

**UPDATED COLORADO
STAFFING STANDARDS FOR
CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT**

FINAL REPORT
July 28, 2000

Submitted to:

State of Colorado
Department of Human Services
Division of Child Support Enforcement
303 E. 17th Street, Suite 200
Denver, Colorado 80203

Submitted by:

Policy Studies Inc.
999 18th Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 863-0900



Jane C. Venohr, Ph.D.
David A. Price, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

Purpose of the Study.....	1
Colorado's Existing Staffing Standard.....	2
Report Organization.....	9

Chapter 2: Staffing Standards in Other States

State Survey.....	11
States with Staffing Standards	12
States without Staffing Standards.....	16
Summary.....	19

Chapter 3: Methodologies and Data Collection

Overview	21
Child Support Functions and Processes.....	21
Time Estimates.....	24
Alternative Methodology.....	32

Chapter 4: Developing a Staffing Standard

Building a Staffing Standard.....	36
Proposed Staffing Standards.....	49

Chapter 5: Special Issues and Updating

Special Issues	51
Updating the Staffing Standards.....	53
Conclusions.....	54

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 Existing Staffing Standards.....	3
Exhibit 2 History of the Colorado Staffing Standards.....	5

Exhibit 3 Perceived Merits and Limitations of Existing Staffing Standards	6
Exhibit 4 States with Staffing Caseload Standards.....	13
Exhibit 5 State Staffing/Caseload Standards Information	17
Exhibit 6 Child Support Functions and Processes	23
Exhibit 7 Selected IV_D Statistics of Participating Counties	25
Exhibit 8 Focus Group Protocol	26
Exhibit 9 Minutes Required to Complete Child Support Processes	28
Exhibit 10 Estimated Work Hours per Year Available to Perform Processes	46
Exhibit 11 Proposed Staffing Standards	50
Exhibit 12 Data Elements Required from the MM-410 Report for Updating the Staffing Standard	54

Appendices

Appendix A: Detailed Tasks of Child Support Processes

Appendix B: Selected Demographics of Participating Counties

Appendix C: Protocol for Focus Groups

Appendix D: Time Log Instructions

Appendix E: Ranges in Time Estimates from the Focus Groups and Time

Appendix F: Statistical Analysis of the Relationship Between Staffing and
Performance

Appendix G: Comparisons Between Existing and Proposed Staffing Standards

Chapter I

Introduction

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In September 1999, the Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Child Support Enforcement (CSE) contracted with Policy Studies Inc. (PSI) to design an improved staffing standard model for Colorado's child support enforcement offices. Beyond this general purpose, the study was designed to achieve the following specific goals:

- Provide a critical review of Colorado's existing staffing model and how that model compares to models being used by other states;
- Validate the processes and tasks that child support technicians must complete as part of their work to locate absent parents and establish and enforce support obligations;
- Measure the amount of time child support technicians need to complete selected child support functions;
- Develop a new or revised staffing standards model that builds upon the work Colorado has already done and incorporates additional variables to make the model more sensitive to the needs and interests of county CSE administrators;
- Identify existing and emerging trends in the child support program (e.g., CSNet, enhanced federal performance requirements) that may affect the workload of child support technicians; and
- Design a training curriculum in cooperation with State staff to educate CSE administrators and others about the model and how to use it.

These project goals recognize that human resources are the greatest asset of the child support program. They are by far the largest expense item in the program's budget and how those resources are organized and managed are critical to the program's success. Estimating the staff size needed to achieve desired program outcomes, however, is complex and Federal and State regulations offer little guidance in what an appropriate staff size should be. Federal regulations [45 CFR 303.20] simply state that there must be an "organizational structure and sufficient resources at the State and local level to meet performance and time standards." Colorado's regulations, as defined in the Department of Human Services' Child Support Enforcement Staff Manual Volume VI [9 CCR 2504-1 §6.102.3], require that "sufficient staff be assigned to the CSE unit to provide the following child support functions: intake, locate, legal determination of parentage,



establishment of the legal obligation, collection, enforcement, investigation, and reporting as prescribed by these rules.” The absence of prescriptive staffing standards can be viewed as an advantage and disadvantage. On the one hand, the absence of specific standards allows CSE administrators considerable flexibility in how they use their staff resources to meet the changing demands of the child support program. On the other hand, the lack of standards creates a tremendous challenge in allocating staff resources to child support functions to achieve the performance standards against which the program’s success is judged.

COLORADO’S EXISTING STAFFING STANDARD

Defining appropriate staffing levels can be viewed as being part science and part art. For the past decade, the State has issued recommended caseload standards for local Child Support Enforcement units annually. The standards are derived from a scientific formula that of necessity relies on certain assumptions about the child support programs and functions. County CSE administrators are free to use or not use the standards for their planning and budgeting purposes.

Development of the Staffing Formula

The formula used to derive the existing staffing standards was developed in 1990 by the Standardization Subcommittee of a CSE Task Force that was formed to assist counties in organizing their staff efficiently. The subcommittee comprised staff and administrators from federal, state and county (large, medium and small counties) agencies.

Based on a model office concept, staffing standards were primarily developed through use of the Delphi method, an approach developed by the Rand Corporation in the late 1960s that uses a group of experts to reach consensus about various topics, in this case the number of staff needed to perform certain child support functions. The professional estimates developed by the subcommittee were checked against staffing measurements available from other parts of the nation through the federal OCSE staff person serving on the subcommittee. Recognizing that specialization of function can lead to efficiencies that only larger counties could realize, the subcommittee included a provision in the staffing standard for a small county add-on.

Staff and Functions Considered in the Formula

As displayed in Exhibit 1, the existing staffing standard formula considers the following functions:

- A. *Establishment*: technicians, clerks and supervisors
- B. *Enforcement*: technicians (IV-A and non-IV-A), clerks and supervisor
- C. *Intake*: technicians, clerks and supervisors
- D. *Other Support Staff*: clerks for reception mail; clerks for customer service; clerks for accounting; ACSES liaison; support supervisors and managers.

The existing formula does not consider attorneys.

Exhibit 1 Existing Staffing Standards
<p>Intake 1 Technician for every 100 monthly intakes 1 Clerk/Legal Technician for every 100 monthly intakes</p>
<p>Establishment 1 Enforcement Technician for every 581 non-ordered cases 1 Clerk/Legal Technician for every 6.7 Establishment Technicians 1 Supervisor for every 7 Establishment Technicians</p> <p>Enforcement 1 Enforcement Technician for every 581 Non-IV-A enforcement cases 1 Enforcement Technician for every 378 IV-A enforcement cases 1 Clerk/Legal Technician for every 9.3 Enforcement Technicians 1 Supervisor for every 8 Enforcement Technicians</p>
<p>Additional Staff <i>Reception Mail</i>: 1 Clerk for every 10,000 cases <i>Customer Service</i>: 1 Clerk for every 1,500 orders <i>Accounting</i>: 1 Clerk for every 1,500 payments processed per month <i>ACSES Liaison^a</i>: 1 Liaison for every 50,000 cases <i>Supervisors</i>: 1 Supervisor for every 6 support staff <i>Managers</i>: 1 Manager for every 4 supervisors <i>Small County Add-On</i>: If a county has less than 10 staff, it can receive a maximum add-on of 100% if the formula results in less than 0.01 staff and a 10% add-on if it results in 9.99 staff.</p>

^a ACSES is Colorado's automated child support system



Periodic Updates to the Staffing Standard

Since the original staffing standard formula was developed, the subcommittee has reviewed and updated it annually based on changes in federal requirements, automation, county staffing needs and other factors in the previous year. As shown in Exhibit 2, some of the most significant changes occurred in 1993-95 to account for efficiencies gained by implementation of the Family Support Registry (FSR) and the automation of document generation. Major changes to the small county add-on were also made during this time. Since 1996, however, no changes have been made to the staffing standard formula.

County Utilization and Perspectives

PSI staff conducted telephone interviews with six county administrators to discuss their opinions about the merits and limitations of the staffing standards and their ideas for revising the standards.

- The counties interviewed range in staff size from two to over 50 staff and they vary significantly in how they organize their staff. The larger the county, the more specialized the staff.
- Regardless of county size, the vast majority of staff are classified as “technicians.”

In small and medium counties, staff typically specialize in two to three tasks (e.g., one staff person handles locate, income assignments and interstate; another staff person handles income assignments, judicial hearing preparations and administrative actions). Larger counties are more likely to organize staff around child support functions (i.e., intake, establishment, enforcement and accounting). These divisions are not uniform across counties; for example, tasks performed by the “intake unit” vary between counties.

Exhibit 2 History of the Colorado Staffing Standards

Year Staffing Standard Was Reviewed	1998	1997	1996	1995	1994	1993	1992	1991	1990	
ESTABLISHMENT										
1 Technician handles	581	581	581	581	840	950	950	950	950	Non-ordered establishment cases
1 Clerk/Legal technician supports	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	1.68	1.48	1.5	1.5	1.5	Establishment technicians
1 Supervisor oversees	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	8	6	Establishment technicians
ENFORCEMENT										
1 Technician handles	378	378	378	378	505	585	660	660	660	IV-A enforcement cases
1 Technician handles	581	581	581	581	770	850	850	850	850	Non-IV-A enforcement cases
1 Clerk/legal technician supports	9.3	9.3	9.3	9.3	2.3	1.85	1.67	1.67	2	Enforcement technicians
1 Supervisor oversees	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	6	Enforcement technicians
SUPPORT: INTAKE										
1 Technician handles	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Average monthly intakes
1 Clerk supports	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	Average monthly intakes
1 Supervisor oversees			7	7	7	7	7	7	6	Intake workers
SUPPORT: RECEPTION MAIL										
1 Clerk supports	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	Total cases
SUPPORT: CUSTOMER SERVICE										
1 Clerk supports	6000	6000	6000	6000	6000	6000	6000	6000	6000	Total orders
SUPPORT: ACCOUNTING										
1 Clerk supports	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1000	1000	1000	Payments per month
SUPPORT: OTHER										
ACES liaison	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	15000	15000	15000	Cases
1 Supervisor oversees	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	Support staff
managers	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	Supervisors
SMALL COUNTY ADD-ON										
Number of Small County Add-On Categories	10	10	10	10	3	2	2	2	2	
Least Number of Staff Considered in Add-on	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	
Add-On for Least Number of Staff	100%	100%	100%	90%	90%	60%	60%	60%	60%	
Most Number of Staff Considered in Add-on	9.99	9.99	9.99	9.99	7.99	6	6	6	6	
Add-On for Most Number of Staff	10%	10%	10%	10%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	



Additional perspectives about the existing staffing standards were obtained from questions submitted to the State project director, and discussions with state administrators and the MIG advisory group. In the telephone interviews, PSI staff asked counties whether they used the recommended staffing standards, and if so how; and what were the merits and limitations of the staffing standards. A summary of their responses is displayed in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit 3		
PERCEIVED MERITS AND LIMITATIONS OF EXISTING STAFFING STANDARDS		
	Merits	Limitations
Utility of the formula	Small, medium and large counties reported that their County Commissions use the standards to decide child support staffing and budgets	A few counties reported that the standards are interesting but their County Commissions do not consider it in their budgetary decisions, rather the County Commissions makes those decisions based on changes in caseload
The formula and its final product	Most of the counties interviewed think the formula results in a number of recommended staff that makes sense	Although the end-number makes sense, most of the counties interviewed think the assumptions underlying the formula do not make sense
Small County Add-On	This adjustment provides adequate staff for small counties	There is a cliff effect after a small county reach 9.99 staff
General Updating of the Staffing Standard Formula	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Historically, the updates to the formula have made senseSpecific adjustments for automated forms generation and the FSR have made sense	The formula needs to be updated to account for automation and recent changes in enforcement tools (e.g., driver's suspension, credit bureau reporting, UIFSA)
Staffing Organization	The formula is flexible, it does not dictate how a county must organize its staff	The formula does not account for all of the tasks staff currently perform

Generally, the counties interviewed thought that the final number resulting from the staffing formula makes sense, but that the existing formula parameters are not congruent with current staffing organizational structures, tasks, functions and workload.

Many of the counties' specific concerns are listed below.

Concerns About Existing Formula Parameters

The concerns about the existing formula parameters are listed below in the frequency with which they were mentioned.

1. *Caseload per Enforcement Technician.* All of the counties interviewed reported that technicians must do more to enforce a case now due to license suspension, credit bureau reporting and other new enforcement remedies. Workload has also increased because technicians are responsible for their own paperwork and rely less on clerks than they did before automated document generation. In short, enforcement technicians must spend a greater amount of time monitoring cases.
2. *Clerks.* None of the counties utilized clerks to the extent that the existing staffing standard suggests. In fact, several counties suggested that due to the capacity to generate forms automatically, “clerks” are obsolete. Instead, enforcement technicians handle all aspects of their caseloads.
3. *Accounting.* Due to the FSR, the need for clerks has declined. Nonetheless, some of the counties suggested that the tasks performed by accounting staff have become more difficult because they require more knowledge about automation, exception reports and other accounting functions. Several counties also suggested that this standard should not be based on payments per month, but ledgers.
4. *IV-A and non-IV-A Division.* Most of the counties interviewed reported that there is no longer a clear distinction between the amount of time necessary to enforce IV-A and non-IV-A cases. Both cases require the same amount of effort.
5. *Interstate Cases.* Several of the counties interviewed have staff that focus primarily on interstate cases. One county administrator explained that this division was necessary because interstate cases require more follow-up and sometimes get neglected if they are merged with the instate caseload.
6. *Staff Training, Turnover and Extended Absences.* Several counties are concerned that the amount of time required to train new staff and cross-train existing staff to serve as back-up is not considered in the existing formula. In today’s tight labor market, most of the counties interviewed have encountered issues relating to high staff turnover or extended absences. As tasks become more complex, it is more difficult for new or back-up staff to fill in.



-
7. *Small County Add-On.* Two of the counties are concerned that a cliff effect may occur once they hit 9.99 staff, the maximum threshold for the small county add-on.
 8. *Supervisors.* A few of the counties thought the number of supervisors in the existing formula was too high.

Other Recommendations

1. *Bilingual Services.* Two of the counties mentioned the need for bilingual services. One county administrator estimated that one out of eight of their “customers” require communication with a bilingual technician.
2. *Flexibility in Staffing Organization and Functions.* A few of the counties emphasized that the staffing standard should be flexible to allow the county self-determination in defining its organizational structure. These county administrators were concerned that measuring staff time for each child support function can lead to staffing standards for the measured function that do not allow them the flexibility to split a child support function into two or more functions or have staff work on multiple functions.
3. *Basing Standards on Caseload.* There was no consensus on what staffing standards should be based on. Some of the suggestions were to base staffing standards on something more than caseload to capture differences in the work intensity required among different cases. Others suggested that caseload should always be the basic unit of measurement because it is the most fundamental and easily understood unit by County Commissioners.
4. *Relate Staffing Standards to Performance.* A couple counties suggested that the best way to assess staffing standards is to examine staffing in the high-performing counties.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

The remainder of this report is organized into four chapters. Chapter II reviews what we learned about the staffing standards used in other states based on our own research and research conducted by the State of Virginia for its own staffing study. We identified only a handful of states that have developed staffing standards.

