WRMA

Washington State Children's Administration Workload Study

VOLUME II: METHODOLOGY

Prepared for:
Washington State
Department of Social and Health Services
Children's Administration
PO Box 45042
Olympia, WA 98504

***Prepared by*:**
Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.
2720 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95833

In collaboration with:
American Humane Association
63 Inverness Dr., East
Englewood, CO 80112

November 2007

Washington State Children's Administration Workload Study

VOLUME II: METHODOLOGY

Prepared for:
Washington State
Department of Social and Health Services
Children's Administration
PO Box 45042
Olympia, WA 98504

***Prepared by*:**
Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.
2720 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95833

In collaboration with:
American Humane Association
63 Inverness Dr., East
Englewood, CO 80112

November 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW OF STUDY METHODS

The Washington Workload Study team constructed a project work plan and participated in planning meetings to understand the Children's Administration (CA) environment of change; to create a process for the development of a *Workload Profile* of current performance; and to develop case weighing formulae in a Staff Allocation Model *(Prospective Workload Model)* which would then provide the team with the tools to understand workload.

The definition and description of the services that CA provides to children and families formed the foundation for the six phases of the methodology for the workload study:

- ***Define Work Categories (Task Inventory).*** The development of the service categories and tasks was the first phase of this project. Study groups from all regions and the central office participated in describing services and defining descriptive terms. The first phase was completed with the development of a Task Inventory.

- ***Develop Time Study Procedures.*** The second phase of the study involved developing a computerized time recording method for staff members to log all their work time for a month. A special feature of the time recording was to assign service time to specific children and families in the same way as would a computerized billing system. All CA staff participating in the study received training on the Task Inventory definitions and the computerized time log software. These procedures and computerized tools have been designed to be transferred to CA at the conclusion of the study. Modifications to study periods and values of the Task Inventory can be made without special computer programming skills.

- ***Collect Data.*** All CA staff members as well as central office staff members providing services to children and families participated in the time study for one month. The time study results described existing casework practice for services and stand as the current *Workload Profile*.

- ***Perform Data Management and Analysis.*** Accumulate measured time by case and calculate case frequency and service time statistics. Descriptive statistics include percentage of cases with a task, average frequency of task per case, and average time per occurrence of task.

- ***Construct Standard.*** Construction of times involved to complete required tasks addresses the "what if" workload. Focus groups in all regions of the state and central office helped to define workload requirements if all current legal, policy and ethical practice requirements were met on a timely basis. These estimates of workload for services were then reviewed again for consensus by CA staff from all regions. A final consensus-building group was made up of staff from all levels from each region and one policy expert from headquarters. Further analysis of tasks refined definitions of case requirements. Consideration of these results in the context of practice requirements led to final workload standards for the service categories.

- ***Staff Allocation Model.*** Analysis of case service times derived from time study data along with workload service standards provided resource estimations in the form of estimates of full time equivalents (FTEs). The gap between FTEs based on current workload[1] and the FTE workload demand estimated from Constructed Standard service times was estimated. The difference in the number of FTEs is the basis for estimating additional FTEs to bring the workload in line with practice expectations consistent with the constructed standards. There are, in addition, other ways of addressing the gap aside from adding staff.

2. TASK INVENTORY

Development of a Task Inventory is a critical phase of all child and family services workload projects. Each state has its own child protection statutes, policies and procedures. Terminology used in a workload study must be specific to a particular state system. The workload study team must identify the language related to work recognizable to all staff. To accomplish this, a list of work tasks was developed though a process involving a sequence of 27 focus group discussions among CA staff representatives from across the state.

2.1 Focus Group Planning

The amount of time required to develop a task inventory, specifically CA staff time, was a significant issue in planning focus groups. A number of options were weighed to determine the best approach. A mixed pool ranging from clerical and fiscal staff to social workers and area administrators were targeted as ideal focus group candidates to contribute information that would help create an accurate and comprehensive list of tasks performed by all staff working on child welfare cases. The composition goal of the focus groups was to include a representative of every classification of CA staff that touches a case.

The original workload study goal and the approach ultimately chosen by the Children's Administration was to conduct four focus groups in each of the 6 regions with 8 to 10 participants in each focus group. Two focus groups would be conducted in one location of a region and two focus groups would be conducted in another location of the region for a total of 24 focus groups in all six DCFS regions between October 16, 2006 and November 9, 2006. Additionally, 3 DLR focus groups were conducted for a grand total of 27 focus groups. This approach would provide information from a broad base of people doing the work; inform field staff about the project; and develop support for the project. Several alternatives were discussed and are shown in **Attachment A, Focus Group Options**.

