### Schedule 13

	Funding	Scn g Request for th	edule 13 ne FY 2015-1	16 Budget Cy	/cle	
Department of Human						
PB Request Number	R-08					
Request Titles				111		
	R	-08 Child Welfare	County Work	load Study		
	. 1	~ <b>1</b>			Supplemer	ntal FY 2014-15
Dept. Approval By:	$M \ell$	un li Jai	relet	X	Change Requ	est FY 2015-16
		/			Base Reduct	ion FY 2015-16
OSPB Approval By:	June	1211		B	udget Amendm	ent FY 2015-16
1 in a line		FY 201	4-15	FY 20	)15-16	FY 2016-17
Line Item Information		Annransistics	Poguest.	Base	FY 2015-16	Continuation
mormation	— Fund	Appropriation	Request	Request	F1 2015-10	Continuation
	Total	\$407,603,681	\$0	\$411,545,733	\$8,227,138	\$7,941,391
	FTE	67.8	-	67.8	0.9	1.0
Total of All Line Items	GF	\$213,153,277	\$0	\$218,115,648	\$6,578,035	\$6,340,866
Total of All Line Rems	CF	\$68,013,433	\$0	\$67,948,467	\$1,551,685	\$1,551,685
	RF	\$27,187,262	\$0	\$25,974,332	\$0	\$0
	FF	\$99,249,709	\$0	\$99,507,286	\$97,418	\$48,840
Line Item		FY 201	4-15		)15-16	FY 2016-17
Information		Annuanulation	Boguest	Base	FY 2015-16	Continuation
momation	Fund	Appropriation	Request	Request	F1 2013-10	Continuation
	Total	\$29,616,816	\$0	\$31,215,736	\$7,927	\$7,927
	0.5	<b>#</b> 050.075	¢ο	<b>\$507.70</b> 6	\$0	\$0
	CF	\$656,675	\$0	\$597,796	\$0	φυ
01. Executive Director's	FF	\$3,853,817	\$0	\$3,907,242	\$1,347	\$1,347
Office - Health, Life, And Dental	GF	\$16,454,712	\$0	\$19,730,141	\$6,580	\$6,580
	RF	\$8,651,612	\$0	\$6,980,557	\$0	\$0
	Total	\$479,976	\$0	\$485,648	\$91	\$101

CF

\$9,749

\$0

\$11,054

\$0

\$0

01. Executive Director's Office - Short-Term	FF	\$72,527	\$0	\$69,490	\$15	\$17
Disability	GF	\$306,198	\$0	\$312,280	\$76	\$84
	RF	\$91,502	\$0	\$92,824	\$0	\$0
	Total	\$8,963,349	\$0	\$10,007,004	\$1,822	\$2,208
	CF	\$178,449	\$0	\$222,977	\$0	\$0
01. Executive Director's	FF	\$1,327,806	\$0	\$1,403,297	\$310	\$375
Office - Amortization Equalization Disbursement	GF	\$5,721,235	\$0	\$6,439,374	\$1,512	\$1,833
	RF	\$1,735,859	\$0	\$1,941,356	\$0	\$0
	Total	\$8,403,140	\$0	\$9,665,857	\$1,760	\$2,185
	CF	\$167,296	\$0	\$215,376	\$0	\$0
01. Executive Director's Office - S.B. 06-235	FF	\$1,244,818	\$0	\$1,355,457	\$299	\$371
Supplemental Equalization Disbursement	GF	\$5,363,658	\$0	\$6,219,850	\$1,461	\$1,814
	RF	\$1,627,368	\$0	\$1,875,174	\$0	\$0
therefore proves the second se	Total	\$5,727,130	\$0	\$5,848,066	\$235,000	\$0

	FF	\$896,468	\$0	\$913,974	\$39,950	\$0
05. Division of Child	FTE	61.8	-	61.8	-	
Welfare - Administration	GF	\$4,693,356	\$0	\$4,793,286	\$195,050	\$0
	RF	\$137,306	\$0	\$140,806	\$0	\$0
	Total	\$6,551,963	\$0	\$6,462,115	\$103,863	\$52,295
	CF	\$137,230	\$0	\$37,230	\$0	\$0
05. Division of Child	FF	\$3,161,684	\$0	\$3,165,237	\$17,657	\$8,890
Welfare - Training	FTE	6.0	-	6.0	0.9	1.0
	GF	\$3,253,049	\$0	\$3,259,648	\$86,206	\$43,405
	Total	\$347,861,307	\$0	\$347,861,307	\$7,876,675	\$7,876,675
	CF	\$66,864,034	\$0	\$66,864,034	\$1,551,685	\$1,551,685
05. Division of Child Welfare - Child Welfare	FF	\$88,692,589	\$0	\$88,692,589	\$37,840	\$37,840
Services	GF	\$177,361,069	\$0	\$177,361,069	\$6,287,150	\$6,287,150
	RF	\$14,943,615	\$0	\$14,943,615	\$0	\$0