Chapter III describes the approaches we used to developing staffing standards for this study, principally the reliance on professional estimates, supplemented by information from self-administered time logs. The chapter also discusses our attempt to develop standards based on federal performance indicators (e.g., percentage of cases with orders, percentage of ordered cases that are paying) and presents the results of that effort.

Chapter IV outlines the steps we used to develop the formula for establishing standards. It documents how we used the data we collected from various sources to build a staffing model and what the outcomes of that model are.

The final chapter, Chapter V, discusses the future of the staffing model; how it could be implemented and updated. The chapter also discusses the existing and future trends that are shaping and will shape staffing standards in the future. The increasing sophistication of automation is one of those trends, along with changes in federal regulations evolving performance measures for child support agencies.



[This page is intentionally blank.]

Chapter II

Staffing Standards in Other States

This chapter provides information collected from a 50-state staffing standards survey. Specifically, this chapter identifies which states currently have staffing standards and provides a brief description of those states' standards. It also provides information we gathered from other states, including information from a few states that do not have formalized staffing standards but that use specific tools to help them assess their staffing needs.

The information presented here was gathered partially from a survey conducted by Virginia as part of its federally-funded Staffing Demonstration Project and partially from a survey administered by Policy Studies Inc. staff of states that identified themselves as currently having staffing standards.

STATE SURVEY

In February 2000, Virginia's State IV-D Director contacted (via e-mail) all of the State IV-D Directors in the country asking them whether their state had staffing standards. Virginia received responses from 27 states and four of those states said they currently have staffing standards. We sent these four states—Colorado, New Jersey, Virginia and West Virginia—a set of questions that we used as an interview guide to capture additional information about those standards. The primary questions we asked were:

- When were the standards first developed and by whom? How often are they updated?
- Why were the standards developed and what method(s) was used to develop them? What method is used to update them and what factors are considered in that updating?
- What factors does your staffing standard consider and what is that standard? Does the standard differ by case function? By office size?
- Have you made (or are you considering making) changes to the standard in response to increases in automation and administrative enforcement remedies mandated by federal law (e.g., income withholding, license revocation, FIDM)?
- Does the standard consider federal performance criteria or an individual office's performance relative to those criteria?
- Do the staffing standards separately consider interstate caseloads and if so, how?



We also contacted the states that did not respond to the Virginia survey to ensure that we had a comprehensive understanding of what states were using standards. None of the states that did not respond to Virginia’s initial inquiry appears to be using staffing standards at the present time.

STATES WITH STAFFING STANDARDS

The base components of formulas for states with staffing standards are displayed in the table below. Exhibit 4 compares the four states with staffing standards across a range of variables.

STAFFING FORMULAS FOR STATES WITH STAFFING STANDARDS			
	Standard for Technician or Technician Equivalent	Attorneys	Other Staff Considered in Formula
Colorado	378-581 cases per enforcement FTE	not included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Intake ✓ Establishment ✓ Customer Service ✓ Accounting ✓ Reception Mail ✓ Supervisors/ Managers ✓ ACSES (statewide automated system) Liaison ✓ Small County Add-On
New Jersey	480-720 per professional staff	not included	Coordinators, administrators, attorneys and supervisors are <i>not</i> considered professional staff
Virginia	about 400-500 cases per FTE for case-related work (no formula specified, this is deduced from the number of recommended staff and caseload)	not included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Supervisors/managers ✓ Operations Support ✓ Fiscal ✓ Computer Technician ✓ Other support staff
West Virginia	575 cases per legal assistant	3,500-4,000 cases per attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support staff ✓ Supervisors

**EXHIBIT 4
STATES WITH STAFFING CASELOAD STANDARDS**

State	Staffing Caseload Standard	Date Developed	Date Last Revised	Development Method	Developed By	How/When Updated	Mandatory or Recommended	Additional Comments /Remarks	Are Interstate Caseloads Separately Considered
1. Colorado	Separated by Function	1990	1998	Delphi Technique	Committee of State and County Staff	Updated annually by committee; new standard currently being developed	Recommended	Colorado Makes Additional adjustments for small counties that have less than ten staff.	Interstate caseloads not considered
2. New Jersey	Separated by Function	1990	1/1/2000	Based on if statistics submitted on paternity establishment, order establishment, locate, and modifications	Committee	As of 1/1/2000, New Jersey's staffing standards will be revised yearly to include performance based standards to meet the federal child support incentive criteria.	Mandatory		no--they are included in the the total caseload
3. Virginia	Separated by Function	1995	1999	Delphi Technique	Demonatration project and child support staff		-----		
4. West Virginia	Separated by Function	1992	1998	Based on actual caseload at a point in time	Federal District Court	Revised in 1994 by further review of the court and examined in 1998 by the Bureau for Child Support Enforcement to make a decision on the allocation of 72 additional positions.	Mandatory		



Colorado

A complete description of Colorado's existing staffing standards was provided in the previous chapter. In summary, Colorado first developed staffing standards in 1990. The standards were developed using the Delphi technique by a statewide task force. They are revised each year as necessary by a committee comprised of staff and supervisors representing different functional levels in the child support program and different geographic areas from across the state. The standards were last revised in 1998 and are currently being reviewed by Policy Studies Inc.

New Jersey

New Jersey developed its staffing standards in 1990. The standards were originally developed to ensure that the County Welfare Agencies had enough staff to maintain performance standards for paternity establishment, order establishment, location and modification. The standards are revised every year in which statistics are submitted.

New Jersey's staffing standards are defined for all types of caseloads, including paternity establishment, order establishment, locate, enforcement and interstate. Unlike Colorado, however, the New Jersey standards do not make adjustments for the size of the child support office. The formula used allows for 600 cases per professional staff on average with a 20 percent variance, not including supervisors or attorneys.

New Jersey recently revised their standards in January 2000 to include the performance-based standards to meet the federal child support incentive criteria and they will be revised each year based on the federal incentives.

Virginia

Virginia developed its staffing standards in 1995 to improve the delivery of child support services. Recommended staffing is determined for each function and, like Colorado, were developed using the Delphi technique. Virginia's standards determine staffing needs for workers in intake, customer service, locate, paternity establishment, enforcement and judicial support. The standards were developed with input from line staff and supervisors.

The standards were last revised in 1999 as part of a federally-funded Staffing Demonstration Project that defined optimum caseloads for a typical small and large office and then evaluated the impacts of those standards on office performance. The evaluation

findings from the small office study showed that using the staffing standards level recommended by the Delphi techniques produced positive and tangible results. The evaluation findings from the large office study should be available before the end of calendar year 2000.¹

West Virginia

The standards West Virginia currently uses were first developed in 1992. They are based on standards previously developed by the Federal District Court when the Court was providing oversight to the Child Support Bureau's operations. (This oversight resulted from a consent decree in class action litigation in which the Court was authorized to control the caseload.)

The standards were revised in 1994 by further review of the Court and examined in 1998 by the Child Support Bureau when it had to make a decision on the allocation of 72 additional positions. In terms of their development, revision and application, the Child Support Bureau uses the actual caseload at a point in time to allocate staff resources. The caseload size standard for the various positions is:

Legal Assistant: 575 cases
Attorney: 3,500 to 4,000 cases
Support Staff: 1,500 cases
Team Leaders: Supervise up to 12 staff.

The Child Support Bureau projects caseload growth by geographical region based on historical trends. However, the Bureau cannot, due to personnel regulations, easily reallocate staff positions based on shifts in where the caseload is located. Other than occasional re-allocations of a single position, caseload sizes are readjusted across regional lines only when additional positions are available. This has made it difficult to maintain standards across the regions in which the Bureau is administratively organized.

Unlike Colorado, the standard does not formally consider office size as an adjustment factor, but some attention is paid to the fact that some staff members travel to cover several satellite offices. Unlike New Jersey, the staffing standards do not currently take into account interstate caseloads or the recently enacted federal performance criteria. No changes have been made in the staffing standards in response to increases in automated and administrative enforcement remedies.

¹ Myers, D., T. Drew and T. Areson, *Virginia Staffing Demonstration: The Small Office Study*, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services (March 1999).



STATES WITHOUT STAFFING STANDARDS

Exhibit 5 displays the full results of the 50-state survey. Of those states that did not have staffing standards, a few have considered or are in the process of developing standards and a few use benchmarks to set a caseload standard for child support technicians. Although the information states provided or that we gathered is somewhat incomplete, some of the key findings from the 50-state survey include:

- Considering/developing standards: Georgia is in the process of reviewing staffing standards for its workers and California has a new mandate from the State Legislature to develop staffing/caseload standards for human services staff, including child support technicians.
- Informal standards based on caseload: Although not based on a formal study, some states, such as Maine and Utah, use caseload statistics to maintain a certain number of cases per FTE. Also, Idaho has some recommended staffing and caseload standards, but they are advisory only to individual counties.
- Informal standards based on external factors: Montana has an informal standard of 400-500 cases per FTE, but uses other, external factors (e.g., automation, caseload characteristics) to make adjustments in the number of FTEs. Oklahoma also has an informal standard of about 350 cases per FTE (an average for all IV-D staff, not just case workers) but uses other tools (e.g., population projections, allocated FTEs, underserved populations) to determine staffing needs.

**EXHIBIT 5
STATE STAFFING/CASELOAD STANDARDS INFORMATION**

State	Staffing Standards?	Caseload Standards?	Contact	Title	Notes																												
Alabama	no	no	Carolyn Lapsley	IV-D Director																													
Alaska	no	no		IV-D Director																													
Arizona	no	no	April Hoolis	Legal Services Dept.																													
Arkansas	no	no	Mary E. Smith																														
California	no	no	Richard A. Williams		CA recently enacted legislation that requires the state to enact staffing/caseload standards. They intend to look into the issue later this year.																												
Colorado	yes	yes	Darius Sams	Policy & Evaluation Section Chief	CO currently has staffing standards in place but has hired PSI to review the formula. Through the Multiple Initiatives Federal grant, they are developing a new formula. The project will be completed by July 31, 2000.																												
Connecticut	no	no																															
Delaware	no	no	Charles E. Hayward	Deputy IV-D Director																													
District of Columbia	no	no			DC used Maximus to do a simple staffing study to justify current staffing.																												
Florida	no	no	Mel Hedick	CSE Resource Management Process Manager																													
Georgia	no	no			Currently have a contract with a sister agency to review staffing standards.																												
Hawaii	no	no																															
Idaho	no	no			In Idaho, we have at various times recommended staffing & caseload standards, but have never officially established them.																												
Illinois	no	no	Joe Mamlin	IV-D Director																													
Indiana	no	no																															
Iowa	no	no	Joan Nessel	Regional Collections Administrator Iowa Bureau of Collections																													
Kentucky	no	no	Steve Veno	IV-D Director																													
Louisiana	no	no	Gordon Hood	Office of Family Support																													
Maine	no	no	Steve Hussey	Director, Division of CSE & Recovery	Maine has no caseload/staffing standards per se. Historically, caseload statistics have been utilized to justify funding/FTE requests to the legislature. Additionally, Maine has been utilizing the finding of its Model Office staff competency study initiated in 1994 to determine recommended staffing based on type of case and staff competency levels. The caseload is divided into paying and non-paying cases. Technicians (paraprofessional level) handle the more administrative actions; while the agents (professional level) handle the enforcement actions. The results of the project were so successful that this approach has been expanded statewide.																												
Maryland	no	no	Shirley Larson	Asst. IV-D Director																													
Massachusetts	no	no	Sharon Blocker	IV-D Director																													
Michigan	no	no																															
Minnesota	no	no	Wayland Campbell																														
Mississippi	no	no																															
Missouri	no	no	Diane Getz																														
Montana	no	no	Chad R. Dexter	CSED Program Specialist	<p>The Montana CSED has never performed an empirical study that would formally define staffing or caseload standards for its IV-D program. Historically, it has been assumed that an appropriate caseload for 1 full time employee (FTE) should be somewhere between 400-500 cases. Externalities such as conversion to a new child support system, special projects, regional office preference, a new employee, and the characteristics of a specific caseload would factor into possible fluctuation. Presently in MT, there are 39,370 open child support cases to which 85 full-time employees are assigned to work. This equates to an average caseload of 463 cases per FTE. The CSED is comprised of 5 Regional Offices responsible for these cases:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FTE</th> <th>Cases</th> <th>Cases/FTE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Great Falls</td> <td>15</td> <td>6,939</td> <td>462.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Billings</td> <td>22</td> <td>10,704</td> <td>486.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Butte</td> <td>18</td> <td>7,720</td> <td>428.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Missoula</td> <td>17</td> <td>7,406</td> <td>435.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Helena</td> <td>13</td> <td>6,601</td> <td>507.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td>85</td> <td>39,370</td> <td>463.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FTE	Cases	Cases/FTE	Great Falls	15	6,939	462.6	Billings	22	10,704	486.5	Butte	18	7,720	428.9	Missoula	17	7,406	435.6	Helena	13	6,601	507.8	Total:	85	39,370	463.2
	FTE	Cases	Cases/FTE																														
Great Falls	15	6,939	462.6																														
Billings	22	10,704	486.5																														
Butte	18	7,720	428.9																														
Missoula	17	7,406	435.6																														
Helena	13	6,601	507.8																														
Total:	85	39,370	463.2																														
Nebraska	no	no																															
Nevada	no	no																															

EXHIBIT 5
STATE STAFFING/CASELOAD STANDARDS INFORMATION

State	Staffing Standards?	Caseload Standards?	Contact	Title	Notes
New Hampshire	no	no			
New Jersey	yes		Tony Passaro		The State of NJ also uses staffing standards for the county welfare agencies.
New Mexico	no	no			
New York	no	no			
North Carolina	no	no			
North Dakota	no	no			
Ohio	no	no			
Oklahoma	no	no			Oklahoma has approximately 140,000 active cases and 39 CSE offices. We have various tools to help determine (1) staffing in the current offices, (2) the need for new CSE offices, and (3) underserved areas of the State. The tools help us establish goals for the program and offices but are not considered mandatory. The tools include Projected Population for 2000, Population Per Office, Cases Per Office, Ratio of Cases Per Population, Allocated FTE Per Office, Cases Per Allocated FTE. Our goal is less than 350 cases per FTE in each office. However, the FTEs are not all case workers, so the actual numbers of cases per case worker would be higher.
Oregon	no	no			
Pennsylvania	no	no	Daniel Richard	IV-D Director	
Rhode Island	no	no	Jack Murphy	IV-D Director	
South Carolina	no	no	Michael Thigpen		
South Dakota	no	no			
Tennessee	no	no			
Texas	no	no			
Utah	no	no	Jim Kidder		Utah has used statewide, regional and local "cases per agent" calculations to determine how many funded and available positions should be allocated to each region and local office so that each has <u>approximately the same ratio.</u>
Vermont	no	no	Jeff Cohen	IV-D Director	
Virginia	yes	yes	Todd Areson	Manager, Program Research	
Washington	no	no			
West Virginia	yes	yes	Marjorie L. Tierney		
Wisconsin	no	no	Susan Pfeiffer		
Wyoming	no	no			

Information is based on a draft table prepared by the Center for the Support of Families (Spring 2000).

