

Virginia Caseload Standards Fredericksburg District Office

Final Report

Division of Child Support Enforcement
Virginia Department of Social Services

December 2001

This page intentionally left blank.

Virginia Caseload Standards Fredericksburg District Office

Final Report

Prepared by:

Donald W. Myers, D.B.A., Principal Investigator
Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA

Project Manager:

Todd W. Areson, Ph.D.
Virginia Division of Child Support Enforcement

December 2001

This page intentionally left blank.

Acknowledgments

Anna DeMoss and Lynn Selfe of the Central Office, Division of Child Support Enforcement, were invaluable in preparing the *Task Checklist* and in reviewing and making recommendations for the final version. I am especially appreciative of their efforts. A number of Fredericksburg district office employees also made important contributions, not only in the field testing and revision of the *Task Checklist* and the *Frequency Worksheet*, but also in the critical phases of data collection, editing, and revision. I appreciate all the efforts of the Fredericksburg district office personnel and, particularly, Kimberly Lancaster, Kelly Ashley, Georjean McDermott, Helen Foiles-Taylor, Debra Corder, and last but certainly not least, Bob Rodenski, District Manager.

Appreciation is also expressed to Vernon Drew, President, Center for the Support of Families, who was a technical consultant on the project. His comprehensive and insightful knowledge were invaluable in the completion of the research. Thanks, also, to Robyn Large of the Center for the Support of Families for conducting research on other states' efforts to develop caseload standards.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	XI
OBJECTIVE/INTRODUCTION	XI
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	XII
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	XII
The Delphi Technique	xii
Caseload Standards	xiii
Human Resource Needs	xiv
Validation of Findings.....	xiv
Research Questions	xv
INTRODUCTION	1
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	1
PROJECT PHASES	3
DEVELOPMENT OF <i>TASK CHECKLIST</i>	4
FIRST ITERATION	4
SECOND ITERATION	5
COMPLETION OF FREQUENCY WORKSHEET	6
CALCULATION OF WEIGHTED TIMES	8
DERIVING CASELOAD STANDARDS	8
DETERMINING HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS	11
VALIDATING CASELOAD STANDARDS	11
VIRGINIA STAFFING DEMONSTRATION STUDY	12
COMPARING THE CASELOAD STANDARDS AND STAFFING DEMONSTRATION STUDIES	13
Differences in the Studies	14
Similarities Between the Studies.....	16
CASELOAD STANDARDS' VALIDITY	17
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
THE DELPHI TECHNIQUE	19
CASELOAD STANDARDS	19
HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS.....	20
VALIDATION OF FINDINGS.....	20
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	22
APPENDIX 1: TASK CHECKLIST	24
APPENDIX 2: TASKS FREQUENCY WORKSHEET	30

APPENDIX 3: INTAKE/LOCATE TASKS.....	36
APPENDIX 4: ESTABLISH PATERNITY TASKS	37
APPENDIX 5: ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION TASKS	39
APPENDIX 6: ENFORCEMENT TASKS	41
APPENDIX 7: CUSTOMER SERVICE TASKS.....	44
APPENDIX 8: GLOSSARY	45

Exhibits

EXHIBIT 1: CASE DEFINITIONS	2
EXHIBIT 2: CALCULATION OF AVAILABLE WORK HOURS IN YEAR.....	9

Index of Tables

TABLE 1: CASELOAD STANDARDS/NUMBER CASES/EMPLOYEE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS	10
TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES OF HUMAN RESOURCES (HR) NEEDS – FREDERICKSBURG DISTRICT OFFICE – DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT	18

Executive Summary

Objective/Introduction

- This Caseload Standards project (“Caseload Standards project”)—which was state funded in 1999 and conducted between 1999 and 2001—was initiated in the Fredericksburg, Virginia district office. The goal was to develop caseload standards for each child support enforcement function, as distinguished by eight different types of cases, including both in-state and interstate cases.¹
- The Caseload Standards project used the Delphi technique (as described below, page xii) to determine the times required to perform tasks for the following child support functions: intake/locate, establish paternity administratively, establish paternity judicially, establish an obligation administratively, establish an obligation judicially, enforce an obligation administratively, enforce an obligation judicially, and perform customer services. Caseload standards were developed, then, from the product of the time per functional task and the frequency of task performance. Caseload standards were developed for 104 distinct combinations of functions and types of cases, including both in-state and interstate cases.²
- Direct customer-related human resource needs were determined using an equation composed of the case mix—the numbers of cases in each function and case category, both in-state and interstate—in the Fredericksburg district office and the respective caseload standards. With the exception of two additional Fiscal Technicians deemed to be needed, no changes were proposed in accounting, technical, or managerial staffing.

¹ Initially, the project was to include developing caseload standards for the Roanoke district office as well. Those data could not be obtained in sufficient time to meet the August 31, 2001 deadline for contract completion.

² $104 = [(8 \times 8 \times 2) - 24]$ is the formula for [8 functions x 8 types of cases x 2 state jurisdictions (in-state and interstate)] - 24 combinations of functions and types of cases (both in-state and interstate) that are not performed in a district office, such as establishing paternity administratively for an in-state ARRP case.

-
- The human resource needs were based upon June 2001 caseload information. In that month, there were 13,839 cases, of which 25.2 percent were interstate cases and 8.2 percent were Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) cases.

Research Questions

The Caseload Standards project addressed the following five research questions:

1. *Can a methodology be developed to formulate caseload standards?*
2. *Are caseload standards the same for the same functions performed in all types of cases?*
3. *Are caseload standards the same for in-state and interstate cases for each of the eight types of cases?*
4. *Can caseload standards be used to determine human resource needs?*
5. *Can the recommended caseload standards improve productivity, be cost-effective, and improve quality of service?*

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The Delphi Technique

- The Delphi technique was determined to be a valid method for determining times required to complete tasks within child support functions by different types of cases, including both in-state and interstate cases.
- The benefits of the Delphi technique include the opportunity for employee anonymity in making contributions, while still allowing for collaboration by those choosing to do so. During the first iteration, employees are usually given one or more weeks to complete data collection forms. This is usually a sufficient period for employees to estimate the time needed to complete tasks,

since it gives them the opportunity to think carefully about time requirements, particularly for tasks which may be more difficult to estimate.

- The feedback process in the second iteration of the Delphi technique gives employees the opportunity to review their original estimations and, in light of the information furnished about average times estimated by all employees, make any necessary changes.
- We recommend using the Delphi technique to establish caseload standards for child support offices.

Caseload Standards

- The caseload standards developed in this project are a function of the times required to accomplish tasks, the frequencies of task performance, and the number of hours in a work year. Times to accomplish tasks were obtained through the Delphi technique.³ Frequencies were obtained from Fredericksburg district office managerial personnel. The number of hours in a work year was estimated at 1,760 hours.⁴
- One hundred and four (104) individual caseload standards were developed.
- The number of cases per employee ranged significantly within different child support enforcement functions and different types of cases, and between different combinations of functions and different types of cases. Among different child support enforcement functions and different types of cases, the number of cases per employee ranged from a low of 183 cases per employee, to enforce State and Local Foster Care cases judicially, to a high of 1,582 cases per employee, to provide customer services in Medical Assistance Only, Partial Services cases.

³ The exceptions are for task times for seven types of interstate cases for the function of Establish Obligation-Administratively. These were unintentionally omitted from the *Task Checklist* and were not discovered until final caseloads were prepared. Times were then obtained from the Supervisor responsible for the function in the Fredericksburg district office, with the concurrence of the District Manager.

⁴ See Exhibit 2: Calculation of Available Work Hours in Year, page 9.

Human Resource Needs

- The human resource needs of the Fredericksburg district office were determined independently of the process to develop caseload standards. Direct customer-related human resource needs were determined using an algorithm of the numbers of cases by function in each case category (both in-state and interstate) and the respective caseload standards. With the exception of two additional Fiscal Technicians deemed to be needed, no changes were proposed in accounting, technical, or management staffing.
- The Fredericksburg district office human resource needs were based upon June 2001 caseload information. In that month there were 13,839 cases.
- The Fredericksburg district office needs 53 employees to work 13,839 cases. Since it currently has a total of 31 approved employees, the Fredericksburg office is understaffed 42 percent.