Department of Human Services Request Title: County CW Workload Study Schedule 13 Funding Request for the 2016 Budget Cycle

Letternote Text Revision Required?	Yes	х	No	If Yes, describe the Letternote Text Revision:
See Tables 10, 11, and 12 of the full narrati (5) d Of this amount, \$2,905,9682,925,596 s shall be from the Title XX Social Services E	hall be	from	Title	<del>_</del>
from state and federal funds that are alloca administration and provision of child welfa \$3,208,511 for parental fee reimbursements for tribal placements of Native American cl administered foster homes, and \$100,000 f counties. The remaining \$343,256,296351,	ated to are served side to aildren for cont 132,97 suant t	coun vices, unties , \$346 tractu 1 incli o Sec Medic	ty dep inclus 5,500 f al ser udes f tion 2	ding the following estimated amounts: ruant to Section 26-5-104 (2), C.R.S., \$950,000 for a statewide insurance policy for county- vices related to the allocation of funds among the state and federal funds to be allocated to 6-5-104, C.R.S., the estimated local share of
B, Subpart 1, of the Social Security Act [74 are not appropriated, these amounts were	al Serv 00]. Al assum E of th I in det	ices I thoug ed in e Soc ermin	Block th fed devel tial Se ing th	Grant, and \$4,019,549(I) shall be from Title IVeral funds amounts that contain the (I) notation oping the appropriated fund source amounts in curity Act is reflected pursuant to Section 26-1-se amount to be deposited to the Excess
Cash or Federal Fund Name and CORE Fur	nd Nun	nber:		Cash Funds are from local funds, and Federal Funds are from Title IV-E of the Social Security Act.
Reappropriated Funds Source, by Departm	ent an	d Line	e Item	Name: N/A
Approval by OIT?	Yes		No	Not Required X
Schedule 13s from Affected Departments: Other Information:	N/A			

John W. Hickenlooper Governor

> **Reggie Bicha** Executive Director

FY 2015-16 Funding Request | November 1, 2014

Department Priority: R-8

Request Detail: County Child Welfare Workload Study

Summary of Incremental Funding Change for FY 2015-16	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
County Child Welfare Workload Study	\$8,227,138	\$6,578,035	\$1,551,685	\$97,418	0.9

### Problem or Opportunity:

The Department of Human Services requests \$8,227,138 (\$6,578,035 General Fund) and 0.9 FTE for FY 2015-16; \$64,716 (\$53,714 General Fund) and 1.0 FTE for FY 2016-17 and beyond to increase county staffing in response to a workload study performed by the Office of the State Auditor (OSA).

The Department requested funding in FY 2013-14 for a workload study of county child welfare staff that focused on the amount of time staff spent on each case. The workload study aligns with the State's client-focused business model and it accounts for differences in cases and services, such as case complexities and the varying lengths of time needed to provide different services. The study was designed to establish a comprehensive picture of the State's child welfare operations and understand how these operations impact various county needs. The work performed at the counties for the provision of child welfare services ranges from many functions including, but not limited to, referrals, ongoing case management out-of-home, administration and documentation, adoptions, and licensing.

The workload study revealed that county caseworkers are working on average 44.6 hours per week while supervisors/managers/executives are working on average 48 hours per week. County child welfare employees spent most of their time on ongoing and out-of-home services (OOH), averaging 7.2 hours per child receiving ongoing or OOH services. Time spent working on case-related services and tasks are in line with other state child welfare studies. In addition, the workload study showed there were few differences between urban and rural counties.

Time spent on screening is the second highest amount of hours worked by county staff on child welfare services. Colorado child welfare staff screened 6,734 referrals in February 2014. The high volume of screenings contributes to a county caseworker spending 38% of their time documenting referrals and case-related work into Trails, Colorado's child welfare case management system. While the Department is recommending Trails be modified and updated to help reduce the amount of re-entry and documentation time needed, other changes in best practices are increasing the time needed for documentation, such as increased family engagement and case-related services. It is anticipated that Colorado's new Child Abuse

and Neglect Hotline will increase the time needed to document referrals. Mobile technology is providing caseworkers more efficiency and more flexibility to enter data into Trails, but not necessarily reducing time. Enhanced documentation will lead to better decisions and better outcomes for Colorado's children. Over time, the Department anticipates the increases in staff and technological improvements will offset the time needed to properly screen and document referrals and case related services.