Of further interest in Exhibit 5 is the apparent absence of standards in states that formerly had standards. For example, the 1994 Virginia small office study cited earlier identified North Carolina and North Dakota as two states that had and were using staffing/caseload standards. They apparently have stopped using those standards if the information gathered in this recent survey is correct. Also, at the time of the Virginia study Iowa was in the process of developing standards. According to the former IV-D director, however, the state abandoned that effort because of the inability to develop precise standards.

SUMMARY

We have the following summary observations about the survey data.

- For whatever reason, very few states have and are using staffing/caseload standards. Moreover, some states that had standards appear to have abandoned them.
- For those states that have standards, average caseloads per FTE appear to range from 300-600 cases. These averages, however, are highly variable depending on the child support function, the size of the office, and other internal and external factors.
- There is little consistency in the standards in terms of how they were established and are updated. Some of the factors states consider in setting/updating their standards are (1) caseload statistics, (2) office size and office characteristics, (3) program changes (e.g., technology, federal and state regulations), (4) program performance, and (5) external factors (e.g., population growth, existence of underserved populations).
- The most common approach to establishing standards has been to use professional estimates either using a Delphi technique or similar approach to arriving at those estimates.
- With the exception of the Virginia staffing demonstration project, there are no evaluation data about the efficacy of standards, what an optimum standard should be, and how those standards can be revised/maintained over time.



[This page is intentionally blank.]

Chapter III

Methodologies and Data Collection

OVERVIEW

A prerequisite for developing staffing standards is a complete understanding of the functions, processes and tasks that comprise operations in a child support office. That understanding is particularly important in Colorado where technician responsibilities vary significantly across counties based on differences in organizational structures and county demographics. Thus, the first section of this chapter provides a detailed list of functions, process and tasks. It also discusses some of the factors that lead to differences among offices in how these functions, processes and tasks are prioritized and implemented.

The second section focuses on measuring the amount of time spent on child support activities, both our approach to measurement and the time estimates that resulted from that approach. The study relies on two methodologies:

- (1) *Professional Estimates*, which are estimates provided by child support staff, supervisors or experts; or extracted from historical records.
- (2) *Time logs*. Workers record what they do and how long it takes to do it.

The final section explores an alternative methodology for determining staffing standards. Specifically, it uses available statistical data to examine the relationship between Federal and State performance indicators and staffing levels. County-level and state-level data are used to define the strength of the relationship between staffing levels and selected program performance measures (e.g., percent of cases under order). We translate that relationship into estimates of staffing levels Colorado would need to achieve its performance goals.

CHILD SUPPORT FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES

PSI staff drafted a list of child support functions, processes and tasks associated with IV-D operations based on:

- Information from the Virginia Child Support Staffing Study
- Information from a prior study we conducted of child support operations in Arapahoe County, Colorado, and



- Information about case processing from our own privatized child support operations (either full or partial service) in 12 states.

We defined work into functions, processes and tasks based on the following definitions:

- ❖ *Function*: Broad but definable area of child support enforcement. The specific processes within the function are unique enough to distinguish it from other broad functional areas. For example, Intake is a distinct function in child support.
- ❖ *Process*: A process is any series of activities (or tasks) that when taken together, transform a series of inputs into an output producing a result of value to a customer. Within the Intake function, for example, opening a new non-IV-A case is a distinct process.
- ❖ *Task*: An activity that when linked with other related activities makes up a process. For example, the distinct tasks associated with the opening of a new non-IV-A case might be (1) processing the IV-D application, (2) updating the system, and (3) gathering any relevant information from the custodial parent.

We sent the draft list of functions, process and tasks to the State project manager, MIG members and IV-D administrators in five counties—Weld County, Conejos County, Kit Carson County, La Plata County, and Routt County—for review. Revisions were made based on their comments. Exhibit 6 displays the finalized list of functions and processes for six functions: intake, locate, establishment, enforcement, fiscal and customer service. A detailed list of the tasks performed within each process is provided in Appendix A.

Exhibit 6
Child Support Functions and Processes

Processes for Intake

1. Case Opening—non IV-A
2. Case Opening—IV-A
3. Case Opening – Foster Care
4. Non-cooperation
5. Good Cause
6. Case Opening – Interstate (Responding)
7. Case Opening – Medicaid

Processes for Establishment

11. Establish Support Order
12. Establish Paternity Order
13. Responding Interstate Paternity and/or Support Establishment
14. Initiating Interstate Paternity and/or Support Establishment
15. Establish Paternity and/or Support – Judicial
16. Responding Interstate Establishment – Judicial
17. Establishment Case Management
18. Non-cooperation
19. Case Closure
20. Genetic Testing
21. Prepare for Hearing

Processes for Fiscal

32. Ledger Calculation
33. Allocation, Distribution, Disbursement

Processes for Locate

8. Locate NCP Address
9. Locate NCP Employer
10. Locate NCP Assets

Processes for Enforcement

22. Income Withholding
23. Review and Adjustment of Orders
24. Enforcement Case Management
25. Case Closure
26. Medical Support
27. Non-cooperation
28. Administrative Enforcement (e.g., license suspension, credit bureau reporting, etc...)
29. Prepare for Hearing
30. Contempt
31. Initiating Interstate Enforcement

Processes for Customer Service

34. Phone Calls
35. Mail
36. Walk-ins



Generally, the people who reviewed the document agreed on the functions and processes, but differed somewhat in the number and content of the individual tasks within each process. To reconcile these inconsistencies, the list of tasks in Appendix A are more rather than less detailed. This detail captures the county differences reviewers reported about individual tasks. Some of the few, but notable differences in tasks reviewers noted included the following.

- The more specialized a County’s staff, the more developed and detailed the tasks within the processes tended to be.
- While the tasks were essentially the same in all counties for order establishment, a county’s use of a judicial as opposed to an administrative process was derived from local office practice and judicial preferences.
- In a variety of enforcement areas, the smaller the county’s size, the greater the preference for negotiating with the obligor.

TIME ESTIMATES

As discussed earlier, we developed time estimates using two different methodologies: (1) professional time estimates; and (2) time logs. To obtain the professional time estimates, PSI staff conducted focus groups in six County IV-D offices: two large offices, two mid-sized offices and two small offices. We asked staff in three different offices—again, one large office; one mid-sized office and one small office—to complete self-administered time logs. The State project manager asked counties to volunteer for participation in the study. In turn, PSI staff contacted the counties to finalize the arrangements for data collection. Selected child support statistics of the counties participating in the study are provided below in Exhibit 7. Selected demographic characteristics for these counties are displayed in Appendix B.

Exhibit 7				
Selected IV-D Statistics of Participating Counties^a				
	Total Number of Cases (Dec 1999)	Number of FTES^b (2000)	Percent of Cases Under Order (Dec. 1999)	Percent of Current Support Paid (Dec. 1999)
Counties Participating in Focus Groups				
Adams County	13,576	54.0	76%	47%
Denver County	31,360	141.3	77%	40%
Delta County	1,687	8.1	69%	58%
Eagle County	734	5.0	61%	48%
Grand County	265	1.5	77%	63%
Garfield County	1,826	8.3	78%	52%
Counties Participating in Focus Groups				
Fremont County	2,371	9.0	81%	49%
Larimer County	6,963	28.0	75%	51%
Prowers County	1,359	3.9	68%	56%
State Total	160,057	612.1	72%	47%

^aInformation from Colorado Monthly Management Report (December 1999)

^bExcludes attorneys. Information was calculated by the State office using County Annual Plans.

Estimates from the Focus Groups (Professional Estimates)

To obtain professional estimates at each of the six participating counties, PSI staff set up six focus groups with enforcement technicians and other staff at each of the County offices. Each focus group centered on one of the functions (i.e., intake, locate, establishment, enforcement, fiscal and customer service). The County administrator was asked to select appropriate staff for each focus group. PSI staff provided them with the following selection guidelines.

- Up to 10 technicians per group (optimal number 5-8 but obviously less in the smaller counties).
- The staff person should have at least 6 months experience in their current position.
- The staff person's primary work is in one or more of the six functions.

PSI staff led the focus groups through a roundtable discussion to reach consensus on the average time it takes to complete each process within a function. The protocol for the focus groups is displayed below in Exhibit 8. A detailed description of the focus group protocol is also provided in Appendix C. Generally, each focus group lasted no longer than two hours. All six focus groups took one to two days per County office. Focus groups were conducted in April and May 2000.



Nuances in Administering the Focus Groups

PSI staff had the following observations based on their facilitation of the focus groups.

- Generally, consensus on the average amount of time required to complete each process was reached rather quickly.
- Defining an “average intake” was difficult for most of the participants. As a result, PSI staff asked participants to estimate time for two separate intakes: (1) a “clean case” and (2) a “problem case.” A clean case was defined as one where things went smoothly. A problem case was defined as a complex case that had difficulties, such as multiple identification numbers or an existing order in another jurisdiction.
- Participants were also asked what proportion of their intakes was “clean” and what proportion was “problematic.” This was used to construct a weighed time average.
- Participants had similar difficulty defining an average case when estimating the amount of time to establish or modify an order. The difficulty was resolved when we discussed three types of establishment methods separately: (1) consent; (2) default; and (3) contested. Participants were asked the frequency they used each type to establish and modify orders. This information was used to form a weighed time average.
- In some situations, it was necessary to walk through all of the tasks within a process and estimate the time for each task. The processes that required this level of detail varied

Exhibit 8 Focus Group Protocol

1. Introduction (e.g. background and goals of project and focus group) and instructions.
2. Distribution of a set of 3 x 5” cards to each participant. Each card displays one process and the tasks associated with that process. Participants are asked to independently estimate the amount of time they need to complete the process from the first task to the last task on the card.
3. A round robin approach was used to capture the time estimates from each participant. Ranges and midpoints are calculated. Participants are asked whether the midpoint accurately reflects an average case. If not, more detail and discussion ensue until participants reach consensus on an average time.
4. Replicate the approach for the remainder of the processes in that function.

among the counties. Generally, this occurred when the process was performed by only a few staff within a County or performed infrequently (e.g., good cause exemption in a rural County).

- The “customer service” function was not always readily separable from the other functions, particularly in counties that do not have staff dedicated to this function. For example, telephone conversations and walk-ins with noncustodial and custodial parents may be viewed as part of the enforcement or other function and not customer service.
- Some of the divisions of labor resulting from the County’s organizational structure did not match the six functions and their respective processes. For example, in Adams County, the staff who conduct modifications are in the establishment unit. Hence, it was not appropriate to include this staff person in the establishment or enforcement focus groups because they did not perform any of the other processes in that function. In situations where staff were highly specialized, we interviewed them separately.
- Some participants struggled somewhat in developing estimates for functions they perform infrequently (e.g., non-cooperation, good cause, and foster care openings in rural counties.)

Time Logs

The three counties participating in the time log study were asked to keep time logs for the last week of March and the second week of April. Staff were given a set of instructions and forms for the time log (displayed in Appendix D) and a list of the functions, processes and tasks about which we were gathering information from the focus groups (previously displayed in Exhibit 6 and Appendix A).

Staff were asked to:

1. keep daily time logs;
2. enter the amount of time spent on each child support process (as identified from the list);
3. enter the number of cases they worked on while performing a specific process (e.g., number of cases in which the staff person was trying to locate the noncustodial parent);
4. enter the number of completed processes during the time period (e.g., the number of cases in which the staff person actually located the noncustodial parent);



5. tally any interruption that lasted at least 10 minutes; and
6. log personal leave time code.

Case management, which is not always case specific, was considered a separate process. Staff noted how much time they spent on case management, but were not required to report the number of cases they worked on during that time.

Time Estimates from the Focus Groups and Time Logs

Exhibit 9 summarizes the time estimates from the focus groups and time logs. A more detailed summary of the time estimates including ranges is provided in Appendix E.

EXHIBIT 9				
MINUTES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE CHILD SUPPORT PROCESSES				
	FOCUS GROUPS		TIME LOGS	
	Average	Median	Average	Median
INTAKE				
01 Case Opening-Non-IV-A	131	106	51	45
02 Case Opening-IV-A	129	98	40	40
03 Case Opening-IV-E	96	94	125	125
04 Non-cooperation	53	49	13	13
05 Good Cause	76	70	NC	NC
06 Case Opening-Interstate (Responding)	100	96	98	98
07 Case Opening-Medical	119	98	40	40
LOCATE				
08 Locate NCP Address	56	54	5	7
09 Locate NCP Employer	57	55	9	5
10 Locate NCP Assets	51	18	5	5
ESTABLISHMENT				
11 Establishment Support Order-administratively	273	262	72	77
12 Establish Paternity Order-administratively	295	308	39	40
13 Responding Interstate Establishment	329	290	59	59
14 Initiating Interstate Establishment	225	195	148	148
15 Establish –Judicial	373	387	212	212
16 Responding Interstate Establishment –Judicial	377	330	21	21
17 Case Management –Establishment (per day)	177	193	12	9
18 Non-Cooperation	36	35	NC	NC
19 Case Closure	27	23	12	8
20 Genetic Testing	86	85	113	113
21 Prepare for Hearing	98	93	68	88
ENFORCEMENT				

EXHIBIT 9				
MINUTES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE CHILD SUPPORT PROCESSES				
	FOCUS GROUPS		TIME LOGS	
	Average	Median	Average	Median
22 Income Withholding	41	23	14	14
23 Review & Adjustment Orders	236	226	135	67
24 Enforcement Case Management (per day)	167	178	95	43
24 Enforcement Case Management (per month)	912	900	NA	NA
25 Case Closure	43	54	13	15
26 Medical Support	41	31	10	10
27 Non-Cooperation	38	35	9	9
28 Administrative Enforcement (liens, levy, tax intercept, credit reporting, license suspension)	Included in Case Management			
29 Prepare for Hearing	122	111	106	115
30 Contempt	151	175	160	160
31 Initiating Interstate Enforcement	132	120	19	21
FISCAL				
32-33 Fiscal Activities (total hours per day – sum of all staff)	9	4	7	7
Ordered Cases per Fiscal FTE	2040	2159	4390	3050
CUSTOMER SERVICE				
34-36 Phone & Walk-ins (total hours per day – sum of all staff)	31	11	10	14
Total Cases per Customer Service FTE	1869	1461	3751	3789

NC-none completed

There are several areas of observations from the information displayed in Exhibit 9 that deserve special mention.