Validation of Findings

- The calculations for the 104 caseload standards and the Fredericksburg district office human resources needs were validated by projecting the results of the Staffing Demonstration, conducted between 1994 and 1998.⁵ By controlling for the June 2001 caseload mix and a 1,760 hour work-year, the human resource needs projected to meet the June 2001 caseload (using the Staffing Demonstration results) would be substantially the same as these Caseload Standards estimations, namely 52 and 53 employees, respectively.
- Implementing the staffing recommendations of the Caseload Standards project should produce results similar to those of the Staffing Demonstration. The

⁵ Between 1994 and 1998, a federally-funded project, the *Virginia Staffing Demonstration* (“Staffing Demonstration”) was conducted to determine the role staffing standards play in the performance of local child support offices. Like the Caseload Standards project, the Staffing Demonstration employed the Delphi technique in the Fredericksburg district office to establish standard times for accomplishing tasks within the following child support enforcement functions: customer intake, locate, establishing paternity (both administratively and judicially), establishing obligations (both administratively and judicially), enforcing obligations, and providing customer service. The Staffing Demonstration concluded that the Fredericksburg district office was 33 percent understaffed, using staffing standards based on time requirements for job tasks obtained from the application of the Delphi technique, plus a forecast of additional managerial, technical, and support human resource needs.

results of implementing the staffing standards recommended by the Staffing Demonstration were significantly positive. Specifically, compared to the control office, the Fredericksburg district office had 73 percent more locates, 1,500 percent more paternities established, 74 percent more administrative obligations established, 633 percent more income withholdings, \$1.08 million more dollars collected (an increase of 61 percent per employee), and a \$1.80 increase in the benefit/cost ratio. In addition, overall employee satisfaction increased 19 percent compared to the control office, and customer satisfaction increased from seven to 10 percentage points depending upon the question asked.

- The fiscal efficiency of the Commonwealth of Virginia—as well as the children and other customers whose needs are being met through services provided by the Division of Child Support Enforcement (DCSE)—will significantly benefit by increasing the Fredericksburg district office staffing to the levels recommended in this report.

Research Questions

1. Can a methodology be developed to formulate caseload standards?

A workable methodology was developed to formulate caseload standards. This report contains the requisite information to formulate standards, including data collection forms, spreadsheets with formulae to determine caseload standards by function, type of case, and by classification as in-state or interstate cases.

2. Are caseload standards the same for the same functions performed in all types of cases?

No, the caseload standards differ significantly among child support enforcement functions, type of case, and in-state and interstate cases.

3. *Are caseload standards the same for in-state and interstate cases for each of the eight types of cases?*

No, the standards differ for in-state and interstate cases. See response to Research Question #2.

4. *Can caseload standards be used to determine human resource needs?*

Yes, caseload standards can be used to determine client-based human resource needs. Human resource needs are a function of the caseload standards and the particular office's mix of cases. A simple algorithm to derive human resource needs was provided to the DCSE. Technical, fiscal, and managerial staffing can be determined through consideration of an effective management span of control and related factors. In the Fredericksburg district office, these jobs constitute 18 percent of the total 53 positions needed to meet the existing mix of caseload demand.

5. *Can the recommended caseload standards improve productivity, be cost-effective, and improve quality of service?*

Yes, based upon the success achieved in the Fredericksburg district office when staffing standards from the Staffing Demonstration were implemented. As noted above, compared to a control office, as a result of additional staffing, the Fredericksburg district office had 73 percent more locates, 1,500 percent more paternities established, 74 percent more administrative obligations established, 633 percent more income withholdings, \$1.08 million more dollars collected (an increase of 61 percent per employee), and a \$1.80 increase in the benefit/cost ratio. In addition, both overall employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction increased.

Introduction

This is the final report of the project to establish caseload standards for employees for the eight principal types of cases in the Fredericksburg District Child Support Office. For each of the eight types of cases, standards were developed for each child support enforcement function for both in-state and interstate cases.⁶ Exhibit 1 (page 2) contains the definitions of the eight types of cases.

Research Questions

The Caseload Standards project addressed the following five research questions:

1. *Can a methodology be developed to formulate caseload standards?*
2. *Are caseload standards the same for the same functions performed in all types of cases?*
3. *Are caseload standards the same for in-state and interstate cases for each of the eight types of cases?*
4. *Can caseload standards be used to determine human resource needs?*
5. *Can the recommended caseload standards improve productivity, be cost-effective, and improve quality of service?*

⁶ The child support enforcement functions used were intake/locate, establish paternity administratively, establish paternity judicially, establish an obligation administratively, establish an obligation judicially, enforce an obligation administratively, enforce an obligation judicially, and perform customer services. An *Interstate IV-D Case* is a case in which the parent or person acting as a parent (CP) and child(ren) live in one state and the Noncustodial Parent (NCP) lives in another state or his/her income source is in another state. *Example:* State A sends an Interstate Child Support Enforcement Transmittal to State B's central registry. An *In-state* (also referred to as *Intrastate*) *IV-D Case* is a case where the CP, NCP, and child(ren) reside in the same state or the state sends an income withholding order directly to an employer in another state. *Example:* When all the parties reside in Virginia or when Virginia sends the NCP's employer in another state an income withholding order directly without going through the central registry in the other state.

Exhibit 1: Case Definitions

ARRN: an abbreviation for Non-TANF Arrears Only, which is a case in which there is not a current support obligation to the child (e.g., the child may have reached age 18 or be less than 19 if a full-time high school student), but the NCP owes past support obligations that were not paid. The case is open for the collection of arrears owed to the child. In addition, when a case involves both **TANF** and **NTANF** arrears and there is no current order, the case is also coded as ARRN.

ARRP: an abbreviation for TANF Arrears Only, which is a case in which there is no current support obligation to the child (e.g., the child may have reached age 18 or be less than 19 if a full-time high school student), but at one time the child received services from the state (**TANF** or Medicaid) and the case is remaining open since the NCP is required to pay this debt owed to the state.

FC: an abbreviation for Foster Care, which is a type of child support enforcement case in which the child is in foster care (the state has custody of the child). The child meets the eligibility requirements for **TANF** but receives foster care maintenance instead of a TANF grant, because the child is separated from his or her parents or other relatives. The DCSE pursues both parents to reimburse the state for the funds for the foster care maintenance.

MAOF: an abbreviation for Medical Assistance Only -- Full Services, which is a case in which the child is receiving Medicaid or is a former **TANF** recipient. The CP wants full services, specifically for the NCP to provide the child with both health benefits and child support benefits. This type of case comes to the attention of the DCSE since the local social services office is providing both Medicaid and TANF benefits.

MAOP: an abbreviation for Medical Assistance Only -- Partial Services, which is a type of child support enforcement case in which the child is receiving benefits under Medicaid. The CP wants the NCP to provide health care so the child does not have to receive Medicaid. This type of case comes to the attention of the DCSE since the local social services office is providing Medicaid benefits.

NTANF: an abbreviation for Non- or Not Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, which is a type of child support enforcement case in which a child is not receiving **TANF**, TANF/FC, Non-IV-E/FC, or Medicaid. The case is initiated by a CP who is applying for full services, which are support obligations and medical benefits for the child, from the DCSE.

SLFC: an abbreviation for a type of child support enforcement case in which the child is receiving Non-IV-E foster care. The child is in-state or local foster care (hence, SLFC). A private caregiver has custody of the child. In this type of case, the client is the social services department that has custody of the child. The social services department makes application for DCSE services by using either an application or a hard copy "501" form. Payments from the state are considered **NTANF**; however, the DCSE is pursuing both parents to recover the monies being given by the local social services department to the caregiver for the care of the child.

TANF: an abbreviation for a type of child support enforcement case in which a child is receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families benefits. The CP wants child support benefits from the NCP, and the state wants reimbursement of the funds spent for the TANF benefits.