The field team requested the name, payroll title, service area, email address, phone number and work location of each person who would participate in the focus groups. The Study Team developed templates of (1) a letter introducing the workload study (**Attachment B, WRMA &**

[1]The method for estimating current allocation is based on exiting caseload volumes and measured workload demand, not on the actual FTE allocation that Children's Administration has budgeted.

AHA Introduction Letter to Washington State CA for the Workload Study Project) (2) a focus group participant roster (**Attachment C, Focus Group Participant Roster**) and (3) a focus group schedule (**Attachment D, Category Definition Focus Group Schedule**).

2.2 Task Inventory Development and Data Template Design

The Study Team developed a preliminary task inventory using models from studies conducted in other states. Two data templates were drafted prior to the focus groups: one for the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS) (**Attachment E, DCFS Data Template**) another for the Division of Licensed Resources (DLR) (**Attachment F, DLR Data Template**).

In addition to communicating with CA staff to schedule the 240 CA participants, focus group planning involved coordinating logistics for 4 Subject Matter Experts to facilitate the focus group discussion; 4 recorders; and local primary and secondary contacts at each office where focus groups were held (See **Attachments D, Category Definition Focus Group Schedule**, and **Attachment G, Task Inventory Definition Focus Group Schedule**). A detailed list of position classifications was extracted from the 27 focus group rosters (see Attachment H). The focus group schedule also involved creating, photocopying and mailing packets to facilitators prior to each focus group. The Study Team ensured adequate orientation of facilitators and recorders prior to the focus group start date.

2.3 Facilitators and Recorders

Study Team focus group facilitators and recorders were provided with an orientation prior to the launch of the work definition focus groups to communicate the same key purposes and definitions of workload, caseload, and share the same concept of the Time Data Collector to be used during the time study. Subject Matter Experts who facilitated the focus groups possessed knowledge and experience on the difference between workload and caseload; time limits, stages, and types of cases; the features of the time data collector; and how to build consensus. The recorders were adept at communicating outcomes from previous focus groups as the data was collected from each focus group was shared with the next group. Recorders typed in each group's ideas on programs, services, and tasks. Recorders wrote down areas of agreement and disagreement between groups and captured comments (but no individual names) from participants to track Children's Administration policy issues; Time Data Collector training issues; potential substantial risks to the workload study; and other general observations.

2.4 Participants Packets

Each facilitator/recorder team was provided with an e-packet. Hard copies were mailed to facilitators of the participant packets and facilitator guidelines. Each packet contained:

a. Task Inventory Definition Agenda Fall 2006
b. Children's Administration CPS/CWS Redesign Schematic (copy for participants)
c. Candidates for Case Characteristics List (copy for participants)
d. Candidates for Unit of Service Categories to describe what is provided to children and families under the redesign model (copy for participants)
e. Task List Candidate Items (copy for participants)

f. Information Processing Categories (copy for participants)
g. Time Data Collector (TDC) Rationale (included 5 screen shots)

A copy of these documents can be found in **Attachment I**, **Facilitator's Guidelines** and **Attachment J, Participants Packet**.

The Task Inventory identified the underlying functional tasks performed by social workers and others providing services to cases. Using the Task Inventory, the workload measurement study documented the services clients receive from staff.

The Task Inventory was continually modified during the consensus building process. The project Advisory Committee reviewed and approved the final Task Inventory.

The design of Task Inventory was based on three dimensions to define case work.

(1) The "Program" dimension refers to the organizational unit within CA.
(2) The "Service" dimension refers to the functional assistance or help provided to a case.
(3) The "Task" dimension refers to the actions undertaken.

A case may be defined as an individual client, a family unit, a resource (kinship or foster care) family, or a nonenrolled individual.

The combination of Program-Service-Task values comprise a "Work Activity" that has an identifiable begin and end time. Thus a Work Activity spans a duration of time, and may be intended to benefit a specific case or a group of cases. Further, a Work Activity may or may not be assigned to a specific case or group of cases, and can consist of work that is not case-related (e.g., training, leave, etc.). This is how work is measured using the Task Inventory. Lastly, since some work can be assigned to specific cases, there may be case characteristics that are important in understanding differences in the duration of the same Work Activities.