Differences between Focus Groups and Time Logs

- ❖ The first observation to be made is that generally the time estimates from the focus groups are higher than those from the time logs. One problem with the time logs is that they were only kept for a week period while several child support processes (e.g., order establishment, intake) may occur over a longer period due to notification, scheduling and waiting for returned information.

Amount of time to complete general functions

- ❖ *Intake.* The amount of time required to complete an intake did not vary consistently by the type of intake (i.e., IVA, NIVA, Foster Care, Interstate, and Medical); that is, no type took consistently less time or more time than the other types.



- ❖ *Locate.* With the exception of two sites, most of the participants reported locating NCP address and employer in tandem.
- ❖ *Establishment.* The time required to complete several types of establishments was captured (e.g., paternity administratively, order administratively, judicial, responding interstate; and initiating interstate). With the exception of judicial established orders and initiating interstate, there are not large time differences required to complete these types of establishments. However, judicial establishments took more time and initiating interstates took less time than the other types of establishment.
- ❖ *Enforcement.* A large proportion of time for enforcement activities is spent on case management. As is evident in Exhibit 9, the focus groups found that this averages around 3 hours (167 minutes) per day. We also estimated a monthly amount to review monthly reports (e.g., caseload listings and drivers' license suspension). As a result most administrative enforcement is included in the monthly enforcement case management.
- ❖ *Fiscal.* The number of ordered cases to hours spent on fiscal activities did not vary significantly between the Counties participating in the focus groups and time logs (this is evidenced in Appendix E). Most were in the range of 2000 ordered cases per fiscal FTE. The exceptions are two counties, one that participated in the time logs has a high ratio of ordered cases per fiscal FTE and dragged up the average amount shown in Exhibit 9.
- ❖ *Customer Service.* As discussed earlier, it was difficult to separate case management from customer service particularly in the smaller counties where staff are more likely to perform both functions. In part, this may explain why the amount of time spent on customer service relative to caseload is larger for the smaller counties. Yet, it was also difficult to separate customer service from case management in Adams County, where there is not a specialized customer service unit.

In visiting the County offices, it was evident that Counties have different philosophies about customer services that also may affect how much time they spend on activities. For example, one County requires non-IVA applicants to have all of their forms completed and copies of required documents prior to any assistance. Conversely, another County reported that they assist non-IVA applicants with completing applications and finding required documents (e.g., birth certificates).

Amount of time to complete specific processes

As is evident in the more detailed time estimates presented in Appendix E, there was considerable variation in time estimates for some processes by County. For example, one County reported a good cause exemption took 5 minutes whereas another county reported that it took 158 minutes on average. In situations such as this, where there are large discrepancies, the discrepancy usually results from the difference between the County's approach to child support. For example, in the County reporting 5 minutes to complete a good cause exemption perceived it as a piece of paper that needed to be filled out and chronicled. On the other hand, the county that reported 158 minutes investigated whether the criteria for good cause were truly met. This investigation resulted in more time spent.



ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGY

As discussed earlier, we explored an alternative approach to developing staffing standards that does not rely on time estimates. Using County statistical data, we conducted analyses to determine whether staffing levels are correlated with the following State and Federal performance indicators:

- ❖ Proportion of non-marital children with paternity established;
- ❖ Proportion of IV-D cases with child support orders established;
- ❖ Proportion of current child support obligations collected; and
- ❖ Proportion of cases with arrearages that have a collection.

We did not include cost effectiveness ratios, which are also a Federal performance indicator, because of their extreme variability, particularly in small counties.

County data were available for calendar year 1999 and for the first four months of 2000. These time periods were estimated separately and compared for consistency in the estimates. National data are available from 1998 and are incomplete for some states.¹

Overview of Findings from Statistical Analysis

This section presents the results from the multiple linear regressions used to statistically estimate the impact of staffing on performance. (The specific results are displayed in Appendix F.)

PEP

- ❖ The relationship between staffing and PEP is statistically insignificant in Colorado. (This was also statistically insignificant in the analysis of all States.) We are not surprised at this finding based on our conversations with County and State IV-D administrators who report that a larger share of their intakes already have paternity established. Many credit the increase to in-hospital paternity acknowledgment programs. Others suggested that in-hospital paternity acknowledgment programs along with other factors (e.g., the courts) have a greater impact on PEP than staffing levels.

¹ U.S. Office of Child Support Enforcement, *Child Support Enforcement FY 1998 Preliminary Data Report*, Department of Health and Human Services (Washington, D.C.: June 1999).

- ❖ The relationship between PEP and unemployment is statistically significant in Colorado. The findings indicate that a 1 percentage point increase in the unemployment rate will lower PEP by 3 percentage points. This is consistent with other research indicating that unemployment rates are negatively correlated with paternity acknowledgment rates.²

Percent of cases under order

- ❖ PEP and the percent of cases under order are statistically positively correlated. In Colorado, a 3 percentage point increase in PEP increases the percent of cases with orders by 1 percent. Nationally, a 2 percentage point increase in PEP increases the percent of cases with orders by 1 percent.

We suspect that this is not a one-to-one relationship because the two variables are measured in different units. PEP measures the percent of children born out-of-wedlock with paternity established, while the other indicator is measured as a percentage of cases. We do not believe much should be inferred about the difference in the relationship between Colorado and the nation. States vary in how they define PEP. We would want to control for these differences before making any inferences from the data.

- ❖ The relationship between staffing levels and the percent of cases with orders yields statistically anomalous results. Specifically, there is a positive correlation between the two. We believe this an artifact of the existing Colorado staffing standards which recommend more staff per ordered case than non-ordered case.

The statistical analysis of all States shows a negative but statistically insignificant correlation between staffing and the percent of cases with orders.

Percent of current support paid

- ❖ The number of cases per FTE is negatively correlated with the percent of current support paid. This correlation is statistically significant. Specifically, increasing the number of cases per FTE by 100 decreases the percent of current support paid by 3-4 percentage points. However, there are some diminishing returns, so the ratio of 100 to 3-4 does not hold precisely for all staffing levels.

² Freya Lund Sonenstein, Pamela Holcomb, and Kristin Seefeldt (1994) "Promising Approaches to Improving Paternity Establishment Rates at the Local Level" in *Child Support and Child Well-Being*, Irwin Garfinkel, Sara S. McLanahan and Philip K. Robins, eds., The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C.



- ❖ The percentage of cases under order is positively correlated with the percent of current support paid—a 3-5 percentage point increase in the cases under order increases the payment of current support by 1 percentage point.
- ❖ The proportion of cases located also affects the percent of current support paid. A 5 percentage point increase in located cases increases current support paid by 1 percentage point.

Percent of arrears cases with payment

- ❖ Payment of current support and the percentage of arrears cases with payments are highly and positively correlated. The analysis indicates that a 1.6-1.8 percentage point increase in the payment of current support increases the proportion of arrears cases with payments by 1 percentage point.

Chapter IV

Developing a Staffing Standard

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the additional procedures and assumptions used to move from the time estimates presented in Chapter III, but displayed again in Exhibit 9 below, to a proposed, updated staffing standard. The chapter concludes with a proposed, updated staffing standard and a comparison of it to the existing standard.

EXHIBIT 9				
MINUTES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE CHILD SUPPORT PROCESSES				
	FOCUS GROUPS		TIME LOGS	
	Average	Median	Average	Median
INTAKE				
01 Case Opening-Non-IV-A	131	106	51	45
02 Case Opening-IV-A	129	98	40	40
03 Case Opening-IV-E	96	94	125	125
04 Non-cooperation	53	49	13	13
05 Good Cause	76	70	NC	NC
06 Case Opening-Interstate (Responding)	100	96	98	98
07 Case Opening-Medical	119	98	40	40
LOCATE				
08 Locate NCP Address	56	54	5	7
09 Locate NCP Employer	57	55	9	5
10 Locate NCP Assets	51	18	5	5
ESTABLISHMENT				
11 Establishment Support Order-administratively	273	262	72	77
12 Establish Paternity Order-administratively	295	308	39	40
13 Responding Interstate Establishment	329	290	59	59
14 Initiating Interstate Establishment	225	195	148	148
15 Establish –Judicial	373	387	212	212
16 Responding Interstate Establishment –Judicial	377	330	21	21
17 Case Management –Establishment (per day)	177	193	12	9
18 Non-Cooperation	36	35	NC	NC
19 Case Closure	27	23	12	8
20 Genetic Testing	86	85	113	113
21 Prepare for Hearing	98	93	68	88
ENFORCEMENT				
22 Income Withholding	41	23	14	14
23 Review & Adjustment Orders	236	226	135	67
24 Enforcement Case Management (per day)	167	178	95	43
24 Enforcement Case Management (per month)	912	900	NA	NA



EXHIBIT 9				
MINUTES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE CHILD SUPPORT PROCESSES				
	FOCUS GROUPS		TIME LOGS	
	Average	Median	Average	Median
25 Case Closure	43	54	13	15
26 Medical Support	41	31	10	10
27 Non-Cooperation	38	35	9	9
28 Administrative Enforcement (liens, levy, tax intercept, credit reporting, license suspension)	Included in Case Management			
29 Prepare for Hearing	122	111	106	115
30 Contempt	151	175	160	160
31 Initiating Interstate Enforcement	132	120	19	21
FISCAL				
32-33 Fiscal Activities (total hours per day – sum of all staff)	9	4	7	7
Ordered Cases per Fiscal FTE	2040	2159	4390	3050
CUSTOMER SERVICE				
34-36 Phone & Walk-ins (total hours per day – sum of all staff)	31	11	10	14
Total Cases per Customer Service FTE	1869	1461	3751	3789

NC-none completed

BUILDING A STAFFING STANDARD

There are five steps to building a staffing standard from the time estimates presented in Exhibit 9 above. They are summarized below.

- Step 1** Count or estimate the number of completed processes displayed in Exhibit 9. This considers the total number of completed processes in calendar year (CY) 1999 for each County participating in the focus groups.
- Step 2** Multiply the average time estimate for each process by the number of processes completed to determine staffing needs. For example, say County X established 100 support orders administratively last year and it takes 5 hours on average to establish an administrative order. By multiplying 5 hours by 100 support orders, we find 500 hours of staff time per year are needed to achieve this outcome. This is repeated for each process within a function and for each County participating in the focus groups to develop the total number of hours of staff time by function.

-
- Step 3** Adjust for time not spent directly on processes (e.g., staff meetings) and convert hours into FTEs by considering holidays and other non-work time.
- Step 4** Relate hours needed to caseload by function. For example, if 3 FTEs are needed to perform all establishment processes and there are 900 cases without orders, the staffing standard is 300 non-ordered cases per FTE.
- Step 5** Make additional adjustments for supervisors and managers and other support functions (i.e., fiscal, customer service and ACSES liaison).

Step 1: Count the Number of Processes Completed

Most of the counts of processes were taken from summing the outcomes displayed in Monthly Management Report 410 (MM-410) for calendar year 1999. The data source and assumptions for each process are discussed in greater detail below by function. In the discussion, we use the following conventions:

- IVA/IVE refers to public assistance cases, including public assistance foster care cases;
- NIVA/NIVE refers to non-public assistance cases, including non-public assistance foster care cases, and
- FAD refers to cases with former (public assistance) arrears due.

Number of Intake Processes

For this function, the major process is intake. In Exhibit 9, which lists the processes considered in the focus groups and time logs, intakes were broken down by IVA status, foster care, and other statuses.

Number of IVA and NIVA Intakes. Although “new” cases are recorded separately for IVA/IVE and NIVA/NIVE on the MM-410 report, a new case does not necessarily mean “intake” for NIVA/NIVE cases. A closed IVA/IVE case may be reopened as NIVA/NIVE case and counted as a “new” NIVA/NIVE case.

To circumvent this problem, we considered two different definitions of “intake.”

- The first definition considers the sum of all IVA/IVE and NIVA/NIVE “new” cases. This is the count used in the existing standard. For reasons described in the previous paragraph, however, this overestimates the number of intakes.



- The second definition sums all IVA/IVE “new” cases and a proportion of IVA/IVE “new” cases. The proportion is the ratio of the number of NIVA/NIVE cases with only NIVA/NIVE current support and/or arrears due to all NIVA/NIVE cases, regardless of whether NIVA/NIVE or IVA/IVE current support or arrears are due.

The two different counts result in negligible differences. Thus, we use the first definition for intake and make no distinction between IVA/IVE and NIVA/NIVE intakes (Activities 1 and 2). Using this definition will also make it less burdensome to calculate in subsequent updates.

Foster Care, Interstate and Medicaid Intakes. The existing management reports do not discern between Foster Care, Interstate and Medicaid intakes, although separate time estimates were developed in the focus groups and time logs for these classifications (Activities 3, 6 and 7). Since these are subgroups under either IVA/IVE or NIVA/NIVE “new” cases, those under NIVA/NIVE would be subject to the same problem of former IVA/IVE cases reopening as NIVA/NIVE. Furthermore, because the amount of time required to perform a Foster Care intake (96 minutes), Interstate intake (100 minutes) and Medicaid Intake (119 minutes) are somewhat less, but close to the amount of time required to perform NIVA/NIVE and IVA/IVE intakes (131 and 129 minutes, respectively), we use the umbrella categories, NIVA/NIVE and IVA/IVE. In effect, this overestimates the time required for intake, but for the purposes of developing a staffing standard, we would rather err on the high side of the estimate.

Number of Non-Cooperation and Good Cause Cases. The remainder of the activities performed in the intake function are: non-cooperation and good cause (Activities 4 and 5 from Exhibit 9, respectively). The numbers of non-cooperation and good cause determinations are not recorded by county. They are only recorded on Colorado’s submission of form OCSE-157. There were 424 determinations of non-cooperation and 57 determinations of good cause during Federal Fiscal Year 1999. Because of the small State number and the lack of County-specific numbers, good cause is not included in the derivation. Non-cooperation, which also may occur in the establishment function, is considered at that stage of case processing rather than inferring how many non-cooperation determinations occur in intake relative to the establishment function.

Number of Completed Intake Processes^a		
Intake Processes	Data Source	Total Intake Processes for Counties Participating in Focus Groups
01 Case Openings (NIVA)	New enforcing NIVA/NIVE cases from MM-410, page 1	648 per month (CY1999)
02 Case Openings (IVA)	New enforcing IVA/IVE cases from MM-410, page 1	666 per month (CY1999)
04 Non-cooperation ^b	estimated from OCSE-157	131 (annually FY1999)
05 Good Cause	estimated OCSE-157	18 (annually FY1999)

^a Intake processes (03: IV-E, 06: Interstate; and 07:Medical) are not readily separable.