Project Phases

The research for this study involved the following phases:

- A checklist (*Child Support Enforcement Task Checklist*) was developed consisting of the principal tasks for each of the major functions and sub-functions of child support work, listed by type of case, both in-state and interstate. See Appendix 1: Task Checklist, page 24.
- Two iterations of the Delphi technique were conducted in which Fredericksburg district office employees were requested to complete the checklist by providing information about the time required to complete each task they perform.⁷
- A worksheet (called the *Frequency Worksheet* to differentiate it from the *Task Checklist*) was completed by Fredericksburg district office managerial personnel, reviewing each task and recording the percentage of cases (for each type of case, both in-state and interstate) that require its completion. See Appendix 2: Tasks Frequency Worksheet, page 30.
- Data were input into spreadsheets and weighted times were computed (product of the times required to complete a task and the percentage of cases in which that task is completed). See Appendices 3 through 7, pages 36 to 44.
- The weighted times were summed and caseload standards were computed for 104^8 combinations of functions and types of cases (both in-state and interstate) using an average work year of 1,760 hours.⁹

⁷ The exceptions are for task times for seven types of interstate cases for the function of Establish Obligation-Administratively. These were unintentionally omitted from the *Task Checklist* and were not discovered until final caseloads were prepared. Times were then obtained from the Supervisor responsible for the function in the Fredericksburg district office, with the concurrence of the District Manager.

⁸ $104 = [(8 \times 8 \times 2) - 24]$ is the formula for [8 functions x 8 types of cases x 2 state jurisdictions (in-state and interstate)] - 24 combinations of functions and types of cases (both in-state and interstate) that are not performed in a district office, such as establishing paternity administratively for an in-state ARRP case.

⁹ The method used to calculate the 1,760 hour figure is shown in Exhibit 2: Calculation of Available Work Hours in Year, page 9.

-
- Human resource needs were determined. Fredericksburg district office customer-related human resource needs were derived by dividing the office caseload mix (number of cases by function in each case category, for both in-state and interstate cases) by the respective caseload standards. Human resource needs for fiscal, technical, and managerial personnel were obtained through discussions with the District Manager. Only two additional Fiscal Technician positions were recommended.
 - Results were sent to the Fredericksburg district office for comment and/or correction at important junctures in the project, including the final caseload standards and the recommended staffing levels.

Development of Task Checklist

The *Task Checklist* (“Checklist”) was initially developed with the assistance of Central Office personnel and then finalized through field testing in the Fredericksburg district office. As shown in Appendix 1: Task Checklist (page 24), the Checklist contains a listing of the principal tasks performed in child support enforcement within each of the major functions (Intake-Locate, Establish Paternity, Establish Obligation, Enforcement, and Customer Services). Two iterations were conducted with the Checklist.

First Iteration

At the beginning of the first iteration of the Checklist, employees in the Fredericksburg district office were asked to first read the entire checklist, including all the tasks, before they commenced completing it. They were then instructed on the Checklist as follows:

This checklist contains a listing of the principal tasks performed in child support enforcement. Please read each task and, if you perform the task, write the number of minutes required to complete it for each type of case at an acceptable level of quality. For example, if a task

requires one hour for a particular type of case, write 60; if the task requires one and one-half hours for another type of case, write 90, and so on. Leave the spaces blank for any tasks that you do not perform.

Due to the care given to the initial development and field testing of the Checklist, the few questions that arose during the first iteration were easily resolved. Employees were instructed to retain a copy of their individually completed checklists so they could refer to them during the second iteration—that is, when the results of the first round were summarized and sent back to them.

The completed checklists for each employee (only one employee did not complete a checklist) were input in a spreadsheet and averages were calculated for all entries. With the exception of one or two estimates for each task, most of the entries were similar. This information was then entered on a summary checklist containing all the averages for each task by type of case, including both in-state and interstate.¹⁰

Second Iteration

In the second iteration, the results of the first iteration were distributed to all employees with the following instructions:

Results of Child Support Enforcement Task Checklist—First Iteration

This checklist contains the average responses of all employees' estimates of the minutes required to complete each task for each type of case at an acceptable level of quality. An "n/a" in a cell means no responses were made for a particular task. Please review these average times and compare them with your original estimates. If you

¹⁰ The exceptions are for task times for seven types of interstate cases for the function of Establish Obligation-Administratively. These were unintentionally omitted from the *Task Checklist* and were not discovered until final caseloads were prepared. Times were then obtained from the Supervisor responsible for the function in the Fredericksburg district office, with the concurrence of the District Manager.

desire to make a change in your original estimate, put an “X” through the number in the cell on the checklist you completed and write-in your revised estimate in the same cell. Do not erase your original estimate simply put an “X” through it, and write the revised number in the cell. If you believe your original estimate is correct, nothing is required.

Fifteen employees who completed the original checklist made no changes in the second iteration. Five employees changed the time estimates of one category only (“Time to provide customer services at a service point”). This item was on page 8 of the questionnaire and involved travel necessary to provide customer services. These five employees originally left the cell blank since they provided service at two different places that required different times. To resolve this, they were asked to provide an average time for the two places. The result was that all five gave the same estimate, 150 minutes. Seven other employees made changes in one or more time estimates for other tasks. Several employees did not participate in the second iteration.

All the changes were entered on separate spreadsheets and averages were tabulated for each task. Again, with the exception of one or two estimates for each task, the estimates were very similar. This information was then entered on a summary checklist, containing all the averages for each task by type of case. This information was transmitted to the Fredericksburg district office for review by managerial personnel, to make any comment and suggest corrections. Some suggestions for corrections were requested and, after discussion, most of them were made.

Completion of Frequency Worksheet

The next step in the process was the preparation and completion of a worksheet in which Fredericksburg district office managerial personnel were asked to determine—for each function by type of case, including both in-state and interstate—the percentage of cases in which the applicable task was performed.

This form was called the *Frequency Worksheet* (see Appendix 2) to differentiate it from the *Task Checklist*. These were the instructions accompanying the *Frequency Worksheet* (“Worksheet”):

This Worksheet contains a listing of the principal tasks performed in child support enforcement. For each type of case, please estimate the percentage of cases that require the completion of a particular task. For example, if 10 percent of TANF cases require completion of the task “Assist applicants in applying for service” – then write 10% in the cell. If 80 percent of NTANF cases require the completion of that task - then write 80%, and so on. Please leave the space blank for tasks not completed in a particular type of case. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

In completing the Worksheet, Fredericksburg district office management conferred with associates in their respective units of responsibility. However, each employee did not complete a Worksheet, as was done in the *Task Checklist* phase of the study. One Worksheet was submitted for the entire office, with individual portions, such as Intake-Locate, Enforcement, and so forth, being completed by the responsible Supervisor.

The frequencies were then input into the same spreadsheet containing the final averages for the *Task Checklist*. Printouts of these spreadsheets were transmitted to the Fredericksburg District Manager for review, to determine any inconsistencies or changes that needed to be made. For example, in completion of the Checklist, some times were provided but frequencies were not made for the same tasks on the Worksheet. All inconsistencies were resolved. In addition, when several task times were compared with task frequencies and vice versa, Fredericksburg district office management recommended some changes, and they were made.

Calculation of Weighted Times

The next step was to calculate weighted times for each task, within each function, for each type of case. This figure was the product of the average time required to complete a task (for each task) and the percentage of cases (for each type of case) in which the task is completed. In essence, the total effect of a task within a function for each type of case was determined by this process of weighting the time to complete the task by the percentage of cases that require its completion. For example, the task “assisting applicants” in the locate function for TANF cases required 30 minutes, but the task is only accomplished in 10 percent of TANF cases. Thus, the weighted effect of this task is three minutes for a TANF case. Conversely, “conducting a quick locate” in a TANF case requires 15 minutes but is accomplished in 95 percent of TANF cases. Thus, the weighted effect of this task is about 14 minutes. It is also true that a task may require a large amount of time for a particular type of case and may have to be accomplished in a large percentage of cases, such as the locate task “conducting a review of APECS and the paper file and record corrections.” This task requires 90 minutes for TANF cases and must be done in 100 percent of TANF cases.