3. TIME STUDY PROCEDURE

Upon completion of the Task Inventory, the American Humane Association (AHA) automated Time Data Collector (TDC) software application was customized for use in Washington. The Multidimensional Task Inventory initially contained:

1) Six different types of clients;
2) Three separate programs;
3) Twelve service areas;
4) Fifty-seven definitions of tasks organized in eight sub-headings; and
5) Fifteen case characteristics.

Categories were reduced to the smallest number possible to facilitate easy use of the drop down menu items in the TDC. The data team reviewed the Multidimensional Task Inventory against Braam requirements; compliance with the scope of work; and *Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS)* elements.

The customization of the TDC allows the State of Washington to have a copy of the AHA proprietary software for its ongoing use. This customization allows changes in the dates over which a study is to be conducted; changes in the code lists of Task Inventory categories; changes in the staff who are allowed to participate; and updating of the caseloads expected to be served by staff members during the time study.

It was decided that a census approach in which all staff completed the time study would be best. This eliminated complex sampling schemes and had the advantage of universal participation in a statewide effort. An alternative would have been random moment sampling.

Random Moment Time Study (RMTS) is a method to allocate large numbers of staff members into a set number of categories. It is typically used to allocate dollar costs in child welfare. Its strength lies in its minimal intrusiveness into the work day of staff members and in the power of statistical sampling. The degree of sampling necessary to adequately address relatively low frequency events would increase the cost of the study. Regional and office variations could not be efficiently explored with such a technique unless the procedure was dense sampling strategy. Of concern is the degree RMTS may address all case phases at the task level. With sampling enough points of observations, that is, random phone calls to staff members to determine what they are doing at that time, RMTS may be a viable method. With known frequency of service-task activities from a census approach of collecting all activities, an RMTS plan may be developed to adequately record events of interest.

3.1 Training-the-Trainers

A model was devised for WRMA to instruct up to 50 trainers in four face-to-face trainings (**Attachment K, Training Module**). Prior to the implementation of the Train-the-Trainers, a pilot training was conducted and feedback on ways to strengthen the curriculum was provided by WRMA and AHA staff (see **Attachment K.4, Training Module Curriculum**). A master list of trainers was produced by the CA workload study project lead. These trainers were instructed to train CA supervisors in face-to-face sessions. Many of these individuals had participated in the Task Inventory study groups and were very familiar with the workload study.

Three in-person Train-the-Trainer sessions were conducted by the data collection and fieldwork team leads at CA's training academy in Seattle, WA. Two makeup Webinar trainings were provided. Utilizing teleconferencing services and an online web seminar service (GoToWebinar.com, 1997-2007), trainers logged onto the internet and viewed the same training materials provided by trainers during the in-person training. Webinar training was used as well to introduce CA supervisors and staff to the Time Data Collector. The Train-the-Trainers preparation activities included:

a. Structuring the curriculum (**Attachment K.4, Training Module Curriculum**);
b. Developing a one page Quick Start (**Attachment K.5, Quick Start**);
c. Creating a quiz (**Attachment K.6, Time Study Quiz (True/False))**;
d. Designing a form to evaluate the training (**Attachment K.7, Trainer Evaluation)**;
e. Assembling a comprehensive user's guide (**Attachment K.8, Time Data Collector (TDC) User's Guide**);
f. Making a sign-in sheet (**Attachment K.10, Training-of-trainers Sign-In Sheet**);
g. Creating a paper log (**Attachment K.11, Washington Workload Study Paper Log**);
h. Preparing an instructional Power Point (**Attachment K.12, Instructional Training-of-trainers Power Point Handouts and CD)**;
i. Addressing time study expectations via a memorandum from the CA Assistant Secretary (**Attachment K.13, Workload Study Memo**); and
j. Disseminating a flyer from the Advisory Committee about the workload study (**Attachment L, Workload Study Info Sheet from the Advisory Committee**).

Trainers were provided with a demonstration copy of the software and all documentation and training aids. This demonstration software is attached on a compact disk.

The trainers provided information and hands-on training to their local staff and provided subsequent first line technical assistance.

To accurately label data collected from time study participants, the data team used six overarching groups of position types (**Attachment M, Definitions for Six Grouping Categories for Workload Study**) and an online Zoomerang Survey (**Attachment N.1, Position Classification Survey Results**) that was implemented to create a record of time study participants by Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) position classification and tenure.

3.2 TDC Software

The TDC software is a stand-alone proprietary application developed by American Humane Association that may reside either on the personal computer desktop or a network location. It requires no special installation. Data files produced by users are saved automatically to the same electronic location from which the application is initiated. TDC data files are automatically encrypted for security so as to remain unreadable without AHA's proprietary data converter. In Washington, the application was deployed and the data collected over the information system network.

