). Finally, only cases opened within the three months preceding the month end are retained.

5) **Trial Home Visit** – Again using the Episode table information, if the placement end reason equals 46 and the placement discharge reason is unpopulated, the child is considered to be on trial home visit.

6) **Supervised Independent Living** – Again using the Episode table information as in step 4, if the placement setting code equals 2, the case type of supervised independent living is designated. This category is merged into "Permanency - Other" below.

7) **Pre-adoptive Home** - Using Episode table information again, if the placement setting code equals 33, the child is designated as in a pre-adoptive home case type.

8) **Runaways, AWOL, Whereabouts Unknown** – Using the Episode table information as in step 4, if the child's placement ending reason is equal to 40 or 41 and the placement discharge reason is unpopulated, the child is designated as a runaway. This category will be merged into "Permanency – Other" below.

9) **ICPC Placement, Sending** – From the Address table, select addresses where the state is not 'AK'; then select those addresses with the latest effective start date from among any records grouped on CD_Grp, CD_Grp_Type and ID_Adrss_Grp and having CD_Grp = 5 and CD_Grp_Type = 1. Using the Provider_Org and Episode tables, retain unduplicated information for those of the preceding addresses where: Provider_Org.ID_Prvd_Org = Episode. ID_Prvd_Org and Provider_Org.ID_Prvd_Org = Address.ID_Adrss_Grp and Episode. CD_ICPC_Status = 'N'. This category is also merged into "Permanency – Other" below.

10) **Permanency – Other** – Combine the temporary case type designations noted above, i.e., ICPC – Receiving, ICPS – Sending, Supervised Independent Living and Runaways, to arrive at a the final designation of "Permanency – Other."

11) **All Types** – Associate information identifying each of the above case types with all matching open cases of appropriate types as identified in step 3.

12) **Final Designations**: If all children in the case have the same case type, the family as a whole is given the designation for that type of case. If children have differing case types, designation of the family case should use the following priorities, i.e., the case is considered to be the first of the following types which is applicable:

   a) Group Home or Institution
   b) Pre-adoptive Home
   c) Foster Home
   d) Relative Home
   e) In-home – Court
   f) Trial Home Visit
   g) In-home – No Court
   h) Other Permanency

Licensing Supervision Cases

1) Using the Provider_Org table, select only active providers representing foster-type or residential care providers (Status = 'A', provider type = 8, 10, 21, 31, 66 or 73).
2) Using the preceding provider information as well as the License table, associate any matching license information available for providers identified in the first step, retaining all of the latter.
3) Using the Assignment table, select all assignments relating to providers (assignment category = 2).
4) Based on the approved providers identified in step 2, associate any corresponding assignment information identified in step 3, retaining all such providers.
5) Using Location table information, select all of the appropriate providers identified in step 4, but making sure that Ad_Name is not "Central Office," assignment start date and License start date are prior to the month end, and License end date is later than one month subsequent to the current date.

6) If more than one assignment start date appears relating to a given provider record as produced in #5, retain the information relating to the latest assignment. Finally, if more than one license start date is reported in connection with that most recent assignment date, retain only the information related to the most recent date.

Licensing Renewal Cases

1) Using the Provider_Org table, select only active providers representing foster-type or residential care providers (Status = 'A', provider type = 8, 10, 21, 31, 66 or 73).
2) Using the preceding provider information as well as the License table, associate any matching license information available for providers identified in the first step, retaining all of the latter.
3) Using the Assignment table, select all assignments relating to providers (assignment category = 2).
4) Based on the approved providers identified in step 2, associate any corresponding assignment information identified in step 3, retaining all such providers.
5) Using Location table information, select all of the appropriate providers identified in step 4, but making sure that Ad_Name is not "Central Office," assignment start date and License start date are prior to the month end, and License end date is within thirty days following the current date.
6) If more than one assignment start date appears relating to a given provider record as produced in #5, retain the information relating to the latest assignment. Finally, if more than one license start date is reported in connection with that most recent assignment date, retain only the information related to the most recent date.

Licensing Assessment Cases

1) Same as #1 for Licensing Supervision except selecting: a) either foster or residential providers (provider type = 8, 10, 21, 31, 66 or 73) and b) pending, in assessment or inactive providers (Status = 'P', 'S' or 'I').
2) Using the preceding provider information and the License table, associate any matching license information available for these providers, but only when 'date license application received' fell between the month begin and the month end, inclusive.
3) Using the Assignment table, select all assignments relating to providers (assignment category=2).
4) Based on the providers identified in step 2, associate any corresponding assignment information identified in step 3, retaining all such providers.

5)   Using Location table information, select all of the appropriate providers identified in step 4, but making sure that Ad_Name is not "Central Office" and assignment start date is prior to the month end.

6)   If more than one assignment start date appears relating to a given provider record as produced in #5, retain the information relating to the latest assignment. Finally, if more than one license start date is reported in connection with that most recent assignment date, retain only the information related to the most recent date.

Licensing Assessment and Renewal Cases

1)   Combine the Licensing Assessment and Licensing Renewal cases into a single group, "Licensing Assessment and Renewal."

2)   Eliminate any identified duplications.

Office Name	101	201	301	302	401 – 1 Child	401 – 2 or More Children	402 – 1 Child	402 – 2 or More Children	403 / 404 – 1 Child	403 / 404 – 2 or More Children	405	408	406 / 407 / 410 / 411	501 – 508, except for 505	505
Anchorage	402	105	12	54	37	26	85	44	80	118	10	16	24	47	313
Aniak	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3	2	4	2	0	1	0	0
Barrow	20	3	0	2	1	2	2	1	3	4	0	0	0	1	1
Bethel	24	3	0	10	9	7	9	6	14	15	2	1	4	4	47
Craig	4	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Delta Jct.	8	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Dillingham	2	0	1	2	2	1	3	1	1	7	0	1	1	0	6
Fairbanks	72	32	4	20	9	7	28	27	21	22	2	7	4	31	209
Fairbanks-Interior Bush	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	0
Galena	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homer	21	8	1	6	1	3	4	8	3	7	0	1	1	0	0
Juneau	48	20	1	17	5	4	17	16	16	10	3	4	2	20	94
Kenai	44	25	4	27	4	3	12	15	3	9	1	2	4	4	59
Ketchikan	34	6	0	13	0	4	8	8	6	3	0	0	0	0	0
King Salmon	4	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1
Kodiak	7	1	0	3	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	4	14
Kotzebue	4	1	1	3	2	0	3	5	10	18	0	0	0	0	0
Mat-Su	70	22	2	15	4	8	26	25	10	16	2	1	4	15	138
McGrath	18	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Nome	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	2	4	7	0	1	0	0	0
Petersburg	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	28
Seward	1	0	0	3	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sitka	3	0	0	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	2
St. Mary's	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Unalaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Valdez	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	11
Total	**792**	**230**	**28**	**190**	**88**	**82**	**231**	**178**	**180**	**253**	**24**	**38**	**52**	**129**	**924**

---

[11] Based on data of May 8, 2006.