Deriving Caseload Standards

The weighted times for all tasks for each type of case were then summed to obtain the total number of weighted minutes required for the completion of each task for each type of function for each type of case. These weighted minutes were then divided by 60, to obtain weighted hours for tasks in all functions for each type of case.

Caseload standards for each function for each type of case were calculated by dividing these figures by an average work year of 1,760 hours. Exhibit 2: Calculation of Available Work Hours in Year shows the method used to derive the 1,760 figure. The caseload standards for all functions for each type of case

are shown in the rows of the Caseload Standards section of Table 1: Caseload Standards/Number Cases/Employee Staffing Requirements (see next page).

Exhibit 2: Calculation of Available Work Hours in Year

Calculation of Available Work Hours in Year		
Total hours in one year = 52 x 40 =		2,080
<i>Minus:</i>		
<i>12 holidays (12 x 8) =</i>		<i>96</i>
<i>SL "use or lose" hours =</i>		<i>64</i>
<i>Family/personal "use or lose" hours =</i>		<i>32</i>
<i>*Assuming 2 weeks vacation =</i>		<i>80</i>
<i>Training of 4 hours/month =</i>		<i>48</i>
		320
Available work hours in one year = 2,080 – 320 =		1,760

Table 1: Caseload Standards/Number Cases/Employee Staffing Requirements

Caseload Standards																																		
Functions	TANF Instate		Interstate		NTANF Instate		Interstate		FC Instate		Interstate		SLFC Instate		Interstate		ARRP Instate		Interstate		ARRN Instate		Interstate		MAOF Instate		Interstate		MAOP Instate		Interstate			
	Intake/Locate	331	314	475	440	331	314	537	492	410	401	471	435	513	471	590	536																	
Establish Paternity/Administrative	503	437	507	440	493	498	486	502					521	508	558	530																		
Establish Paternity/Judicial	364		374	421	361		357		838		977	448	372		387																			
Establish Obligation/Administrative	422	323	464	361	465	356	450	355	429	357			468	363	494	367																		
Establish Obligation/Judicial	341		346	504	339		337		354		381		346	539	388																			
Enforce Obligation/Administrative	365	311	293	261	320	297	306	284	951	986	429	436	250	236	464	471																		
Enforce Obligation/Judicial	201		203	473	185		183		422		422	1446	188		471																			
Customer Services	1115	1114	1604	1305	1324	1114	1324	1114	1324	1114	1324	1114	1324	1114	1582	1260																		
Number Cases/Employees Required																		Total Cases	Employee Needs															
Intake/Locate	215	42	268	115	64	6	6	2	153	30	26	19	296	49	88	8	1387																	
	0.65	0.13	0.56	0.26	0.19	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.37	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.58	0.10	0.15	0.01		3.23																
Establish Paternity/Administrative	99	23	163	147	9	1	8						222	74	77	19	842																	
	0.20	0.05	0.32	0.33	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00					0.43	0.15	0.14	0.04		1.69																
Establish Paternity/Judicial	29		26	28	3				1				52		21		160																	
	0.08		0.07	0.07	0.01		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.14		0.05			0.42																
Establish Obligation/Administrative	215	51	458	275	140	21	53	5	187	121			236	92	125	5	1984																	
	0.51	0.16	0.99	0.76	0.30	0.06	0.12	0.01	0.44	0.34			0.50	0.25	0.25	0.01		4.71																
Establish Obligation/Judicial	29		14	29	23		3		8				31		6		143																	
	0.09		0.04	0.06	0.07		0.01		0.02									0																
Enforcement/Administrative	341	38	3543	1431	141	2	90	4	686	108	702	410	1355	185	185	17	9238																	
	0.93	0.12	12.09	5.48	0.44	0.01	0.29	0.01	0.72	0.11	1.64	0.94	5.42	0.78	0.40	0.04		29.43																
Enforcement/Judicial	4		39	6	1				9		4		21		1		85																	
	0.02		0.19	0.01	0.01				0.02		0.01		0.11		0.00			0.37																
13839																																		
Customer Services Contacts/Employees Required					<u>4315</u>																													
					<u>3.26</u>														3.26															
Management/Support Employees																																		
District Manager																			1															
Supervisors																			2															
Secretary																			1															
Accountant																			1															
Fiscal Technicians (existing 3 plus 2 additional)																			5															
																			53.39															

Determining Human Resource Needs

To determine human resource needs for customer-related work, it was necessary to obtain Fredericksburg district office caseload data for each function for each type of case, including both in-state and interstate. This information was then input in a spreadsheet containing the caseload standards. Customer-related staffing requirements were then calculated by dividing the number of cases in each category by the respective caseload standard. Human resource needs for technical, fiscal, and managerial positions were obtained from discussions with the District Manager. The final product of this effort is shown in the “Number Cases/Employees Required” section of Table 1: Caseload Standards/Number Cases/Employee Staffing Requirements above.

At this final juncture, all the data, including the task times, task frequencies, caseload standards, and staffing standards were sent to the Fredericksburg district office for comment and discussion. Information had also been furnished to the Fredericksburg district office at the conclusion of each major phase of the study, such as the end of the administration of the *Task Checklist* and the *Frequency Worksheet* phases, so management and other staff were kept well informed about the project’s tentative findings as the project proceeded. Consequently, at this stage, no changes were proposed, since there were no major surprises in the final results sent to the Fredericksburg district office management for review.

Validating Caseload Standards

Validating the methodology used is an important issue for evaluating the results of a project that involves—either directly or indirectly—determining the human resources needed to accomplish a given workload effectively. The basic purpose of the Caseload Standards project was to calculate caseload standards for child support enforcement functions by type of case for both in-state and interstate

cases. An important, ancillary purpose was to determine human resource needs by applying these caseload standards to the caseload mix in the Fredericksburg district office. The two purposes are related—that is, the validity of the caseload standards could be questioned if they were not able to project reasonable staffing levels based upon the Fredericksburg district office caseload mix. As shown in Table 1: Caseload Standards/Number Cases/Employee Staffing Requirements (page 10), the Fredericksburg district office needs 53 employees to work its unique caseload mix, using the caseload standards. This finding can be validated by comparing it with the results of a prior study (the *Virginia Staffing Demonstration*) that developed staffing standards to determine the number of employees required in the Fredericksburg district office.¹¹

Virginia Staffing Demonstration Study

Between 1994 and 1998, a federally-funded project, the *Virginia Staffing Demonstration* (“Staffing Demonstration”), was conducted to determine the role staffing standards play in the performance of local child support offices. Like the Caseload Standards project, the Staffing Demonstration employed the Delphi technique in the Fredericksburg district office to establish standard times for accomplishing tasks within the following child support enforcement functions: customer intake, locate, establishing paternity (both administratively and judicially), establishing obligations (both administratively and judicially), enforcing obligations, and providing customer service. The Staffing Demonstration concluded that the Fredericksburg district office was 33 percent understaffed, using staffing standards that were a function of the product of time requirements for job tasks, estimates of the frequencies of task performance, and a forecast of managerial, technical, and support human resource needs.

¹¹ Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, *Virginia Staffing Demonstration*, August 2000.