The Children's Administration Technology Services (CATS) served two critical roles in producing information from the automated information system to make the TDC more efficient and effective. The first role was to produce electronic lists of staff members and their assigned caseloads. These lists were formatted to be accessible to the TDC so that a worker's caseload list was loaded each time he or she used the TDC. The second role was to deploy the TDC to network locations, provide desktop icons to access the TDC, and to gather the completed data files. To accomplish this goal, CATS devised a Workload Study Tool Deployment, Technical Support, and Training Plan.

3.3 Time Study Software Setup

Three files were transmitted to CATS for deployment. The technical procedures for these files are found in **Attachment O, Time Data Collector Implementation**.

The Time Data Collector software was configured in two versions, one for DCFS and one for DLR. Each had its code lists and caseload files. The Time Data Collector software is a compiled or executable file that logs in a user and provides the data entry procedures. To run, it must reside in the same folder or directory as two other files.

The TDCInfo.txt is a file of configuration parameters such as dates and code lists of services and tasks. It is critically important that the standard formatting of this file be used. **Attachment O** details this formatting.

The Caseload.txt file is a file of staff names, staff identifiers and associated cases. Only staff identifiers specified in this file can successfully log onto the TDC. It is critically important that the standard formatting of this file be used. **Attachment O** details this formatting.

3.4 Time Study Technical Assistance and Quality Assurance

The CA encouraged full participation in the time study with the slogan, "TELL YOUR STORY: All Day, Every Day, for Thirty Days!" which, along with pertinent time study information, was displayed on a poster that was distributed throughout all six regions. This study addressed both the time it took workers to handle their case responsibilities and the time it took workers to address other job requirements including paid leave. This provided a complete picture of child welfare work across the state. The statewide training for study participants was completed using a Training Module. The time study was implemented with 2,189 CA staff for 30 days.

3.5 Technical Assistance

A graphic representation of the path for obtaining technical assistance and support (TA) during the time study was drafted and discussed by the data team lead, CA workload study project lead, and workload study project director. The approved and final version of the TA graphic was shared with trainers, supervisors and staff (**Attachment N.2, Washington Workload Time Study Technical Assistance Path)**. A list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and answers were drafted and posted on the CA intranet as technical assistance was provided to trainers, supervisors and time study participants in the field. FAQs were posted on the CA intranet (**Attachment O.1, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs**).

3.6 Quality Assurance

Statewide weekly quality assurance reports provided feedback and ongoing support during the one month data collection process. QA reports summarized response rates and data collected. The Study Team provided this information to CA study coordinators who distributed the reports weekly to workload study contacts in the offices.

QA reports were for feedback purposes only. Four QA reports were prepared and distributed over the 5 week time study period.

After thirty days of data collection DCFS and DLR data was merged resulting in a very large data file of more than 500,000 activity records. The first step in "cleaning" the large database was to make office, division, and identification corrections based on feedback from the QA reports. Next, time data was omitted from the working database that designated nonwork activities such as time spent with no client contact while on call. To ensure accuracy of the data, corrections were made to paid leave and break data fields where additional leave and break times were inadvertently left out. Lastly, corrections were made for incorrect case numbers and distinctions were made among cases attributed to valid case numbers, and those attributed to multiple clients, nonenrolled clients, and nonclient related task activities.

3.7 Case Characteristics Problems

One special area of inquiry of this study was whether certain types of cases required additional levels of effort and represented additional workload compared to other cases. As part of the workload data collection process, staff were asked to indicate if any of the following characteristics were associated with their cases that received services during the study period. However, staff were not required to supply this information and the response levels were too low to permit adequate data analysis. In the future, the state may want to concentrate more attention on workload with respect to specific case characteristics and implement procedures to insure that the necessary data are collected. Shown below is ***Table 1, Case Characteristics***.

Table 1: Case Characteristics

DCFS Only Cases
1) Guardianship - Child's current legal status is a dependency guardianship
2) ICPC - Interstate compact case
3) ICW - Child is alleged or determined to be Native American
4) Chemically Dependent - Parent or child with diagnosed substance abuse issue
5) Child has four or more placements -
6) Mental Health - Parent or child with diagnosed mental health issue
7) LEP - Limited English Proficiency; Persons who do not speak or communicate well in English
8) SSI - Supplemental Security Income; Child has alleged, determined or has appealed SSI eligibility status
Division of Licensing Resources Only (case characteristics for DLR are self-explanatory, and are used for distinguishing types of facilities)
1) Child Care Facility
2) Foster Home Facility
3) Staffed Facility
4) Group Home Facility
5) Tribal Facility
6) Child Placing Agency

These characteristics were selected because a consideration was raised by focus group participants that such characteristics may increase the time needed to provide services. For the most part the presence or absence of these factors did not have a major influence on the measured time to provide services.