^b Because non-cooperation is also an establishment function and the number of non-cooperation determinations is small, all non-cooperation cases are considered in the establishment function.

Counting Locate Activities

The average amount of time for locating an address (Activity 8) is multiplied by the “verified locates: addresses” for IVA/IVE, NIVA/NIVE and FAD cases on page 3 of the MM-410. The average amount of time for locating assets (Activity 10) is multiplied by the “verified locates: assets” listed on the same page of the MM-410. The MM-410 information is captured for CY1999.

Number of Completed Locate Processes		
Locate Processes	Data Source	Total Locate Processes for Counties Participating in Focus Groups (CY 1999)
08-09 Locate NCP Address and Employer	MM-410, page 3, Verified Locates: Addresses (sum of IVA/IVE, NIVA/NIVE and FAD)	51,094
10 Locate NCP Assets	MM-410, page 3, Verified Locates: Assets (sum of IVA/IVE, NIVA/NIVE and FAD)	272



Counting Establishment Activities

The focus groups and time logs captured time estimates for 11 establishment processes, several of which are variations of order establishments. This included several sub-categories of establishment: (a) paternity and financial order establishment; (b) judicial and administrative process; and (c) responding and initiating interstate. With the exception of paternity and order establishments, and to a limited degree APAs, these distinctions are not made in any monthly management reports.

Number of Paternities and Orders Established. Page 3 of the MM-410 provides counts for order establishments and paternity establishments. The former is by number of orders and the latter is by the number of children. Both counts are listed for IVA/IVE, NIVA/NIVE and FAD separately. For the purposes of developing a staffing standard, all three counts for each activity are totaled for CY1999.

Number of APAs. Existing management reports do not tell us which orders are established administratively and which are established judicially. The MM-410, however, does list the number of APAs on page 3. We assume the difference between APAs and order establishments are judicial orders. (This adjustment accounts for Activities 11, 12 and 15 in Exhibit 9.) We use the ratio of APAs to judicially established orders to apportion the number of paternities into those established through APA and those established judicially.

Number of Interstate Establishments. Responding and initiating interstate establishments (Activities 13, 14 and 16) are not available on any existing management reports, so no distinction regarding interstate status is made. Nevertheless, we do not believe this is a necessary distinction because the time difference in establishing interstate and intrastate orders appears to be negligible.

Establishment Case Management. Case management has no measurable outcome. It includes follow-up telephone conversations with parents and enforcement technicians in other Counties and States whenever necessary. It also includes reviewing monthly and weekly reports (e.g., monthly caseload listings). It is considered in Step 3 along with other staff time not spent directly on processes.

Number of Non-Cooperation Cases. As discussed earlier, non-cooperation (Activity 18 of Exhibit 9) is not available in any monthly management report by county; however, the total for the State is provided in form OCSE-157. This number is attributed to each county by its respective share of the total State caseload.

Number of Case Closures. The number of case closures (Activity 19) is from the MM-430 rather than the MM-410, which has been the data source for all activities discussed thus far. Similar to most of the counts, they are listed separately by IVA/IVE and NIVA/NIVE status and are totaled for CY1999. Because case closure is also an enforcement function, only a share of them are assigned to establishment. They are assigned in the same ratio as court actions, which is discussed later.

Number of Genetic Tests. Genetic testing is not considered in this step for two reasons. First, the number of genetic tests performed (Activity 20) is not provided in any existing management report. Second, the focus groups considered genetic testing as part of establishing a paternity order.

Number of Court Hearing Preparations. The final establishment process (Process 21 in Exhibit 9) is court hearing preparation. Court orders filed for IVA/IVE, NIVA/NIVE and FAD cases, which are listed on page 3 of the MM-410, are used to count this process. However, because a court hearing preparation is also an enforcement function, we prorated the number of establishment court orders filed by using the ratio of estimated judicially established orders to the number of total orders established.



Number of Completed Establishment Processes		
Establishment Processes	Data Source	Total for Counties Participating in Focus Groups (CY 1999)
11 Establishment Support Order-administratively ^a	estimated from MM-410, page 3 from total orders established and APAs	1,753
12 Establish Paternity Order-administratively ^a	estimated from MM-410, page 3 from total paternities established and APAs	832
13 Responding Interstate Establishment	not separated	
14 Initiating Interstate Establishment	not separated	
15 Establish –Judicial ^b	estimated from MM-410, page 3 from total orders established and APAs	729
16 Responding Interstate Establishment –Judicial	not separated	
17 Case Management – Establishment (per day)	no measurable outcome	
18 Non-Cooperation	estimated from OCSE-157	131 (annually FY1999)
19 Case Closure	from MM-440 and weighed between enforcement and establishment	4,124
20 Genetic Testing	not available separately, included in paternity establishment	
21 Prepare for Hearing	from MM-410, page 3 from court orders filed and weighed between enforcement and establishment	731

^a In all, there were 2,585 APAs.

^b This is the difference between the number of orders established 3,314, and the number of APA (2,585).

Counting Enforcement Activities

Number of Income Withholdings and Modifications. There are nine enforcement activities displayed in Exhibit 9. The first two activities listed, income withholdings (Activity 22) and review and adjustment (Activity 23), have counts available from page 7 of the Monthly Monitoring Report.

Enforcement Case Management. Similar to establishment case management, enforcement case management (Activity 24) has no measurable outcome, thus is considered in Step 3 along with other staff time not directly spent on processes. It includes staff time dedicated to

monthly management reports such as the MW-530 (caseload listings) and EM-100 Credit Reporting Agency Notification reports.

Case Closure. Case closure (Activity 25) under the enforcement function includes the remainder of the total case closures that are not included as an establishment function.

Number of HIPs. Medical support (Activity 26) is typically sought in conjunction with income assignment, thus the same count available for income assignments from the Monthly Monitoring Reports is applied.

Number of Non-Cooperations. Non-cooperation (Activity 27), which is not available at the County level, but estimated from State data in the establishment function, is not considered in the enforcement function. All non-cooperation cases are assumed to occur in establishment.

Number of Administrative Enforcement Activities. Most administrative enforcement activities (Activity 28) consist of reviewing reports generated by the state (e.g., license suspension) and are included in the add-on for enforcement case management in Step 3.

Number of Court Hearing Preparations. Since this is also an establishment process, the difference between the total number of court filings and the amount applied to establishment are considered enforcement.

Number of Contempts. The number of contempt citations filed by county is recorded on page 7 of the Monthly Management Reports.

Number of Interstate Actions. The number of completed interstate actions is based on the total number of initiating reciprocal actions reported on page 3 of the MM-410.



Number of Completed Enforcement Processes		
Enforcement Processes	Data Source	Total for Counties Participating in Focus Groups (CY 1999)
22 Income Withholding	Monthly Monitoring Reports: Income Assignments filed, page 7	29,925
23 Review & Adjustment Orders	Monthly Monitoring Reports: Modifications, page 7	1,194
24 Enforcement Case Management	No Measurable Outcome	
25 Case Closure	from MM-440 and weighed between enforcement and establishment	16,004
26 Medical Support	Estimated from Monthly Monitoring Reports: Income Assignments filed, page 7	29,925
27 Non-Cooperation	Included in Establishment	
28 Administrative Enforcement (liens, levy, tax intercept, credit reporting, license suspension)	With the exception of liens, so specific outcome or count available from existing reports. Included in case management.	
29 Prepare for Hearing	from MM-410, page 3 from court orders filed and weighed between enforcement and establishment	3,326
30 Contempt	Monthly Monitoring Reports: Income Assignments filed, page 7	78
31 Initiating Interstate Enforcement	from MM-410, page 3, total initiating reciprocal actions	81

Fiscal and Customer Service

As discussed in the previous chapter, the number of fiscal and customer service activities completed are not counted. As a result, they are not addressed until Step 4 where the time spent on these activities is directly related to caseload.

Step 2: Multiply Time Estimates by Number of Processes Completed and Repeat for Each County and Processes

No additional assumptions were necessary to complete Step 2 with the exception of dividing the total number of orders established in Grand County between administratively and judicially established orders. The number of APAs in Grand County exceeded the number of orders established, so we assumed that all orders were established administratively in Grand County. Nonetheless, the number of APAs in Grand County could have exceeded the number of order establishments because it included modifications. No additional adjustment was made for this.

Step 3: Adjust for staff time not spent directly on processes.

County IV-D directors and supervisors were asked about the number of paid holidays and vacation time. Most of the counties have 11 paid holidays and two to three-weeks of paid vacation. In developing the staffing standard, we assumed 11 paid holidays and three-weeks of paid vacation.

County IV-D directors and supervisors also were asked how many hours staff spend in meetings and training. The responses varied widely among Counties and even among teams within the same County. As a result, we assumed 80 hours per year, which was toward the high-end of the estimates.

We made an additional adjustment for vacancies. The vacancy rate averaged 8 percent in the counties participating in the focus groups. As evident in Exhibit 10, when all factors are considered, we estimate that there are 1,630 available work hours per year per FTE to work directly on processes. (This is approximately 86 percent of total paid time.)

The Virginia Staffing Standard assumes 1,372 staff hours available per year before vacancies.¹ Since Virginia's vacancy rate is also 8 percent, this further reduces the total number of hours per year available to work directly on processes in Virginia to 1,210 hours (58 percent of total hours available). This is considerably less than what is shown in Exhibit 10 for Colorado, but Virginia did not separate out the extensive establishment and enforcement case management that was captured in the Colorado focus groups. If Virginia has excluded case management time from its calculations, the estimate of available work time would be higher.

¹ Omni Systems Inc. *Staffing Standards Analysis of the Virginia Department of Social Services Child Support and Enforcement Program*, Report to the Virginia Department of Social Services, Jasper, Georgia (December 29, 1995) page 9.



Exhibit 10		
Estimated Work Hours per Year Available to Perform Processes		
(1)	Total number of possible hours (52 weeks times 40 hrs per week)	2,080
(2)	11 paid holidays	- 88
(3)	3 weeks paid vacation/sick time	-120
(4)	80 hrs per year in meetings and training	- 80
(5)	Reduction due to vacancies (8% times line 1)	-162
(6)	Work hours available to perform processes (Line 1 minus sum of lines 2, 3, 4 and 5)	1,630
(7)	% of time (line 5 divided by line 1)	86%

The time logs also provide some indication of the proportion of time available to directly work on processes and that information supports our higher estimate of available work time. For the three sites recording time logs, the proportion of time spent working directly on processes was calculated at 67 percent, 87 percent, and 88 percent. We assumed that intake and locate technicians could work 75 percent of their time directly on processes. For establishment and enforcement technicians, we assumed 1,630 hours per year available to work directly on processes, but added hours for daily and monthly case management, which amounted to about three to four hours per day. The specific amounts added are based on the hours per day required for establishment and enforcement case management (Activities 17 and 24). There were no additional assumptions necessary for fiscal and customer service staff because they are related directly to caseload.

Step 4: Relate hours needed to caseload by function.

Caseloads were derived from the MM-410 reports for CY1999.

- ❖ Intakes are the monthly average number of new cases.
- ❖ Monthly average number of cases that need locate determined (i.e., categories 3, 5 and 7).
- ❖ Establishment caseloads are based on the monthly average number of located cases that need establishment (i.e., categories 4 and 6)
- ❖ Enforcement caseloads are based on the monthly average number of located cases with orders (i.e., categories 1 and 2)
- ❖ Customer Service is based on total caseload.
- ❖ Fiscal activity is based on the number of cases with orders.

The caseload for each function was divided by the total number of minutes required to complete each of the processes within that function, which was calculated in Step 2. This was done individually for each county that participated in the focus groups. We used an average for all the counties as the staffing standard.

Step 5: Make additional adjustments for managers and supervisors and other functions.

Other functions considered in this task are fiscal activities, customer service and ACSES liaison. In this step, we also add supervisors and managers and address the small county add-on.

Fiscal Activities. Staffing for fiscal activities is based on information from the focus groups. Since no measurable outcomes for fiscal activities exist, we developed a caseload standard directly. Our approach was to take the number of ordered cases divided by the average number of hours per day (converted to FTEs) spent on fiscal activities.

As shown in Appendix E, the number of ordered cases per fiscal FTE averages 2,040 cases and ranges from 1,299 to 2,424 ordered cases per fiscal FTE.

Customer Service. As discussed earlier, customer service is one of the most difficult functions to define precisely. It is particularly difficult in the smaller counties where customer service is entangled with intake, establishment and enforcement processes. To add further difficulty, it is similar to fiscal activities in that there are no measurable outcomes. As a result, we developed a caseload standard similar to fiscal activities. To do that, we used total caseload because some customer activities (e.g., Denver County's staff person dedicated to handling walk-ins) may involve spending time on ordered and non-ordered cases.

As evident in Appendix E, the number of cases per customer service FTE averages 1,869 cases and ranges from 848 to 3,194 cases per customer service FTE. Due to the wide range, we discussed the issue with the MIG Advisory Group. They recommended using 1,500 cases per customer services FTE, which is closer to the median shown in Appendix E.

ACSES Liaison. Per the recommendation of the MIG Advisory Group, an additional adjustment for the ACSES Liaison was added to the standard later. An e-mail was sent to the ACSES County Users Group requesting they send estimates to project staff about the average amount of time spent on ACSES Liaison duties. Some of the ACSES Liaison duties include the following:



-
- ❖ Serving as the County ASCES Point of Contact for problem logs, hotline issues, disseminating new and revised State procedures to the County, and providing/arranging training as needed.
 - ❖ Researching and attempting to resolve ACSES issues at the County level before they are referred to the State as problem logs.

Four counties responded to the survey. The number of cases per ACSES Liaison FTE equivalent they reported were 8,915; 116,408; 9,778; and 15,576, respectively. We eliminated the highest estimate to arrive at an average number of cases of 11,423. We rounded this number to 11,400 cases per ACSES Liaison.

Supervision and Management. Assumptions about management and supervision are based on (a) existing staffing levels for those positions, (b) experiences at other child support offices, and (c) a discussion with the MIG advisory group. The recommended staffing levels for supervision and management are:

- ❖ one supervisor for every seven staff; and
- ❖ one manager for every seven supervisors.

Small County Add-On. We found little evidence in our work to justify a small county add-on. With the exception of customer services, the time estimates for the processes showed no major departure by county size.

With respect to customer service, smaller counties had a higher ratio of cases to customer service hours in the focus groups. (That pattern was not evident in the time logs, however.) When presented with this issue, the MIG Advisory Group recommended a limited small county add-on: the minimum number of staff for a county would be 1.0 FTE. That is, if the staffing formula resulted in a staff level of 0.5 FTE, the number would be increased to 1.0 FTE. The basis for this recommendation is that it would be difficult to fill a part-time position.