Based upon the recommendations of the Staffing Demonstration, 14 additional employees were hired in the Fredericksburg district office. As a consequence of this action, the employees of the Fredericksburg district office achieved positive results, compared to a control office. Specifically, compared to the control office, the Fredericksburg district office had 73 percent more locates, 1,500 percent more paternities established, 74 percent more administrative obligations established, 633 percent more income withholdings, \$1.08 million more dollars collected (an increase of 61 percent per employee), and a \$1.80 increase in the benefit/cost ratio. In addition, overall employee satisfaction (“*Overall, how satisfied are you with working here?*”) increased 19 percent, compared to the control office. In addition, compared to the control office, customers’ satisfaction in the Fredericksburg district office increased from the Base Period by 9 percentage points in response to “*Was your case handled in a timely manner?*”; by 7 percentage points in response to “*Are you treated courteously when you phone or visit the office?*”; and by 10 percentage points in response to “*Have child support staff been helpful?*”

Comparing the Caseload Standards and Staffing Demonstration Studies

There are some similarities between this Caseload Standards study and the Staffing Demonstration study. First, both studies involved the use of employee estimates of time requirements using the Delphi technique. In the Staffing Demonstration, an outside contractor used two iterations of a Delphi technique with an employee panel to determine the amount of time needed to perform each child support service-related task at an acceptable level of quality. The panel members were child support enforcement workers with at least six months of experience who spent at least 24 percent of their time in the functions studied. That information was supplemented by estimates of the frequencies of task performance, provided by Fredericksburg district office management. Weighted

times in minutes were calculated from the product of task time-estimates and task frequencies. This product was then converted into hours and divided by 1,586¹² to derive service-related personnel needs. The total human resources needed to staff the Fredericksburg district office was the sum of these service-related employees, plus an estimate of managerial, technical, and support personnel needed.

There are some basic differences in the approach used in this Caseload Standards project versus that used in the Staffing Demonstration. In the Caseload Standards project, the purpose of the research was to calculate the number of cases (caseload standards) employees can manage within available work time at an acceptable level of quality. These caseload standards were calculated for each of the eight child support enforcement functions, such as intake-locate, and further distinguished by the eight different types of cases, and even further distinguished by both in-state and interstate cases. The final product was the development of 104 different caseload standards.

Another major difference from the methodology used in the Staffing Demonstration was that the Caseload Standards project used two iterations of the Delphi technique for employees to estimate times required to complete both service-related and non service-related tasks. In comparison, the Staffing Demonstration only asked employees to estimate time for service-related work. Non-service related work was calculated in another manner (as noted below). These and other differences in the two studies are summarized below.

Differences in the Studies

- The focus of the Staffing Demonstration was to determine the number of employees needed to staff the Fredericksburg district office. The focus of the Caseload Standards project was to determine the number of cases, by

¹² The contractor for the Staffing Demonstration used this figure as the total number of hours, case-related and non-case-related, in one work-year. Fredericksburg management and DCSE Personnel concurred with this figure. Case-related work was considered to comprise 86.5% of the work-year.

function, that employees could handle by case type for both in-state and interstate cases.

- The Staffing Demonstration calculated human resource needs directly from the product of estimated time requirements and frequencies of task performance. The Caseload Standards project determined employee requirements as a function of caseload standards and the caseload mix in the Fredericksburg district office.
- In the Staffing Demonstration, employees made estimates of the time required to complete service-related tasks, using the Delphi technique. The times to complete non service-related tasks were estimated by a consensus of opinions from Central Office personnel, Fredericksburg district office staff, and the two contractors. In the Caseload Standards project, the Delphi technique was used for employees to make estimates of time to complete both service-related and non-service-related tasks.
- The number of work-hours in an employee-year that was used to calculate human resource needs differed for the Staffing Demonstration and the Caseload Standards project, being 1,586 and 1,760, respectively.
- The Staffing Demonstration asked employees to estimate the time required to complete tasks for “a case.” The Caseload Standards project required employees to differentiate among the eight different types of cases in making estimates of time requirements to accomplish tasks. Also, the Staffing Demonstration did not require employees to differentiate between in-state and interstate cases when making estimates. The Caseload Standards project required employees to make this distinction.
- The employees who participated in the Staffing Demonstration’s Delphi panel were representative of the six (6) small district offices in the Commonwealth of Virginia. In the Caseload Standards project, the participants were restricted to Fredericksburg district office staff.

Similarities Between the Studies

Both studies were similar in the following areas:

- Two iterations of the Delphi Technique were used for employees to make estimates of time requirements.
- Estimates were made of the relative frequencies at which tasks were performed.
- Weighted times, which were the product of the time estimates and frequencies, were used.
- Estimates were made of managerial, technical, and support personnel.

Table 2: Comparison of Estimates of Human Resources (HR) Needs – Fredericksburg District Office – Division of Child Support Enforcement (below, page 18) compares the Caseload Standards project and the Staffing Demonstration study in several key areas. For the month of June 1994, the caseload was 10,173 cases. (It was during the January to December 1994 interval when data collection was conducted in the Staffing Demonstration.¹³) The total number of employees required to accomplish this caseload, using the calculated staffing standards, was estimated to be 42.¹⁴

The caseload for the period of the Caseload Standards project (June 2001) was 13,839, as shown in Table 2. Assuming the caseload mixes were similar for June 1994 and the same month seven (7) years later, the present number of employees required could be estimated as 57.1, allowing for the larger caseload. This number is somewhat greater than the estimate of 53 employees, which is the number necessary to meet the caseload for June 2001 as projected through this study. A major difference in the calculations in the two studies, however, is the estimation of the number of hours in an employee work-year. As shown in Table 2 and noted previously, the estimated numbers of hours in a work-year for the

¹³ Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, *Virginia Staffing Demonstration*, August 2000, pp. 45 and 155.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

Staffing Demonstration and the Caseload Standards studies were 1586 and 1760, respectively. Using the 1586 figure, the estimated number of employees required for the 2001 caseload would be 57.7.

Caseload Standards' Validity

In sum, although the two studies used different methodologies to derive staffing levels, the outcomes are quite similar when applied to derive estimated human resource needs to meet the Fredericksburg district office caseload demand—namely, 52 and 53 employees, respectively, for the Staffing Demonstration study and the Caseload Standards study. These results validate the caseload standards. The ultimate validation, however, is to implement the staffing conclusions of the Caseload Standards study and evaluate the results, as discussed in the following section, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (page 19).

**Table 2: Comparison of Estimates of Human Resources (HR) Needs –
Fredericksburg District Office – Division of Child Support Enforcement**

Name of Study	Caseload	Date of Caseload	Estimated HR Needs	Estimated HR Needs (13,839 Caseload) ¹⁵	Hours in Employee Work-Year	Estimated HR Needs (1,586 hour Work-Year) ¹⁶	Estimated HR Needs (13,839 Caseload and 1,760 hour Work-Year)
Staffing Standards ¹⁷	10,173	June 1994	42 ¹⁸	57.1	1,586	n/a	52
Caseload Standards	13,839	June 2001	53 ¹⁹	n/a	1,760	57.7	53

¹⁵ Based upon caseload of 13,839. [$57.1 = (13,839 \div 10,173) \times 42$].

¹⁶ Based upon 1,586 hours in employee work-year. [$57.1 = (1,760 \div 1,586) \times 52$].

¹⁷ Division of Child Support Enforcement, Virginia Department of Social Services, *Virginia Staffing Demonstration*, August 2000.

¹⁸ This methodology involved employee estimates (using the Delphi technique) of time in minutes to complete service-related tasks. This information was supplemented by Fredericksburg district office management estimates of the frequencies of task performance. Weighted times in minutes were calculated from the product of task time estimates and task frequencies. This product was converted into hours and divided by 1,586 to derive service-related HR needs. Total HR needs was the sum of service-related HR needs plus a forecast of managerial, technical, and support personnel HR needs.

¹⁹ This methodology involved the product of employee estimates (using the Delphi technique) of time to complete tasks (service- and non-service related) for each type of case and the percentage of cases that require completion of the tasks. This product (weighted times) was converted into hours to determine hours required per case (for all eight types of cases categorized by in-state and interstate) and then divided by 1,760, to calculate the caseload standard per worker. HR needs were the product of the caseload standard and the number of each type of case, categorized by in-state and interstate. Total HR needs were the sum of this product and a forecast of managerial, technical, and support HR needs.