If CA decides in future studies to examine the effects of case characteristics on workload results, then a more intensive staff training and motivation effort needs to be staged. This would include clear definitions and criteria for recording. A detailed exposition of the importance of the recording and how the information would be used would likely be useful.

4. DATA MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS

Results of time study data entry are extracted from the TDC files by means of the Converter program described in Attachment O.1 regarding TDC implementation. The resulting text files can be read into any analytic software.

Current analytic procedures were developed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software and have been reviewed with CA staff. These procedures are considered open source. The source code is available to CA as requested.

5. CONSTRUCTED STANDARDS

A Workload study addresses the types of task involved in the delivery of services, the amount of time those tasks require and what staff roles perform the tasks. A workload study needs to address not only what is being currently provided to children and families but also what needs to be provided in order to address all legal, policy and ethical requirements of service to a case. In many states, staff members participating in workload studies have asked the same question, "What about all the things that should be done that are not getting done?"

"Workload standard" is the term used for the expected amount of time needed to perform all the tasks necessary to provide a service to a case in a month. It is assumed that this level of service delivery is not being met, and so workload standard times cannot be directly measured under existing work conditions. To construct workload standard values for the different services, a process of expert review provides a consensus approach anchored in current requirements.

An alternative approach would be to follow individual cases and measure all work for those cases. A separate review of those cases may determine if all work requirements were met. For cases where all requirements were met, average task times could then be determined. The alternative approach requires a longer, unpredictable time span for completion as it depends on cases being completed. It would also be difficult to predict what services a case would receive. These two considerations lead to the approach not being chosen.

A three phase approach was used in the construction of workload standards. These procedures are presented in more detail in **Attachment P, Construction of Standards.**

I. Obtaining broad practice input on task requirements of different services from groups of practice experts with policy support;
II. Review of the groups' average task requirements by policy experts and practice administrators;
III. Review of task requirements by policy and practice experts based upon necessary legal and policy requirements with attention to key component analysis and sensitivity analysis of overall service times.

5.1 Phase I

The initial phase of broad practice input from DCFS and DLR staff occurred across the state in a series of study groups that addressed all services multiple times. All 6 Regions were represented, 2 Regions in each DCFS study group and three small DLR groups, so that the study groups addressed all services. Attachment P presents the plan for conducting the statewide study groups.

Group members volunteered and were selected by regions based upon their knowledge of specific service areas, familiarity with practice patterns of more than a single Region or Office if possible and perceived ability to rapidly adapt to and contribute to the standard construction task. In all there were 115 participants who represented 7 support staff, 4 special support staff, 12 non case carrying social workers, 54 case carrying social workers, 24 supervisors, 6 program managers, and 1 area administrator. Position type was not recorded for 7 participants. Policy experts were present in each group in case there were clarifications needed.

The study groups required two types of support. Policy analysis determined the task requirements for services. These requirements were available as a resource for the groups. In addition, policy experts were present as a live resource in groups. Facilitators in groups explained the structure of task time construction, recorded judgments of group members on a display, and rationale issues expressed by the group members.

Time study data were used to assemble average time per case estimates for each service. Average time per case is based upon all cases receiving the service. Three statistics were determined from the time study results: (1) the count of number of cases receiving any task within a service and the number of cases receiving each task activity within that service was computed from the time study results, (2) the average number of times workers provided a task to a case in a month, and (3) the average amount of time (expressed as decimal hours) workers spent on each instance of task delivery.

Three computations for each task provided summary statistics. These statistics, labeled in columns A, B and C, formed the judgments of group members. Group members could choose to leave the statistic as measured or to change the statistic up or down. Changed statistics were shaded. The number of cases receiving each task was divided by the number of cases receiving the service to yield the percent of cases receiving the task, labeled column A. The average number of occurrences, labeled column B, repeated the computed number of the second statistic stated above. Column C summed the time for each task. The three statistics were multiplied

together to produce the average time of the task for all cases receiving the service. Due to weighting of task times by three components, the sum of the task times does not precisely equal the total average task time. The larger the number of cases receiving a service, the closer the sum of the tasks is to the average service time computed.