PROPOSED STAFFING STANDARDS

Exhibit 11 summarizes the staffing standard developed in this chapter. It provides three options:

- ❖ Option A: Does not treat locate separately.
- ❖ Option B: Treats locate separately, provides more customer service (i.e., customer service amount is based on the median caseload by Customer Service FTE).
- ❖ Option C: Treats locate separately, but provides less customer service than Option B (i.e., uses the average caseload per Customer Service FTE rather than the median caseload).

For comparison purposes, the existing standard is also displayed in the exhibit. The effects of these proposed staffing standards on Counties are also displayed in Appendix G.



Exhibit 11 Proposed Staffing Standards				
Function	Effective Existing Standard	Proposed Standard: Option A	Proposed Standard: Option B	Proposed Standard: Option C
Intake	50 intakes per FTE	60 intakes per FTE	60 intakes per FTE	60 intakes per FTE
Locate	not considered	not considered	630 categories 3,5 and 7 cases per FTE	630 categories 3,5 and 7 cases per FTE
Establishment	447 non-ordered cases per FTE	745 categories 4, 5 6 & 7 cases per FTE	325 categories 4 & 6 per FTE	325 categories 4 & 6 per FTE
Enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 303 IVA cases per FTE • 466 NIVA cases per FTE 	570 categories 1, 2 & 3 cases per FTE	390 categories 1 and 2 per FTE	390 categories 1 and 2 per FTE
Fiscal	1,500 payments per month per FTE	2,040 ordered cases per FTE	2,040 ordered cases per FTE	2,040 ordered cases per FTE
Customer Service	6,000 cases per FTE	1,500 cases per FTE	1,500 cases per FTE	1,870 cases per FTE
ACES Liaison	50,000 cases per FTE	11,400 cases per FTE	11,400 cases per FTE	11,400 cases per FTE
Supervisors and Managers	4-8 supervisors per FTE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 supervisor per 7 FTE • 1 manager per 7 supervisors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 supervisor per 7 FTE • 1 manager per 7 supervisors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 supervisor per 7 FTE • 1 manager per 7 supervisors
Small County Add-on	10-100% Add-on for counties with less than 10 FTE	Minimum number of FTE = 1	minimum number of FTE = 1	minimum number of FTE = 1

Chapter V

Special Issues and Updating

In this chapter, we address some of the special issues that have arisen in developing staffing standards:

- ❖ need for bilingual services;
- ❖ additional time needed to process interstate cases;
- ❖ high staff turnover;
- ❖ new demands for customer service, including fatherhood programs;
- ❖ attorneys; and
- ❖ future changes in automation, legislation, and focus.

We also provide some guidance for updating the recommended staffing standards.

SPECIAL ISSUES

Bilingual services. Half of the counties that participated in the focus groups made a point of hiring bilingual staff. Spanish was the second language of the bilingual staff, yet some counties reported that they have an increasing number of non-English speaking customers who speak other languages (e.g., Vietnamese). With the exception of one County, there is a general belief that there is a greater need for bilingual services in the early stages of child support enforcement such as in the intake and establishment functions. For these functions, focus group participants typically estimated that processes take 50 percent longer when bilingual staff are required. In particular, interviewing takes longer for non-English speaking customers. One focus group participant explained that the increased time not only resulted from the language barrier, but time to explain the laws and deal with cultural differences.

Interstate cases. One issue of concern was whether interstate cases require more work than in-state cases and therefore whether adjustments to the standards are needed for technicians with a high proportion of interstate cases in their caseload. We could find no evidence that interstate cases require more work. As shown in the time estimates for intake and establishment functions (Exhibit 9), interstate cases did not take longer to process than intrastate cases. With regard to enforcement, interstate case activity was considered through filing interstate actions and as part of case management (e.g., calling other responding and initiating States as needed). Our analysis does not show a



relationship between the proportion of interstate cases in a caseload and the time required for case management.

Staff turnover. Supervisors at the Counties that participated in the focus groups repeatedly mentioned the problems high staff turnover create, especially in training new staff. We do not know what the staff turnover rate is, but did not hear that it is excessively high or low. Nevertheless, we recognize there will always be some staff turnover and all of the counties we visited had experienced some turnover in the last year. We attempted to deal with this issue as part of the focus group discussions by specifically asking participants to tell us how their time estimates would change for a new worker. The average time estimates we developed from those focus groups include the increased time new technicians would require to complete their work. Thus, we believe the staffing standards shown in Exhibit 11 are sufficient to accommodate a normal level of staff turnover.

Customer Service. The MIG Advisory Group suggested that the proposed staffing standard should emphasize customer service and give counties flexibility in how they provide customer service. Customer service may take several avenues ranging from fielding questions directed to a call center to providing intensive, personal services for a fatherhood program. The staffing standards would be quite different depending on the type and level of service. Of the ten fatherhood programs we are evaluating around the country, one program has as few as 30 cases per FTE (case management, peer support, job-related services), while another has several hundred (monitoring job search and job retention).

Attorneys. Attorneys are not considered in the existing staffing standard, nor are they considered in the proposed staffing standard. Most Counties contract with the County District Attorney's Office for child support attorneys. The contracts and attorney staffing are determined by the County.

Future Changes. Changes in automation, legislation and other directives could result in changes in recommended staffing standards. This year alone, the State has made many improvements that should help technicians locate parents more quickly and streamline administrative enforcement actions. The precise impact of these changes on staffing is unknown. On the one hand, increased automation may eliminate steps in some processes (e.g., recent improvements to locate.) On the other hand, it may increase the need for customer service (e.g., automated license suspension). The proposed staffing standards were designed with a customer service emphasis and to allow Counties flexibility in how they staff this function. The standards also ensure that all Counties, no matter how small,

have at least one child support FTE. As the impacts of these and other changes become better known, we believe the staffing standards may need to be adjusted.

UPDATING THE STAFFING STANDARDS

The approach used to updating any of the proposed staffing standards should be very similar to the approach used to update the existing standards. That approach requires using the counts from the MM-410, entering those counts into a spreadsheet that has the staffing formulas, and then executing the formulas to arrive at the standards. We see no reason to deviate from this practice.

Most of the counts used in the recommended staffing standards are the same as those used in the existing standards. Exhibit 12 compares what data elements are necessary to update the existing standards and what data elements are necessary to replicate the proposed standards. Proposed Model A requires one less data element than the existing model. Proposed Models B and C both require three new data elements, but also eliminate one of the existing data elements.

Exhibit 12				
Data Elements Required from the MM-410 Report for Updating the Staffing Standard				
	Existing	Proposed: Model A	Proposed: Model B	Proposed: Model C
Total number of “new” enforcing cases	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total number of cases	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total number of ordered cases	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total number of non-ordered cases	✓	✓	✓	✓
Number of payments processed	✓			
Number of cases in Locate Status (Categories 3, 5 and 7)			✓	✓
Number of Located, Enforcement Cases (Categories 1 and 2)			✓	✓
Number of Located Establishment Cases (Categories 4 and 6)			✓	✓



CONCLUSIONS

There are several approaches we could have taken to developing staffing standards in this study. All of them have advantages and disadvantages. Regardless of what approach we used, however, none will produce standards that are perfect. This reflects the fact that establishing staffing standards is part science and part art, especially in the human services profession. If it were all science, it is quite likely that every state would have invested in developing staffing standards for their child support operations. Yet, our review of efforts in other states reveals that very few of them have staffing standards and a few that once had standards have since abandoned them or not updated them.

The Delphi technique we used to develop standards in this study relies on professional estimates from child support technicians about the time needed to do quality work on individual cases. Those estimates will vary for a wide range of factors—some specific to the organization, some to the nature of the work, some to the population being served, and some to differences among individual staff—not all of which can be accommodated within a single standard. The standards developed in this study attempt to incorporate adjustments for several special factors (e.g., staff turnover) we believe are important to consider. We have been guided by input from the MIG Advisory Group and others about the appropriateness of the resulting standards and by the State’s desire to make the standards flexible and easy to update. We believe the final standards achieve those objectives.

**APPENDIX A:
DETAILED TASKS OF CHILD SUPPORT PROCESSES**



Detailed Tasks for Child Support Processes

Function	Process	Steps	
I. INTAKE	1. Case Opening – Non IV-A		
		A Process application fee	
		B Check COIN to make certain CP was not previously on assistance	
		C Set up case on ACSES	
		D Check judicial system (ICON) for orders and records on NCP	
		E Conduct soft locate (DMV, ESC, food stamps, etc.)	
		F Check vital statistics records for birth certificate (COVIS)	
		G Create case file	
		H Conduct interview with CP	
		I Initiate locate if necessary	
		J Request orders and pay records, if necessary (From CP)	
		K Initiate ledger	
		2. Case Opening – IV-A	
			A Conduct interview with CP
			B Notify IV-A of cooperation status (if CP is Non-Coop)
			C Check judicial system (ICON) for orders and records on NCP
			D Conduct soft locate (DMV, ESC, food stamps, etc.)
			E Check vital statistics records for birth certificate (COVIS)
			F Assess ACSES information to determine appropriate enforcing county
			G If not appropriate enforcing county, send e-mail to enforcing county to alert them that the CP is now in County, and provide updated information from the CP
			H Update ACSES
			I Create case file
			J Initiate Locate if necessary
			K Initiate ledger
		3. Case Opening – Foster Care (not relevant for all Counties)	
			A Check judicial system (ICON) for orders and records on NCP
			B Conduct soft locate (DMV, ESC, food stamps, etc.)
			C Check vital stat records for birth certificate (COVIS)
			D Assess ACSES information to determine appropriate enforcing county
			E If not appropriate enforcing county, send e-mail to enforcing county to alert them of foster care status
			F Update ACSES
		G Create case file	

Function	Process	Steps
I. INTAKE		H Initiate ledger
	4. Non-cooperation	
		A Meet with CP to obtain mandatory information
		B If information not provided, complete non-coop form
		C Forward form to IV-A Tech
		D Generate closure letter
		E Close case on ACSES
		F Forward file to archived area (file room)
	5. Good Cause	
		A Review good cause request
		B Make recommendation for IV-A Administrator
		C Close case on ACSES
		D Forward file to archived area (file room)
	6. Case Opening – Interstate (Responding)	
		A Obtain referral from State central registry. ACSES updated at State office.
		B Send acknowledgement to initiating state and request for information if necessary
		C Initiate locate if necessary and update initiating state
		D Create case file
		E Establish ledger
	7. Case Opening – Medicaid	
		A Conduct interview with CP
		B Notify IV-A of cooperation status
		C Check judicial system for orders and records on NCP
		D Conduct soft locate (DMV, ESC, food stamps, etc.)
		E Check vital statistics records for birth certificate (COVIS)
		F Assess ACSES information to determine appropriate enforcing county
		G If not appropriate enforcing county, send e-mail to enforcing county to alert them that the CP is now in now in County, and provide updated information from the CP
		H Update ACSES
		I Create case file
		J Initiate locate if necessary
		K Initiate ledger
		L Request court orders if relevant

Function	Process	Steps	
II. LOCATE	8. Locate NCP Address	A Send address verification form to the PO	
		B Put NCP in locate on ACSES if necessary	
		C Contact CP for updated information and/or to provide status update	
		D Send out-of-state locate request if necessary	
		E Check food stamp records	
		F Check old employer records for last known address	
		G Soft locate (DMV, ESC, food stamps, etc.)	
		H Phone contact with anyone that might give them a lead	
		I Check ICON (court system)	
		J Credit check	
		K Update ACSES	
		9. Locate NCP Employer	A Send employment verification form to employer or last known employer
			B Call employer or last known employer
	C Put NCP in locate on ACSES if necessary		
	D Contact CP for updated information and/or to provide status update		
	E Send out-of-state locate request if necessary		
	F Soft locate (DMV, ESC, food stamps, etc.)		
	G Phone contact with anyone that might give them a lead		
	H Check ICON (court system)		
	I Credit check		
	J Update ACSES		
	10. Locate NCP Assets		A If CP reports that NCP has assets, contacts assessor or clerk and recorder for property and/or vehicle information. Check for Bank accounts.
		B Send subpoena to banks in which NCP may have an account	
		C Initiate discovery proceedings to locate assets	
		D Credit check	
		E Update ACSES	

Function	Process	Steps
III. ESTABLISHMENT		
	11. Establish Support Order	
		A Send notice of financial responsibility, subpoena and notice of negotiation conference to NCP by personal service or certified mail
		B Set cal review
		C Obtain wage history for NCP from ESC or employer
		D Send notice of negotiation conference to CP
		E IF NO RESPONSE:
		F Calculate support based on whatever income can be found for the party
		G Create default order
		H File order with Court
		I Mail order to parties
		J Enter order on ACSES
		K Send IWO and HIP to employer (if appropriate)
		L Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger
		M Update ACSES
		N IF RESPONSE RECEIVED:
		O Review returned documents and calculate support during negotiation conference
		P Prepare order and obtain signature at negotiation conference OR
		Q File order with Court
		R Enter order on ACSES
		S Send IWO and HIP to employer (if appropriate)
		T Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger
		U Update ACSES
		V Set Cal review to check for payment
		W IF PARTY CONTESTS
		X File motion for hearing with court
		Y Serve Parties with motion for hearing
		Z Update ACSES
	12. Establish Paternity Order	
		A APA Action for Paternity
		B Send notice
		C Set cal review
		D IF NO RESPONSE:
		E Create default order
		F File order with Court
		G Mail order to parties
		H Enter order on ACSES
		I Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger
		J Update ACSES
		K IF RESPONSE RECEIVED:
		L Review returned documents

Function	Process	Steps
III. ESTABLISHMENT		M Prepare order and obtain signature at negotiation conference OR
		N Schedule Genetic Tests
		O File order with Court
		P Enter order on ACSES
		Q Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger
		R Update ACSES
		S IF PARTY CONTESTS
		T File motion for hearing with court
		U Serve Parties with motion for hearing
		V Update ACSES
13. Responding Interstate Paternity and/or Support Establishment		
	A	Send notice of financial responsibility, subpoena and notice of negotiation conference to NCP by personal service
	B	Obtain wage history for NCP from ESC or employer
	C	Send notice of negotiation conference to initiating state
	D	IF NO RESPONSE:
	E	Calculate support based on whatever income can be found for the party
	F	Create default order
	G	File order with Court
	H	Mail order to parties
	I	Enter order on ACSES
	J	Send IWO and HIP to employer (if appropriate)
	K	Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger
	L	Update ACSES
	M	IF RESPONSE RECEIVED:
	N	Review returned documents and calculate support during negotiation conference
	O	Prepare order and obtain signature at negotiation conference OR
	P	Schedule Genetic Tests OR
	Q	Refer to attorney for hearing if NCP refuses to sign order
	R	Update initiating state
	S	File order with Court
	T	Enter order on ACSES
	U	Send IWO and HIP to employer (if appropriate)
	V	Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger
	W	Set cal review to check for payment
	X	If party contests, refer case to the attorney for hearing
	Y	Update ACSES
14. Initiating Interstate Paternity and/or Support Establishment		
	A	Schedule meeting with CP to sign UIFSA documents