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The Delphi Technique

- The Delphi technique was determined to be a valid method for determining times required to complete tasks within child support functions by different types of cases, including both in-state and interstate.
- The benefits of the Delphi technique include the opportunity for employee anonymity in making contributions, while still allowing for collaboration by those choosing to do so. In the first iteration, employees are usually given one or more weeks to complete data collection forms. This is usually a sufficient period for employees to estimate the time needed to complete tasks, since it gives them the opportunity to think carefully about time requirements, particularly for tasks which may be more difficult to estimate.
- The feedback process in the second iteration of the Delphi technique gives employees the opportunity to review their original estimations and, in light of the information furnished about average times estimated by all employees, make any necessary changes.
- We recommend using the Delphi technique to establish caseload standards for child support offices.

Caseload Standards

- The caseload standards developed in this project are a function of the times required to accomplish tasks, the frequencies of task performance, and the number of hours in a work year. Times to accomplish tasks were obtained through the Delphi technique.²⁰ Frequencies were obtained from

²⁰ The exceptions are for task times for seven types of interstate cases for the function of Establish Obligation-Administratively. These were unintentionally omitted from the *Task Checklist* and were not discovered until final caseloads were prepared. Times were then obtained from the Supervisor responsible for the function in the Fredericksburg district office, with the concurrence of the District Manager.

Fredericksburg district office managerial staff. The number of hours in a work-year was estimated at 1,760 hours.²¹

- One hundred and four (104) individual caseload standards were developed.
- The number of cases per employee ranged significantly within different child support enforcement functions and different types of cases, and between different combinations of functions and different types of cases. Among different child support enforcement functions and different types of cases, the number of cases per employee ranged from a low of 183 cases per employee, to enforce State and Local Foster Care cases judicially, to a high of 1,582 cases per employee, to provide customer services in Medical Assistance Only, Partial Services cases.

Human Resource Needs

- The human resource needs of the Fredericksburg district office were determined independently of the process to develop caseload standards. Direct customer-related human resource needs were determined using an algorithm of the numbers of cases by function in each case category (both in-state and interstate) and the respective caseload standards. With the exception of two additional Fiscal Technicians deemed to be needed, no changes were proposed in accounting, technical, or management staffing.
- The Fredericksburg district office human resource needs were based upon June 2001 caseload information. In that month there were 13,839 cases.
- The Fredericksburg district office needs 53 employees for the 13,839 cases. Since it currently has a total of 31 approved employees, the Fredericksburg office is understaffed 42 percent.

Validation of Findings

- The calculations for the 104 caseload standards and the Fredericksburg district office human resources needs were validated by projecting the results of the

²¹ See Exhibit 2, p. 9.

Staffing Demonstration, conducted between 1994 and 1998.²² By controlling for a June 2001 caseload mix and a 1,760 hour work year, the projected human resource needs to meet the June 2001 caseload using the Staffing Demonstration's results would be substantially the same as these Caseload Standards study estimations, namely 52 and 53 employees, respectively.

- Implementing the staffing recommendations of the Caseload Standards project should produce results similar to those of the Staffing Demonstration. The results of implementing the staffing standards recommended by the Staffing Demonstration were significantly positive. Specifically, compared to the control office, the Fredericksburg district office had 73 percent more locates, 1,500 percent more paternities established, 74 percent more administrative obligations established, 633 percent more income withholdings, \$1.08 million more dollars collected (an increase of 61 percent per employee), and a \$1.80 increase in the benefit/cost ratio. In addition, overall employee satisfaction increased 19 percent compared to the control office and customer satisfaction increased from 7 to 10 percentage points, depending upon the question asked.
- The fiscal efficiency of the Commonwealth of Virginia—as well as the children and other customers whose needs are being met through services provided by the DCSE—will significantly benefit by increasing the Fredericksburg district office staffing to the levels recommended in this report.

²² During the interval of 1994 and 1998, a federally-funded project, the Virginia Staffing Demonstration (“Staffing Demonstration”) was conducted to determine the role staffing standards play in the performance of local child support offices. Like the Caseload Standards project, the Staffing Demonstration employed the Delphi technique in the Fredericksburg district office to establish standard times for accomplishing tasks within these child support enforcement functions: customer intake, locate, establishing paternity (both administratively and judicially), establishing obligations (both administratively and judicially), enforcing obligations, and providing customer services. The Staffing Demonstration concluded that the Fredericksburg district office was 33 percent understaffed, using staffing standards based on time requirements for job tasks obtained from the application of the Delphi technique, plus a forecast of additional managerial, technical and support human resource needs.

Research Questions

1. Can a methodology be developed to formulate caseload standards?

A workable methodology was developed to formulate caseload standards. This report has presented the requisite information to formulate standards, including data collection forms, spreadsheets with formulae to determine caseload standards by function, type of case, and by classification as in-state or interstate cases.

2. Are caseload standards the same for the same functions performed in all types of cases?

No, the caseload standards differ significantly among child support enforcement functions, type of case, and in-state and interstate cases.

3. Are caseload standards the same for in-state and interstate cases for each of the eight types of cases?

No, the standards differ for in-state and interstate cases. See response to Research Question #2.

4. Can caseload standards be used to determine human resource needs?

Yes, caseload standards can be used to determine client-based human resource needs. Human resource needs are a function of the caseload standards and the particular office's mix of cases. A simple algorithm to derive human resource needs was provided to the DCSE. Technical, fiscal, and managerial staffing can be determined through consideration of an effective management span of control and related factors. In the Fredericksburg district office, these jobs constitute 18 percent of the total 53 positions needed to meet the existing mix of caseload demand.

5. Can the recommended caseload standards improve productivity, be cost-effective, and improve quality of service?

Yes, based upon the success achieved in the Fredericksburg district office when staffing standards from the Staffing Demonstration were implemented. As noted above, compared to a control office, as a result of additional staffing, the Fredericksburg district office had 73 percent more locates, 1,500 percent more paternities established, 74 percent more administrative obligations established, 633 percent more income withholdings, \$1.08 million more dollars collected (an increase of 61 percent per employee), and a \$1.80 increase in the benefit/cost ratio. In addition, both overall employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction increased.

Appendix 1: Task Checklist

This checklist contains a listing of the principal tasks performed in child support enforcement. Please read each task and write the number of minutes required to complete each task for each type of case at an acceptable level of quality. For example, if a task requires one hour for a particular type of case, write 60; if the task requires one and one-half hours for another type of case, write 90, and so on. Leave the spaces blank for all tasks that you do not perform.

INTAKE/LOCATE TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT I: INTAKE/LOCATE									
A. Assist applicants in applying for service.									
B. Process change in payee.									
C. Conduct a quick locate									
D. Conduct a full locate, which could include skip tracing.									
E. Contact the parent(s) and/or other entities and obtain information for an in-state case.									
F. Contact the parent(s) and/or other entities and obtain information for an interstate case.									
G. Build the file, update APECS and accounting information, and refer the case.									
H. Other tasks related to case processing.									
ELEMENT II: RESEARCH AND “CLEAN UP” FAILED INTERFACES (that is, mismatches or transition cases).									
A. Review APECS and paper file and record corrections.									
B. Other research and clean up tasks									

Appendix 1, continued

ESTABLISH PATERNITY	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	
ELEMENT I: ESTABLISH PATERNITY ADMINISTRATIVELY									
A. In-state case									
1. Arrange and conduct interviews with the custodial parent and non-custodial parent.									
2. Obtain a voluntary acknowledgment of paternity or schedule blood test.									
3. Process genetic blood testing results.									
4. Other in-state administrative paternity establishment tasks									
B. Interstate case									
1. Obtain a voluntary acknowledgment of paternity for in-state custodial parent and out-of-state putative parent.									
2. Refer the case to another state's IV-D agency by filing a UIFSA petition.									
3. Coordinate genetic blood testing with responding state.									
4. Other interstate administrative paternity establishment tasks									
ELEMENT II: ESTABLISH PATERNITY JUDICIALLY	Do not write in this space								
A. In-state									
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other in-state judicial paternity establishment tasks									
B. Interstate									
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other interstate judicial paternity establishment tasks									