The study made a recommendation of the number of county staff that needed to be added to address the increased time it takes to provide services and complete tasks. What the workload study did not address specifically was the right caseload ratio per worker to provide the right services at the right time. The summary suggests the Department may want to consider options for conducting additional workload studies that build upon the current baseline results. Future analyses could elaborate upon the findings of this study and assess the impact of process improvements<sup>1</sup>.

#### Proposed Solution:

The workload study determined that apart from identifying inefficiencies and streamlining processes, counties needed 650 additional staff in order to meet program goals and outcomes. Under the current Child Welfare infrastructure, the Department estimates that it would take five years for counties to increase capacity to the level recommended in the workload study. Based on this estimation, the Department recommends only increasing the work force by 130 additional child welfare staff in FY 2015-16 which is approximately one-fifth of additional staff recommended by the workload study.

Tables 1, 2, 4, and 5 illustrate costs comprised of 110 caseworkers, 15 supervisors, and 5 case aides, but counties could also choose to hire nurses, practice coaches, or educational specialists. In an effort to increase retention, job satisfaction, caseworker performance, and supervisor performance, practice coaches could be hired for the purpose of helping individuals to learn new skills faster, more efficiently and effectively, and support county departments in implementing new practices and strategies. As caseworkers are experiencing more complex cases, with many medical aspects, nurses could be hired to be a resource for referral screening, medical consultation, assessments, medical report interpretations, referral to ongoing medical care, and medical records reviews. Children ages 0-5 are at the highest risk of near fatalities, and fatalities and having a nurse consult on high risk cases could prove to be valuable.

The Department is requesting funds to further analyze caseload ratios and monitor the impact the 130 additional child welfare staff on the overall system before funding is requested for the remaining 520 child welfare staff recommended in the workload study. Lastly, the Department of Human Services requests an additional (1.0 FTE) training certification specialist (GP III) to handle the increase in training demands. As noted earlier, counties should know their individual staffing needs to determine what combination of caseworkers, supervisors, case aides, nurses, or practice coaches to hire. However, the Department will work collaboratively with counties on the details of staffing needs. This request is for new county FTE only and not to supplement overtime costs at the county level. The funding to the counties will be appropriated via legislation in the Child Welfare Services line item and the funding for state staff and training

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> ICF International Incorporated, L.L.C., Colorado Child Welfare County Workload Study, August 2014, (Denver)

development will be appropriated in the Training line item. The legislated Child Welfare Allocation Committee will determine the allocation to counties through the approved child welfare allocation methodology.

### **Anticipated Outcomes:**

The workload study includes child welfare worker's perspectives about the issues they observed as affecting their volume of work, employee morale, job satisfaction, and staff retention<sup>2</sup>. Overall, workers reported that the volume of work can have a significant impact on staff. Approximately two-thirds of workers describe their volume of assigned work as heavy and often unmanageable. Increased volumes of work can also impact the quality of work and services provided to children and their families.

Additionally, increased work load can significantly affect employee morale and job satisfaction, as well as staff retention and turnover. Workers reported reasons such as lack of engagement with client families, inadequate time to perform all necessary tasks or quality work, and a consistent feeling of being behind on work and never caught up. These issues are magnified if a supervisor has to dedicate time to casework, and is unable to provide support, mentoring and guidance to staff.

The workload study also looked at turnover rates in participating counties. The average annual turnover rate was about 10 percent (ranging from 0 to 24 percent) for 2009 through 2011. This compares to a 2009 study documenting annual turnover between 23 and 60 percent nationally. Although turnover rates do not appear to be excessively high, the impact can be compounded by the number of child welfare workers that will be retiring in the next several years.

Additional caseworkers and related staff are expected to reduce these adverse effects, leading to higher employee morale, job satisfaction, and staff retention and caseload continuity.

#### **Assumptions and Calculations:**

The Department based the assumptions on recommendations of the Office of the State Auditor's (OSA) August 2014 workload study.

For the workload study, 49 of 64 counties provided staffing information and showed an average of 24.5 case workers per county. Applying this number to 64 counties equals 1,568 caseworkers. Counties received 33,443 screened in referrals (cases accepted for further investigation) in Fiscal Year 2012-13. Based on this figure, the Department is proposing to fund 130 total new child welfare staff in FY 2015-16.