Function	Process	Steps	
III. ESTABLISHMENT		B Complete UIFSA documents	
		C Mail docs to responding state	
		D Set cal review	
		E Update ACSES	
		F Send status requests	
		G Call CP with updates	
	15. Establish Paternity and/or Support – Judicial		
		A Attempt administrative process first	
		B If party objects refer to attorney for hearing	
		C If multiple putative fathers, or either CP or NCP is a minor, automatically file judicial action	
		D Serve parties	
		E Prepare stipulation and order	
		F Calculate support	
		G Calculate UPA (IF doing debt order)	
		H Attend hearing and attempt to obtain stipulation	
		I Enter order on ACSES	
		J Send IWO and HIP to employer (if appropriate)	
		K Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger	
		L Update ACSES	
	16. Responding Interstate Establishment – Judicial		
		A Attempt administrative process first	
		B If party objects refer to attorney for hearing	
	C Update initiating state		
	D Serve NCP		
	E Prepare stipulation and order		
	F Calculate support		
	G Calculate UPA		
	H Attend hearing and attempt to obtain stipulation		
	I Enter order on ACSES		
	J Send IWO and HIP to employer (if appropriate)		
	K Forward file to bookkeeping to initiate the ledger		
	L Update ACSES		
	M Update initiating state		
17. Establishment & Enforcement Case Management			
	A Work ACSES referral lists		
	B Make daily chronology notes of action taken on cases		
	C Contact CPs with status update or request for new information		
	D Work ACSES cal reviews		
	E Work monthly State management reports including		
	F MW-530 or MW-531 Caseload Listings		
	G IM-710 Case Class & Status Exception Report		

Function	Process	Steps	
III. ESTABLISHMENT		H EM-100 Credit Reporting Agency Notification	
		I EM-002 Drivers License Suspension & Case History	
		J AM-240 Auto MSO	
		K MM-460 Delinquent Accounts 30,60,90 days	
		L Work daily mail	
		M Take daily phone calls	
		N See daily walk-ins	
		O Maintain ACSES	
		18. Non-cooperation	
			A Meet with CP to obtain mandatory information
			B If information not provided, complete non-coop form
			C Forward form to IV-A Tech if necessary
			D Generate closure letter
			E Close case on ACSES
			F Forward file to closed file room
		19. Case Closure	
			A Generate closure letter
			B Update ACSES screens including ledger
			C Notify other states if relevant
			D Copy and mail letter
			E Forward file to closed file room
		20. Genetic Testing	
			A Schedule parties for testing
			B If responding interstate case, call Immunological Associates to schedule the CP
		C Send letter to parties with schedule information	
		D Notify parties when results received	
		E Update ACSES	
	21. Prepare For Hearing		
		A Serve notice of hearing on NCP	
		B Obtain record of earnings	
		C Calculate support	
		D Calculate retroactive debt	
		E Calculate UPA	
		F Prepare any necessary documents	
		G Update ACSES	

Function	Process	Steps
IV. ENFORCEMENT		
	22. Income Withholding	
		A Locate employer
		B Determine arrears amount to be withheld
		C Prepare IWO
		D Copy and mail IWO to employer
		E File copy with the Court
		F Set Cal review to check for payment
		G If out-of-state employer, send direct withholding documents to other state
		H Update ACSES
	23. Review & Adjustment of Orders:	
		A Upon written request for review, prepare, copy and mail notice of right to review, financial affidavit, etc., to parties
		B Set cal review
		C Send postal and employment verifications out on both parties
		D Review returned financial affidavits (FA) for completeness. If incomplete, contact parties
		E If FA not returned by CP, initiate closure process for non-cooperation
		F If FA not returned by NCP and he/she requested the review, close review and notify parties
		G If CP cooperates and NCP does not, obtain wage information from all sources possible, or impute minimum wage
		H Complete guidelines calculation worksheet
		I Send review results to parties, including stipulation and order if appropriate.
		J If parties sign stipulation, prepare order, file with court and mail to parties
		K If CP signs and NCP doesn't respond, prepare default order
		L If any party refuses to sign, prepare motion and order for judicial hearing, and notice of hearing if hearing warranted, e.g., (custody dispute)
		M Prepare for hearing
		N AFTER NEW ORDER OBTAINED:
		O Enter new order information on ACSES
		P Send e-mail to accounting to adjust the ledger
		Q Send income withholding documents to employer
		R If interstate case, send status updates
		S Update ACSES
	24. Establishment & Enforcement Case Management	
		A Work ACSES referral lists
		B Make daily chronology notes of action taken on cases

Function	Process	Steps	
IV. ENFORCEMENT		C Contact CPs with status update or request for new information	
		D Work ACSES cal reviews	
		E Work monthly State management reports including	
		F MW-530 or MW-531 Caseload Listings	
		G IM-710 Case Class & Status Exception Report	
		H EM-100 Credit Reporting Agency Notification	
		I EM-002 Drivers Lic Suspension & Case History	
		J AM-240 Auto MSO	
		K MM-460 Delinquent Accounts 30,60,90 days	
		L Work daily mail	
		M Take daily phone calls	
		N See daily walk-ins	
		O Maintain ACSES	
		25. Case Closure	
			A Make closure determination
			B Generate closure letter
			C Adjust non-assigned arrears off of the ledger
			D If still current order, send notice to NCP to pay the CP directly (if appropriate)
			E Update ACSES screens
			F Copy and mail letter
			G Transfer case file to basement
		26. Medical Support	
			A Locates employer
			B Prepare HIP
			C Copy and mail HIP to employer
			D Interact with employer to answer questions if relevant
			E Send policy information to the CP
			F Update ACSES
		27. Non-cooperation	
			A Meet with CP to obtain mandatory information
			B If information not provided, complete non-coop form
			C Forward form to IV-A Tech if necessary
			D Generate closure letter
			E Close case on ACSES
			F Forward file to closed file room
		28. Administrative Enforcement (Liens, Levy, Tax Intercept, Credit Reporting, License Suspension)	
			A Complete monthly arrears calculation
			B If arrears correct, refer to IV-D Administrator for administrative review

Function	Process	Steps
IV. ENFORCEMENT		C If arrears incorrect, contact NCP with updated information
		D IF ARREARS CORRECT
		E Generate, copy and mail notice of review to parties
		F Update ACSES screens with admin review information
		G Review entire case and financial history
		H Make determination
		I Draft determination notice, copy and mail to the parties
		J Update ACSES
		29. Prepare For Hearing
	A Calculate arrears	
	B Prepare chronological history for attorney	
	C Review case with attorney	
	D Prepare all appropriate pleadings	
	E Coordinate service of process	
	F Re-locate NCP if necessary	
	G Attend hearing	
	H Prepare final order, copy and mail, etc.	
	I Update ACSES	
	30. Contempt	
	A Locate NCP	
	B Prepare contempt citation	
	C Review case with attorney	
	D Prepare service documents	
	E Prepare for hearing	
	F Contact CP to appear at hearing	
	G Prepare order, etc.	
	H Update ACSES	
	31. Initiating Interstate Enforcement	
	A Schedule meeting with CP to sign UIFSA documents	
	B Complete UIFSA documents	
	C Mail docs to responding state	
	D Set cal review	
	E Update ACSES	
	F Call CP with update	
	G Send status requests to responding state	

Function	Process	Steps
IV. FISCAL	32. Ledger Calculation	
		A Enter order and/or judgment information in ACSES
		B Initiate the ledger
		C Post MAD and MSO
		D Send redirect notice to CP, NCP and/or court
	33. Allocation, Distribution, Disbursement	
		A Adjust ledgers
		B Keep credit bureau and license suspension ledgers cleaned up
		C Process over-the-counter payments
		D Reconciliation activity
		E General ledger activities
		F Work daily ID suspense
		G Place CP or NCP in locate if necessary
		H Review ledger to determine how and where to apply payment
		I Recover erroneous disbursements
		J Resolve misapplied payments
		K Resolve State and FSR problem logs
		L Update ACSES screen

Function	Process	Steps
V. CUSTOMER SERVICE:		
	34. Phone Calls	
		A Call goes to automated attendant, and if extension number or name of worker known, caller is transferred directly to that individual
		B Otherwise, call goes to customer service
		C If unresolvable by customer service, chronology note made by CSR, and then cal review set for appropriate legal tech to follow up.
		D Update ACSES
	35. Mail	
		A All mail given to workers by admin
		B Review mail
		C Update ACSES
		D Take next appropriate step
	36. Walk-Ins	
		A Customer service initially sees all walk-ins. If unable to help, then legal tech sees the individual right away
		B Take whatever action is necessary
		C Update ACSES

**APPENDIX B:
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS OF
PARTICIPATING COUNTIES**



Selected Demographics of Colorado Counties Participating in Study

	Adams	Delta	Denver	Eagle	Fremont	Garfield	
Population (July 1998 Estimate)	323,853	26,619	499,055	33,538	43,904	39,301	
<i>Ethnic/Minority Population (1990)</i>							
-white	75.3%	90.3%	61.6%	85.6%	87.8%	93.0%	
-African American	3.2%	0.2%	12.9%	0.2%	2.6%	0.4%	
-Hispanic	17.9%	8.4%	21.9%	13.4%	8.3%	5.5%	
-Asian/Pacific Islander	2.4%	0.2%	2.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	
-American Indian/Eskimo	0.9%	0.8%	1.1%	0.4%	1.0%	0.9%	
-Other	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
Median Family Income (1990)	\$34,618	\$22,197	\$32,038	\$41,183	\$24,350	\$32,377	
Personal Income Per Capita (1990)	\$12,615	\$9,586	\$15,590	\$18,202	\$9,971	\$13,086	
Unemployment Rate (Jan 2000)	2.7%	4.2%	3.2%	1.5%	3.6%	3.2%	
Families with Children (1990)	40,357	2,640	54,524	3,182	3,640	4,407	
Proportion of Single-Parent Families with Related Children	26.0%	18.9%	36.1%	19.0%	23.2%	20.9%	
Proportion of Single-Parent Families with Related Children	33.5%	54.1%	43.1%	20.7%	45.4%	25.4%	
Birth Rate-- per 1,000 (1998)	16.8	11.9	19.7	18.6	10.0	15.9	
Number of Births (1998)	5,428	318	9,833	623	438	624	
Births to unwed mothers (1998)	1,578	80	3,535	96	156	144	
Non-Marital Birth Ratio (1998)	29.1%	25.2%	36.0%	15.4%	35.6%	23.1%	
- Language - English	84.1%	90.0%	81.8%	83.3%	91.1%	92.2%	
- Language - Spanish Isolated	1.14%	1.34%	2.19%	2.67%	0.23%	0.33%	
- Language - Asian Isolated	0.59%	0.04%	0.52%	0.02%	0.00%	0.09%	
- Language - Other Isolated	0.28%	0.50%	0.85%	0.32%	0.30%	0.18%	
Spanish Spoken at Home (Persons)	19,498	1,178	51,641	1,999	1,422	820	
Spanish Spoken at Home %	7.4%	5.6%	11.0%	9.1%	4.4%	2.7%	
1998 Hispanic Population Estimate	70,438	2,917	135,308	5,396	5,092	2,605	
1998 Hispanic Population Estimate %	21.7%	11.0%	27.1%	16.1%	11.6%	6.6%	

**APPENDIX C:
PROTOCOL FOR FOCUS GROUPS**



CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT TECHNICIANS FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

Policy Studies Inc. (PSI) is under contract to the Colorado Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) to develop a model for estimating staffing standards for child support enforcement technicians. Since the existing model was last updated in 1995, the child support program has changed dramatically, particularly with the passage of PRWORA in 1996. The State is seeking advice about how it can refine its existing staffing model or develop a new model that better meets the changing nature of the child support program.

With the help of county program managers, PSI staff have defined a set of child support functions (e.g., establishment), processes (e.g., establish a paternity order), and steps (e.g., APA action for paternity) enforcement technicians must complete as part of program operations. PSI staff are now trying to capture information about the amount of time required to complete the selected processes. Some of the data collection will be done in interviews with small groups of technicians in selected counties. In other counties, we are asking staff to complete logs of the time they spend on selected child support processes. PSI will analyze the information from both the interviews and time logs and develop some suggested time ranges for each child support process. These times will be reviewed and refined with input from a small group of county program directors before we use them to establish staffing standards.

Focus Group Specifications

1. We will conduct focus groups for the following six functions: (a) Intake (b) Locate, (c) Establishment, (d) Enforcement, (e) Customer Service, and (f) Accounting. These may be separate focus groups in offices where technicians specialize by function, or combined groups where they do not.
2. Up to 10 technicians per group (optimal number 5-8). Criteria for selection include: (a) at least 6 months in their current position, (b) primary work is in one or more of the six functions.
3. Focus groups will last no longer than 2 hours.

Focus Group Protocol

1. Introduction: (a) give the background to and goals of the project, (b) list the goals of the focus group sessions, (c) describe the process to gather information from participants, (d) discuss how the information will be used, and (e) respond to participant questions.
2. Distribute a set of 5x7 cards to each participant. Each card will display one function, one process, and the steps associated with that process. Participants will be asked to independently estimate the amount of time they need to complete the steps shown for a given process. Do this for one process and continue with the next steps so that participants better understand the process and so that later steps can be done more quickly.
3. Use a round robin approach to list on a flip chart the time estimates from each participant. Discuss the estimates so that all participants understand what others were thinking in developing their independent estimates. Note any special factors the participants think need to be considered in developing the estimates.
4. Refine the estimates and try to develop some estimate of time for an average technician. Try to define a range around the average for more experienced and new technicians.
5. Replicate the approach for the remainder of the processes in that function. However, in the second round, give participants time to develop time estimates for all the remaining processes to be discussed. Discuss each process separately.
6. If there is time, develop a separate time estimate for administrative/non-work processes.
7. Debrief at least in first session to learn what worked/did not work and how to improve the approach to developing time estimates.

**APPENDIX D:
TIME LOG INSTRUCTIONS**



CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT TECHNICIAN TIME LOG INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING TIME LOGS

INTRODUCTION

Policy Studies Inc. (PSI) is under contract to the Colorado Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) to develop a model for estimating staffing standards for child support enforcement technicians. Since the existing model was last updated in 1995, the child support program has changed dramatically, particularly with the passage of PRWORA in 1996. The State is seeking advice about how it can refine its existing staffing model or develop a new model that better meets the changing nature of the child support program.