Appendix 1, continued

ESTABLISH PATERNITY	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	
ELEMENT III: OTHER PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT TASKS	Do not write in this space								
A. Respond to all case-specific inquiries that involve research or verification in order to resolve the call.									
B. Work other critical worklist items in the caseload and update APECS, as appropriate.									
C. Other tasks not described above									

ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	
ELEMENT I: ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION ADMINISTRATIVELY	Do not write in this space								
A. Establish current support obligation administratively when no order exists.									
B. Preparing for and attending appeal hearings									
C. Documentation and case processing									
D. Other tasks to establish an obligation									
ELEMENT II: ESTABLISH A SUPPORT OBLIGATION JUDICIALLY	Do not write in this space								
A. In-state	Do not write in this space								
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other tasks to establish the obligation									
B. Interstate	Do not write in this space								
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									

Appendix 1, continued

ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other tasks to establish the obligation									
C. De novo appeals									
ELEMENT III: OTHER TASKS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF OBLIGATIONS	Do not write in this space								
A. Respond to all case-specific inquiries that involve research or verification in order to resolve the call.									
B. Work other critical worklist items in the caseload and update APECS, as appropriate.									
C. Other tasks not described above									

ENFORCEMENT TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	
ELEMENT I: ENFORCEMENT OF OBLIGATIONS ADMINISTRATIVELY	Do not write in this space								
A. Process wage withholding - In-state									
B. Process wage withholding - Interstate									
C. Preparing for and attending appeals hearings									
D. Documentation and case processing									
E. Enforcement by IRS or state tax intercept process									
F. Enforcement by other methods	Do not write in this space								
1. Review and process data match worklists.									
2. Lien processing									
3. Order to withhold and an order to deliver processing									
4. Seizure and sale (i.e., SAFE) processing									
5. Extradition processing									
6. Criminal prosecution (PSOC) processing									

Appendix 1, continued

ENFORCEMENT TASKS	TYPE OF CASE							
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP
7. UIFSA processing								
G. Other tasks in enforcing obligations administratively								
ELEMENT II: JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT	Do not write in this space							
A. In-state	Do not write in this space							
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.								
2. Make court appearance, including travel.								
3. Documentation and case processing								
4. Other in-state judicial enforcement tasks								
B. Interstate	Do not write in this space							
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.								
2. Make court appearance, including travel.								
3. Documentation and case processing								
4. Other interstate judicial enforcement tasks								
ELEMENT V: MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDERS	Do not write in this space							
A. In-state	Do not write in this space							
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.								
2. Make court appearance, including travel.								
3. Documentation and case processing								
4. Other in-state tasks for modification of court orders								
B. Interstate	Do not write in this space							
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.								
2. Make court appearance, including travel.								
3. Documentation and case processing								
4. Other interstate tasks for modification of court orders								
ELEMENT VI: REVIEW AND ADJUST OBLIGATIONS	Do not write in this space							
A. Process, review and adjustment - in-state.								
B. Process, review and adjustment - interstate.								

Appendix 1, continued

CUSTOMER SERVICES	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	
A. Receive, research and respond to customer inquiries, including documentation and case maintenance - in-state.									
B. Receive, research and respond to customer inquiries, including documentation and case maintenance - interstate.									
C. Travel to provide customer services at a service point.									

Appendix 2: Tasks Frequency Worksheet

This worksheet contains a listing of the principal tasks performed in child support enforcement. For each type of case, please estimate the percentage of cases that require the completion of a particular task. For example, if 10 percent of TANF cases require completion of the task “Assist applicants in applying for service” - then write 10% in the cell. If 80 percent of NTANF cases require the completion of that task - then write 80%, and so on. Please leave the space blank for tasks not completed in a particular type of case. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Hopefully, the outcome from this research project will lead to realistic staffing levels for the vitally important work you are doing.

INTAKE/LOCATE TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT I: INTAKE/LOCATE	Please do not write in this space								
A. Assist applicants in applying for service.									
B. Process change in payee.									
C. Conduct a quick locate									
D. Conduct a full locate, which could include skip tracing.									
E. Contact the parent(s) and/or other entities and obtain information for an in-state case.									
F. Contact the parent(s) and/or other entities and obtain information for an interstate case.									
G. Build the file, update APECS and accounting information, and refer the case.									
H. Other tasks related to case processing.									
	Please do not write in this space								
A. Review APECS and paper file and record corrections.									
B. Other research and clean up tasks									

Appendix 2, continued

ESTABLISH PATERNITY	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT I: ESTABLISH PATERNITY ADMINISTRATIVELY	Please do not write in this space								
A. In-state case									
1. Arrange and conduct interviews with the custodial parent and non-custodial parent.									
2. Obtain a voluntary acknowledgment of paternity or schedule blood test.									
3. Process genetic blood testing results.									
4. Other in-state administrative paternity establishment tasks									
B. Interstate case									
1. Obtain a voluntary acknowledgment of paternity for in-state custodial parent and out-of-state putative parent.									
2. Refer the case to another state's IV-D agency by filing a UIFSA petition.									
3. Coordinate genetic blood testing with responding state.									
4. Other interstate administrative paternity establishment tasks									

ESTABLISH PATERNITY	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT II: ESTABLISH PATERNITY JUDICIALLY	Please do not write in this space								
A. In-state									
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other in-state judicial paternity establishment tasks									
B. Interstate									
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									

Appendix 2, continued

ESTABLISH PATERNITY	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other interstate judicial paternity establishment tasks									
ELEMENT III: OTHER PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT TASKS	Please do not write in this space								
A. Respond to all case-specific inquiries that involve research or verification in order to resolve the call.									
B. Work other critical worklist items in the caseload and update APECS, as appropriate.									
C. Other tasks not described above									

ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT I: ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION ADMINISTRATIVELY	Please do not write in this space								
A. Establish current support obligation administratively when no order exists.									
B. Preparing for and attending appeal hearings									
C. Documentation and case processing									
D. Other tasks to establish an obligation									
ELEMENT II: ESTABLISH A SUPPORT OBLIGATION JUDICIALLY	Please do not write in this space								
A. In-state									
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other tasks to establish the obligation									

Appendix 2, continued

ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
B. Interstate									
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other tasks to establish the obligation									
C. De novo appeals									
ELEMENT III: OTHER TASKS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF OBLIGATIONS	Please do not write in this space								
A. Respond to all case-specific inquiries that involve research or verification in order to resolve the call.									
B. Work other critical worklist items in the caseload and update APECS, as appropriate.									
C. Other tasks not described above									

ENFORCEMENT TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT I: ENFORCEMENT OF OBLIGATIONS ADMINISTRATIVELY	Please do not write in this space								
A. Process wage withholding - In-state									
B. Process wage withholding - Interstate									
C. Preparing for and attending appeals hearings									
D. Enforcement by IRS or state tax intercept process									
E. Documentation and case processing									
F. Enforcement by other methods	Please do not write in this space								
1. Review and process data match worklists.									
2. Lien processing									
3. Order to withhold and an order to deliver processing									

Appendix 2, continued

ENFORCEMENT TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
4. Seizure and sale (i.e., SAFE) processing									
5. Extradition processing									
6. Criminal prosecution (PSOC) processing									
7. UIFSA processing									
G. Other tasks in enforcing obligations administratively									

ENFORCEMENT TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
ELEMENT II: JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT	Please do not write in this space								
A. In-state									
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other in-state judicial enforcement tasks									
B. Interstate									
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other interstate judicial enforcement tasks									
ELEMENT V: MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDERS	Please do not write in this space								
A. In-state									
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.									
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other in-state tasks for modification of court orders									
B. Interstate									
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.									

Appendix 2, continued

ENFORCEMENT TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
2. Make court appearance, including travel.									
3. Documentation and case processing									
4. Other interstate tasks for modification of court orders									
ELEMENT VI: REVIEW AND ADJUST OBLIGATIONS	Please do not write in this space								
A. Process, review and adjustment - in-state.									
B. Process, review and adjustment - interstate.									

CUSTOMER SERVICES TASKS	TYPE OF CASE								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank
A. Receive, research and respond to customer inquiries, including documentation and case maintenance - in-state.									
B. Receive, research and respond to customer inquiries, including documentation and case maintenance - interstate.									
C. Travel to provide customer services at a service point.									