The Department of Human Services requests \$8,227,138 (\$6,578,035 General Fund) and 0.9 FTE for FY 2015-16 in response to a workload study performed by the Office of the State Auditor (OSA). Costs by fund type and cost component are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Detailed costs are illustrated in Tables 3 through 5. The monitoring of caseload ratios is estimated at one-half the amount of the cost of the workload

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ICF International Incorporated, L.L.C., *Colorado Child Welfare County Workload Study, August 2014*, (Denver)

study. Funding to counties will be distributed through the Child Welfare Allocation Committee's allocation model currently used to distribute funding of the Child Welfare Block pursuant to 26-5-104 C.R.S. (2014).

**Table 1 – Summary of Costs by Component** 

		Monitoring and	Training	Training	
Fiscal Year	County Staff	Caseload Study	Development	Certification	Total Cost
				<b>Specialist</b>	
FY 2015-16	\$7,876,675	\$235,000	\$52,000	\$63,463	\$8,227,138
FY 2016-17	\$0		\$0	\$64,716	\$64,716
and ongoing					

**Table 2 – Summary of Costs by Fund Type** 

Fiscal Year	Total Cost	General	Cash Funds	Federal	FTE
		Fund		Funds	
FY 2015-16	\$8,227,138	\$6,578,035	\$1,551,685	\$97,418	0.9
FY 2016-17 and ongoing	\$64,716	\$53,714	\$0	\$11,002	1.0

Training development costs include the funding needed for the development of training for new county staff. For example, if practice coaches were hired, this would include a pre-service training for practice coaches. Staff costs are the salaries of the additional Training Certification Specialist needed as the number of county staff increases.

**Table 3 - Position: Training Development and Staff Costs (See Attachment 1 for FTE detail)** 

Fiscal Year	Training Development	Training Certification Specialist	<b>Total Funds</b>	General Fund	Federal Funds	FTE	
FY 2015-16	\$52,000	\$63,463	\$115,463	\$95,835	\$19,628	0.9	
FY 2016-17 and ongoing	\$0	\$64,716	\$64,716	\$53,714	\$11,002	1.0	

County staff costs are an average of salaries paid for each position, as surveyed from nearly half of all counties of various sizes. Benefits, one-time operations and pre-service training costs are estimated at a rate typical for current State FTE or county case workers. Table 4 details this cost per worker.

**Table 4 - Staffing Cost Per Worker** 

Position	Salary	Benefits at 30%		One-Time perations Costs	Pre-Service Training Cost			Total Annual Cost per Position		
Case Aide	\$ 29,076	\$	8,723	\$ 5,000	\$	1	\$	42,799		
Case Worker	\$ 41,112	\$	12,334	\$ 5,000	\$	1,000	\$	59,446		
Supervisor	\$ 53,352	\$	16,006	\$ 5,000	\$	550	\$	74,908		

Table 5 - Year One County Staff Request (FY 2015-16)

	Number of													
	Staff	Salaries	Benefits	Operating	T	raining	7	Total Cost	Ge	ene ral Fund	C	Cash Funds	Fe	de ral Funds
Case Aides	5	\$ 145,380	\$ 43,615	\$ 25,000	\$		\$	213,995	\$	171,196	\$	42,799	\$	-
Caseworkers	110	\$ 4,522,320	\$ 1,356,740	\$ 550,000	\$	110,000	\$	6,539,060	\$	5,218,048	\$	1,285,812	\$	35,200
Supervisors	15	\$ 800,280	\$ 240,090	\$ 75,000	\$	8,250	\$	1,123,620	\$	897,906	\$	223,074	\$	2,640
Total	130	\$ 5,467,980	\$ 1,640,445	\$ 650,000	\$	118,250	\$	7,876,675	\$	6,287,150	\$	1,551,685	\$	37,840

**Table 6 - Letternote (5) d Calculation** 

Fund Type	Title IV-E	Title XX		
<b>Current Amount</b>	\$2,905,968	\$255,716		
Change	\$19,628	\$0		
New Amount	\$2,925,596	\$255,716		

Note: The change in Title IV-E funding is earnings for the Salary, PERA, and Medicare costs for the GPIII FTE and training development.