With the help of county program managers, PSI staff have defined a set of child support functions (e.g., establishment), processes (e.g., establish a paternity order), and steps (e.g., APA action for paternity) enforcement technicians must complete as part of program operations. PSI staff are now trying to capture information about the amount of time required to complete the selected processes. Some of the data collection will be done in interviews with small groups of technicians in selected counties. In other counties, we are asking staff to complete logs of the time they spend on selected child support processes. PSI will analyze the information from both the interviews and time logs and develop some suggested time ranges for each child support process. These times will be reviewed and refined with input from a small group of county program directors before we use them to establish staffing standards.

The following instructions will help you complete the time logs to document the time you spend on selected child support processes. The instructions require that you have the following information.

✓ **Before you begin, you should have the following information:**

1. Daily time log to record your time.
2. List of codes for each child support process and how we define case completion.
3. List of child support functions, processes, and steps.

PROCEDURES

1. Find the daily time log for the day you are working. Please enter the office location, the date, and the time you began work.
2. As you begin your day, please select a process code from the list provided and write the code on the time log. (If you need information about what steps are included in each process, please review the extensive list of functions, processes and steps also provided.) Record the start time for this process to the nearest minute.

(Please note: there is a code for every process. We realize you may help another worker on a process that is normally not your responsibility. That is fine. Just record whatever process number you are working on.)

For example, you would enter process code "10" on the time log if you are "Establishing a Support Order" and the time you began that process (e.g., 8:45 a.m.)

3. When you begin a different process, please record (a) the time you stopped the previous process, (b) the number of cases you worked on, and (c) the number of cases for which you *completed* the process. By "completing the process" we mean when you completed your work on the case *for that process*. For "Establishing a Support Order," the case completion activity would be when you enter the order on ACSES. Thus, although you may have done work on eight cases related to Establishing a Support Order, you may only have entered the order on ACSES in two cases. In the "number of cases worked on" column, then, you would enter the number 8 and in the "number of cases completed" column you would enter the number 2.

For example, for "Establishing a Support Order" a typical time log entry might be:

Process Code	Time start	Time end	# cases worked on	# cases completed
10	8:45	9:30	8	2

4. Case Management: We have defined a separate process for case management activities. This includes activities that are case-related, but that cannot be linked to specific establishment/enforcement processes. Updating ACSES entries for information from telephone contact with or mail from customers and working monthly management reports are examples of these activities. Please record time spent on these activities as a separate process.
5. Personal Leave Time (code = 99): We have added a special process code for personal leave

time; that is, time spent out of the office for such things as medical appointments, running errands, and the like. For personal leave, please record the time you left the office, and the time you returned. We will use this to adjust the total time you have available to work on processes.

6. Administrative and Non-Work Time: In addition to work processes that can be linked directly to cases, there are other processes that cannot be linked. This includes time spent on administrative tasks (e.g., staff meetings, training, meeting with a supervisor, filing, opening mail, cleaning desk, conversing with other staff) and non-work time (e.g., breaks, lunch). We realize these are necessary activities in any job and are not asking you to record the time spent on them. Rather, we will assume that any time not recorded for work processes and personal leave was spent on administrative or non-work activities.
7. Interruptions: In any work day there are many interruptions likely to occur (e.g., telephone calls, conversations with other technicians). We do not want you to record interruptions unless they account for at least 10 minutes of time. For those interruptions that take at least 10 minutes, please put a tick mark in the “interruptions” column *for every 10 minutes you were interrupted*. For example, if you talked with another enforcement technician for 20 minutes, put two tick marks in the “interruptions” column.
8. At the end of the day, please write in the time you left work and return your completed time log to your supervisor who will return the information to PSI.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP ON THIS IMPORTANT STUDY

**APPENDIX E:
RANGES IN TIME ESTIMATES FROM
THE FOCUS GROUPS AND TIME**



Focus Groups

1 = least amt of time reported, 6 = most amt of time reported

Intake	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Median
01 Case Opening-Non-IV-A	89	92	106	107	190	200	131	106
02 Case Opening-IV-A	72	90	98	98	153	263	129	98
03 Case Opening-IV-E	10	25	87	100	153	200	96	94
04 Non-cooperation	40	47	51	75			53	49
05 Good Cause	5	37	103	158			76	70
06 Case Opening -Interstate (Responding)	47	86	95	98	120	153	100	96
07 Case Opening- Medicaid	78	90	98	98	168	185	119	98
Locate	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Median
08 Locate NCP Address	16	34	53	56	88	90	56	54
09 Locate NCP Employer	16	34	53	56	84	98	57	55
10 Locate NCP Assets	4	5	15	20	65	198	51	18
Establishment	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Median
11 Estab. Support Order—adm	165	212	249	275	280	456	273	262
12 Estab Paternity Order—adm	165	247	279	337	358	384	295	308
13 Responding Interstate Establish.	165	245	279	301	346	636	329	290
14 Initiating Interstate Establish.	45	138	150	240	360	420	225	195
15 Establish – Judicial	212	224	365	409	455	570	373	387
16 Rspndng Intrstate Estab. – Jud	212	277	295	365	394	720	377	330
17 Case Mgt -Est (per day)	90	120	175	210	227	240	177	193
18 Non-cooperation	2	15	25	45	53	75	36	35
19 Case Closure	15	20	20	25	38	45	27	23
20 Genetic Testing	20	45	75	95	98	180	86	85
21 Prepare for Hearing	5	20	35	150	188	190	98	93
Enforcement	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Median
22 Income Withholding	5	20	23	24	60	113	41	23
23 Review & Adj of Orders	153	161	180	273	320	333	236	226
24 Enforcement Case Mgt (per day)	90	168	175	180	195	196	167	178
24 Enforcement Case Mgt (per mo)	231	570	600	1200	1365	1504	912	900
25 Case Closure	5	15	53	54	64	65	43	54
26 Medical Support	13	15	20	42	53	105	41	31
27 Non-cooperation	2	15	25	45	53	85	38	35
28 Administrative Enforcement (liens, levy, tax intercept, credit reporting, license suspension)	included in monthly case mgt							
29 Prepare for Hearing	20	35	40	183	188	265	122	111
30 Contempt	90	120	175	183	188		151	175
31 Initiating Interstate Enf	1	31	90	150	190	330	132	120
Fiscal	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Median
32-33 Fiscal Activities (total hrs per day-- sum of all staff)	1.3	2	4	4.75	34	96	9	4
Ordered Cases per FTE	1299	1788	2314	2412	2424	2003	2040	2159
Customer Service	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Median
34-36 Phone & walk-ins (total hrs per day-- sum of all staff)	3	10	11	34	96		31	11
34-36 Total Cases per FTE	848	1461	1227	3194	2613		1869	1461

Timelogs

1 = least amt of time reported, 3 = most amt of time reported

1	2	3	Average	Median
41	45	67	51	45
29	40	52	40	40
35	216		125	125
11	15		13	13
36	160		98	98
26	53		40	40
1	2	3	Average	Median
3	5	8	5	5
3	7	16	9	7
3	6		5	5
1	2	3	Average	Median
60	77	80	72	77
12	40	65	39	40
38	80		59	59
148			148	148
200	224		212	212
7	35		21	21
9	9	11	10	9
6	8	22	12	8
105	120		113	113
24	88	91	68	88
1	2	3	Average	Median
13	14		14	14
8	67	331	135	67
13	43	228	95	43
7	15	16	13	15
8	12		10	10
9			9	9
24	115	180	106	115
160			160	160
6	21	30	19	21
1	2	3	Average	Median
0.95	6.5	13.6	7	7
7756	2364	3050	4390	3050
1	2	3	Average	Median
2	14	14.7	10	14
6108	1355	3789	3751	3789

**APPENDIX F:
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
STAFFING AND PERFORMANCE**



Coefficient Estimates from Models of Child Support Performance Indicators: Colorado Counties
Multiple Linear Regressions
(t-values in parentheses)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	PEP (1999)	PEP (2000)	% of Cases under Order (1999)	% of Cases under Order (2000)	% of Current Support Paid (1999)	% of Current Support Paid (2000)	% of Current Support Paid (1999)	% of Current Support Paid (2000)	Cases with Payments (1999)	Arrears Cases with Payments (2000)
Constant	105.841 16.511 (-689)	106.157 (17.907)	34.208 (3.118)	46.704 (8.386)	48.331 (10.359)	34.895 (4.251)	34.679 (6.61)	26.773 (3.355)	40.592 (7.737)	10.342 (1.543)
Population per FTE	-1.09E-04	-1.69E-05								
Population per FTE Squared	1.99E-10 (0.563)	-5.04E-11 (-.150)								
Cases per FTE			3.66E-02 (1.463)	8.90E-03 (.659)	-4.26E-02 (-3.784)	-2.50E-02 (-1.961)	-3.13E-02 (-3.08)	-1.79E-02 (-1.493)	-1.92E-02 (-2.46)	8.61E-04 (-0.08)
Cases per FTE Squared			-2.00E-05 (-1.485)	-9.67E-06 (-1.269)	2.29E-05 (3.744)	1.82E-05 (2.526)	1.71E-05 (3.098)	1.41E-05 (2.072)	8.67E-06 (2.0628)	-1.68E-06 (-.273)
% of cases located unemployment	-2.772 (2.068)	-3.083 (-2.465)					0.19 (4.102)	0.186 (3.163)		
PEP			0.319 (3.499)	0.305 (6.273)						
% of Cases under Order					0.19 (3.221)	0.338 (3.347)	0.172 (4.102)	0.262 (2.729)		
% of Current support pd									0.546 (6.66)	0.634 (6.08)
N	52	53	52	52	53	53	52	52	52	53
R Squared	0.098	0.124	0.211	0.482	0.318	0.256	0.495	0.382	0.593	0.440
Adjusted R Squared	0.043	0.071	0.163	0.451	0.276	0.212	0.453	0.332	0.617	0.406

There are 53 observations because some offices provide services for multiple counties.
Unemployment is based on the most current rate (Quarter 2, 2000)

Coefficient Estimates from Models of Child Support Performance Indicators: States
Multiple Linear Regressions
(t-values in parentheses)

	(1) PEP	(2) % of Cases under Order	(3) % of Current Support Paid	(4) Arrears Cases with Payments
Constant	-24.037 (-1.375)	0.698 (7.074)	0.588 (3.813)	-9.92E-02 (-.429)
Cases per FTE	1.29E-02 (.238)	-4.96E-04 (-1.184)	-6.38E-04 (-1.318)	7.30E-04 (1.121)
Cases per FTE Squared	-1.53E-05 (-.290)	1.74E-07 (0.425)	7.25E-07 (0.425)	-1.02E-06 (-1.659)
PEP		0.419 (4.54)		
% of Cases under Order			0.23 (1.83)	
% of Current Support Paid				0.718 (3.173)
N	51	51	43	40
R Squared	0.353	0.457	0.457	0.306
Adjusted R Squared	0.315	0.425	0.425	0.25

**APPENDIX G:
COMPARISONS BETWEEN
EXISTING AND PROPOSED STAFFING STANDARDS**



COUNTY	FTE 2000*	Existing Standard Based on 2000 caseload	Proposed Standard A	Proposed Standard B	Proposed Standard C
			located not separated Cust Serv @ 1,500 cases/fte	located separated Cust Serv @ 1,500 cases/ fte	located separated Cust Serv @ 1,870 cases/fte
ADAMS	54.0	56.7	51.2	57.8	55.8
ALAMOSA	5.0	7.1	3.8	4.7	4.6
ARAPAHOE	52.0	61.2	48.4	56.8	54.8
ARCHULETA	1.5	3.6	1.9	2.2	2.2
BACA	0.7	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
BENT	2.0	2.9	1.3	1.7	1.6
BOULDER	23.0	23.5	21.3	24.6	23.7
CHAFFEE	4.1	4.9	2.4	2.9	2.8
CHEYENNE	0.5	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.0
CLEAR CREEK	0.0	1.9	1.0	1.1	1.1
CONEJOS	0.0	3.4	1.6	2.0	1.9
COSTILLA	1.5	1.7	1.0	1.1	1.1
CROWLEY	1.0	2.6	1.2	1.4	1.4
CUSTER	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0
DELTA	8.1	8.4	5.4	6.7	6.5
DENVER	141.3	123.1	111.0	127.7	123.2
DOLORES	0.7	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
DOUGLAS	5.3	6.3	3.8	4.7	4.5
EAGLE	5.0	5.3	2.7	3.2	3.1
ELBERT	1.3	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.0
EL PASO	53.6	71.6	69.0	86.9	83.9
FREMONT	9.0	10.7	8.6	10.1	9.8
GARFIELD	8.3	9.7	6.4	7.6	7.4
GILPIN	0.0	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0
GRAND	1.5	2.3	1.5	1.8	1.7
GUNNISON	0.0	1.8	1.0	1.1	1.0
HINSDALE	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.0	1.0
HUERFANO	0.0	3.4	1.6	1.8	1.8
JACKSON	2.0	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0
JEFFERSON	47.8	59.5	54.9	64.3	61.9
KIOWA	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
KIT CARSON	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
LAKE	2.0	2.3	1.0	1.3	1.2
LA PLATA	6.2	8.6	5.2	5.9	5.7
LARIMER	28.0	26.3	24.1	28.2	27.2
LAS ANIMAS	5.0	6.8	4.1	4.9	4.7
LINCOLN	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0
LOGAN	4.9	6.6	3.8	4.7	4.6
MESA	20.0	20.6	18.5	21.4	20.7
MINERAL	0.0	0.1	1.0	1.0	1.0
MOFFAT	2.8	5.9	2.7	3.2	3.1
MONTEZUMA	3.9	5.4	3.5	4.0	3.9
MONTROSE	6.0	9.3	5.6	7.1	6.8
MORGAN	8.0	10.1	6.7	8.0	7.7
OTERO	4.9	8.2	5.8	6.7	6.5
OURAY	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
PARK	0.0	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.0
PHILLIPS	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
PITKIN	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0
PROWERS	3.9	7.7	4.6	6.1	5.9
PUEBLO	40.0	33.4	31.0	36.3	35.0
RIO BLANCO	1.0	2.5	1.2	1.6	1.5
RIO GRANDE	5.0	4.7	2.5	3.1	3.0
ROUTT	1.3	3.6	1.7	2.0	2.0
SAGUACHE	2.0	3.1	1.5	1.8	1.7
SAN JUAN	0.0	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.0
SAN MIGUEL	0.0	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0
SEDGWICK	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
SUMMIT	2.4	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.0
TELLER	4.1	3.8	2.1	2.6	2.5
WASHINGTON	0.9	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
WELD	24.5	26.6	23.7	27.4	26.4
YUMA	1.0	3.0	1.4	1.7	1.7
TOTAL	612.1	687.8	573.1	671.5	637.6

*Includes contracted staff. Excludes attorneys.