5.2 Phase II

A review was done by senior staff and policy staff, to get a consensus of the three groups products. This resulted in a refinement and consolidation of multiple group estimates of the same service times. These composite standard times were based on the average task times per group refined by the phase II group.

5.3 Phase III

Further analysis of task components by a final group of statewide practice experts, consisting mostly of social workers and supervisors, resulted in refinement of the percent of cases that would require some tasks. This review examined the change in a task as a percentage of total service time change. A sensitivity analysis was developed that showed the changes on total monthly case time for a service. This final review lead to final constructed standards.

6. CONSTRUCTION OF ALLOCATION MODELS

Using the results of the measured time data analysis and the construction of standards, staff allocation models were developed. Microsoft Excel spreadsheets were used to manage the data and to develop tabular presentations.

The results of these models are presented below as ***Table 2, Summary of Statewide FTE Requirements by Services – DCFS***. For staff allocation model purposes, some service units were combined. The results are presented in Volume I, Chapter 2, Table 2.04 as combined services.

Based on additional input from policy and budget staff, it was determined that, for staff allocation purposes, related DCFS services would be combined into one constructed standard for staff allocation model purposes. This created three combined service categories. Weighting of Family Voluntary In Home and Family Voluntary Placement times formed a Family Voluntary Service. Weighting of Family Voluntary In Home FRS and Family Voluntary Placement FRS times formed a Family Voluntary Service FRS. Weighting of Family Dependency In Home, Family Dependency Placement, and Legally Free times formed a Family Dependency Service. Case counts were also combined into a single count of cases for the three combined services in order to estimate FTE needs.

Gap analysis vs. base – It is important to understand that the difference between constructed standard FTEs and measured time study FTEs is the *gap.* This gap is artificial, in that it is not necessarily the number of FTEs the CA would need to meet the constructed standard. Because we were not able to access the state's Human Resource Management System (HRMS) or the Agency's accounting system (Fastrack), we were not able to access the actual number of FTEs by service area in CA at the time of the study. This means that when calculating the number of

FTEs required to complete the tasks for a specific service, the CA will need to use their FTE allotment to figure an accurate number

Table 2: Summary of Statewide FTE Requirements by Services – DCFS

Summary by Service - Statewide	Estimated Number of FTE's From Time Study	Number of FTE's from Constructed Standard	Difference
Intake	170.2	232.4	62.2
Investigations	533.3	727.2	193.9
Voluntary CW Combined	131.8	263.6	131.8
Voluntary FRS Combined	55.3	86.0	30.7
Dependency Combined	944.2	1852.8	908.6
Adoption Support	23.0	36.2	13.3
Total	1857.8	3198.2	1340.4

Title IV-E funding supports foster care services. The detailed analysis of dependency placement activities at the task level provides insight into the components of IV-E services. The sensitivity analysis used during the construction of workload standards is an example of how workload may contribute to IV-E analysis. Workload investigations take apart services into their task components. Each component can be described in detail either from a measured actual or a constructed standard approach. The detail of task activities within services are the proportion of cases a task occurs for, the number of times in a period (such as a month) that a task occurs, and how long a task takes when it does occur.

The sensitivity analysis used in this workload study focused on the task of in person visits with children in their own residence. By connecting this task to others, a work model was developed about tasks that are related to a focal task. In that way, the overall impact of changes on one task has effects on other tasks. Changes in workload related to individual task changes can then be described for a caseload. Other tasks may be taken as the focal task to create other work models. Work models related to single tasks may be combined into more complex work models. It is through these models that workload analysis can contribute to a greater understanding of IV-E costs and funding.

7. INTERVIEWS WITH OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Workload project staff members met with a group of legislative and budget office personnel and the CA external advisory committee to review the study purposes and objectives. The coordination between the workload study and the CA CPS/CWS redesign was discussed. The study details reviewed were: Issues of work categories (the redesign services and tasks within them); timing of the study (one month after full redesign implementation); length of time study data collection and study participants(one month census of CA staff working on cases); and type of results from the study (average case times within services).

8. LITERATURE AND POLICY REVIEW

As part of the preparation of the construction of standards, two documents were developed. One was a review of other states' work on construction of standards. This work is often considered as "case weighing" or "case weighting". This review considers results related to workload studies from the Federal Performance Improvement Plans of all the states. The other review was specific to issues of Washington State. This review includes the policy reviews of Washington State CA Policies pertinent to workload issues and Braam Settlement issues. These tables were reviewed by Washington CA policy staff members.

These documents are presented as **Attachment Q, Literature and Policy Review**.