**Table 7 - Letternote (5) e Calculation** 

							Remaining
				Tribal			Allocation to
Fund Type	Total Funds	Holdout	Parental Fees	Placements	Insurance	Contractual	Counties
<b>Current Amount</b>	\$347,861,307	\$4,605,011	\$3,208,511	\$950,000	\$346,500	\$100,000	\$343,256,296
Change	\$7,876,675	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,876,675
New Amount	\$355,737,982	\$4,605,011	\$3,208,511	\$950,000	\$346,500	\$100,000	\$351,132,971

**Table 8 - Letternote (5) f Calculation** 

Fund Type	Title IV-E	Title 20	Title IV-B		
<b>Current Amount</b>	\$64,153,620	\$23,590,313	\$4,019,549		
Change	\$1,551,685	\$0	\$0		
New Amount	\$65,705,305	\$23,590,313	\$4,019,549		

## County Child Welfare Workload Study: Attachment 1 – FTE Calculation

#### Calculation Assumptions:

<u>Operating Expenses</u> -- Base operating expenses are included per FTE for \$500 per year. In addition, for regular FTE, annual telephone costs assume base charges of \$450 per year.

<u>Standard Capital Purchases</u> -- Each additional employee necessitates the purchase of a Personal Computer (\$900), Office Suite Software (\$330), and office furniture (\$3,473).

General Fund FTE -- New full-time General Fund positions are reflected in FY 2015-16 as 0.9166 FTE to account for the pay-date shift.

Expenditure Detail				FY 2015-16			FY 2016-17		
Personal Services:				FTE			FTE		
		Mont	hly Salary						
Training Specialist		\$	3,834	0.9		41,407	1.0		46,008
PERA						4,203			4,670
AED						1,822			2,20
SAED						1,760			2,18
Medicare						600	6		66
STD						91			10
Health-Life-Dental						7,927			7,92
Subtotal Position 1.	## FTF			0.9	\$	57,810	1.0	\$	63,76
Subtotal I ostion 1,	, m•m <b>I</b> III			0.7	Ψ	37,010	1.0	Ψ	05,70
Subtotal Personal Se	rvices			0.9	\$	57,810	1.0	\$	63,76
Operating Expenses									
Regular FTE Operation	ing		500	1.0		500	1.0		50
Telephone Expenses			450	1.0		450	1.0		45
PC, One-Time			1,230	1.0		1,230			
Office Furniture, One	e-Time		3,473	1.0		3,473			
Other						-			
Other						-			
Other						-			
Other						-			
Subtotal Operating E	Expenses				\$	5,653		\$	95
r						- )			
TOTAL REQUEST				0.9	\$	63,463	1.0	\$	64,71
	General Fund:				\$	52,675			53,71
Cash funds: Reappropriated Funds:									
	Federal Funds:				\$	10,788			11,00

Priority: R-8 County Child Welfare Workload Study FY 2015-16 Change Request

### Cost and FTE

• The Department of Human Services requests \$8,227,138 (\$6,578,035 General Fund) and 0.9 FTE for FY 2015-16; \$7,941,391 (\$6,340,864 General Fund) and 1.0 FTE for FY 2016-17 and ongoing to increase county staffing in response to a workload study performed by the Office of the State Auditor (OSA). This represents a 2.3% increase in the Child Welfare Services line item.

#### **Current Program**

- The Department received funding in FY 2013-14 for a workload study of county child welfare staff.
- The client-oriented workload study focused on the amount of time spent on each child welfare case and was designed to establish a comprehensive picture of child welfare operations.
- The workload study aligns with the State's client-focused business model and it accounts for differences in cases and services, such as case complexities and the varying lengths of time needed to provide different services.

#### **Problem or Opportunity**

- The workload study revealed that county caseworkers are working on average 44.6 hours per week while supervisors/managers/executives are working on average 48 hours per week.
- Time spent working on case related services are in line with other State child welfare studies.
- However, Colorado caseworkers and supervisors manage more cases than compared to the national average per various studies reviewed in the workload study. In addition, the workload study showed there were few differences between urban and rural counties.

### Consequences of Problem

- Heavy caseloads and workloads have been cited repeatedly as key reasons workers leave child welfare. Turnover is both a consequence and a cause of high workloads. Staff turnover impacts the ability to deliver quality services with a negative impact on timeliness, continuity, and quality.
- Continued heavy workload could lead to a degradation of services or prevent an expansion of services to children in need.

# **Proposed Solution**

- As recommended by the OSA, the Department requests additional funds to allow counties to hire additional child welfare staff to provide the level of staff needed to manage a more appropriate number of cases.
- For Colorado to continue implementing best practices and putting what is best for children first, more funding for county child welfare staff is needed.