Appendix 3: Intake/Locate Tasks

Type of Case	Minutes Required to Perform Task for Each Case Type										Percent of Cases in Which Task is Performed for Each Case Type								Weighted Time (Minutes Required to Perform Task x % of Cases for Each Case Type in Which Task is Performed)									
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP			TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP		
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J3		K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S3		T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA
ELEMENT I: INTAKE/LOCATE																												
A. Assist applicants in applying for service	30	30	25	30		30	30	22	4	0.10	0.8	0.1	0.1		0.8	0.6	0.2	4		3	24	2.5	3	0	24	18	4.4	
B. Process change in payee	24	21	22	21	22	22	22	22	5	0.25	0.4	0.25	0.25	0.2	1	0.25	0.05	5		6	8.4	5.5	5.25	4.4	22	5.5	1.1	
C. Conduct a quick locate	15	16	15	16	16	15	15	16	6	0.95	0.75	0.95	0.95	0.75	0.75	0.95	0.95	6		14.3	12	14.3	15.2	12	11.3	14.3	15.2	
D. Conduct a full locate, which could include skip tracing	57	57	58	52	56	56	57	56	7	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7		57	57	58	52	56	56	57	56	
E. Contact the parent(s) and/or other entities and obtain information for an in-state case	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	9	0.90	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.9	9		36	36	36	36	24	36	36	36	
F. Contact the parent(s) and/or other entities and obtain information for an interstate case	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	11	0.90	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.9	0.9	11		54	54	54	54	30	54	54	54	
G. Build the file, update APECS and accounting information and refer the case	60	60	60	60	50	50	50	41	13	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13		60	60	60	60	50	50	50	41	
H. Other tasks related to case processing	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	14	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14		25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	
ELEMENT II: RESEARCH AND "CLEAN UP" FAILED INTERFACES (that is, mismatches or transition cases)									15									15										
A. Review APECS and paper file and record corrections	90		90		60				17	1.00		1		1				17		90		90		60				
B. Other research and clean up tasks	27		27		26				18	1.00		1		1				18		27		27		26				
In-state = sum of 21 - 13																				372	276	372	250	287	278	260	233	
Interstate = sum of 21 - 11																				318	222	318	196	257	224	206	179	
																				336	240	336	214	263	242	224	197	

INTAKE/LOCATE TASKS																
Caseload Standards																
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate
Weighted Minutes/Case	318.3	336.3	222.0	240.0	318.3	336.3	196.5	214.5	257.0	263.0	224.0	242.3	205.8	223.8	178.7	196.7
Weighted Hours/Case	5.3	5.6	3.7	4.0	5.3	5.6	3.3	3.6	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.0	3.4	3.7	3.0	3.3
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760
Caseload Standard/Worker	331.8	314.1	475.7	440.0	331.8	314.1	537.4	492.3	410.9	401.5	471.4	435.8	513.1	471.8	590.9	536.9

Appendix 4: Establish Paternity Tasks

Type of Case	Minutes Required to Perform Task for Each Case Type										Percent of Cases in Which Task is Performed for Each Case Type								Weighted Time (Minutes Required to Perform Task x % of Cases for Each Case)							
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	J3		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J3		K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA
ELEMENT I: ESTABLISH PATERNITY ADMINISTRATIVELY	Please do not write in this space																									
A. In-state Case																										
1. Arrange and conduct interviews with the custodial parent and non-custodial parent	46	46	46	46			46	36		0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95			0.95	0.95	43.7	43.7	43.7	43.7				43.7	34.2
2. Obtain a voluntary acknowledgment of paternity or schedule blood test	15	15	15	15			15	15		0.4	0.7	0.3	0.3			0.4	0.6	6	10.5	4.5	4.5				6	9
3. Process genetic blood testing results	20	20	20	20			20	20		0.5	0.4	0.7	0.7			0.5	0.3	10	8	14	14				10	6
4. Other in-state administrative paternity establishment tasks	24	23	24	24			22	22		1	1	1	1			1	1	24	23	24	24				22	22
Sum of 15 + 49																		83.7	85.2	86.2	86.2				81.7	71.2
																		210	208	214	217				203	189
B. Interstate Case																										
1. Obtain a voluntary acknowledgment of paternity for in-state custodial parent and out-of-state putative parent	30	30	30	30			30	30		0.2	0.25	0.1	0.1			0.25	0.2	6	7.5	3	3				7.5	6
2. Refer the case to another state's IV-D agency by filing a UIFSA petition	90	90	90	90			90	90		0.7	0.7	0.4	0.35			0.35	0.35	63	63	36	31.5				31.5	31.5
3. Coordinate genetic blood testing with responding state	27	27	27	27			27	27		0.9	0.9	0.95	0.95			0.95	0.8	24.3	24.3	25.7	25.7				25.7	21.6
4. Other interstate administrative paternity establishment tasks	22	22	19	19			22	22		1	1	1	1			1	1	22	22	19	19				22	22
Sum of 25 + 49																		115	117	83.7	79.2				86.7	81.1
																		241	240	212	210				208	199
ELEMENT II: ESTABLISH PATERNITY JUDICIALLY	Please do not write in this space																									
A. In-state Case																										
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying	31	30	32	32			28	26		0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6			0.65	0.4	18.6	15	19.2	19.2				18.2	10.4
2. Make court appearance, including travel	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90		1	1	1	1			1	1	90	90	90	90	0	0	90	90	
3. Documentation and case processing	24	23	24	24	23	23	23	23		1	1	1	1			1	1	24	23	24	24	0	0	23	23	
4. Other in-state judicial paternity establishment tasks	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31		1	1	1	1			1	1	31	31	31	31	0	0	31	31	
Sum of 33 + 49																		164	159	164	164	0	0	162	154	
																		290	282	292	295	126	108	283	272	
B. Interstate Case																										
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying		38					38			0.75					0.75			28.5							28.5	
2. Make court appearance, including travel		60					60			0.75					0.75			45							45	
3. Documentation and case processing		22					22			1					1			22							22	
4. Other interstate judicial paternity establishment tasks		32					32			1					1			32							32	
Sum of 40 + 49																		128							128	
																		251							236	
ELEMENT III: OTHER PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT TASKS	Please do not write in this space																									
A. Respond to all case-specific inquiries that involve research or verification in order to resolve the call																										
	30	30	35	38	30	30	30	27		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	30	30	35	38	30	30	30	27	
B. Work other critical work list items in the caseload and update APECS, as appropriate																										
	43	40	40	40	43	25	38	38		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	43	40	40	40	43	25	38	38	
C. Other tasks not described above																										
	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	
Sum of 126 + 123 + 128 + 131 + 126 + 108 + 121 + 118																										

Appendix 4, continued

ESTABLISH PATERNITY TASKS ADMINISTRATIVELY																
Caseload Standards																
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate
Weighted Minutes/Case	209.7	241.3	208.2	239.8	214.2	211.7	217.2	210.2					202.7	207.7	189.2	199.1
Weighted Hours/Case	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5					3.4	3.5	3.2	3.3
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760					1760	1760	1760	1760
Caseload Standard/Worker	503.6	437.6	507.2	440.4	493.0	498.8	486.2	502.4					521.0	508.4	558.1	530.4
ESTABLISH PATERNITY TASKS JUDICIALLY																
Caseload Standards																
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	In-state	Interstate
Weighted Minutes/Case	289.6		282.0	250.5	292.2		295.2		126.0		108.0	235.5	283.2		272.4	
Weighted Hours/Case	4.8		4.7	4.2	4.9		4.9		2.1		1.8	3.9	4.7		4.5	
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760		1760	1760	1760		1760		1760		1760	1760	1760		1760	
Caseload Standard/Worker	364.6		374.5	421.6	361.4		357.7		838.1		977.8	448.4	372.9		387.7	

Appendix 5: Establish Support Obligation Tasks

Type of Case	Minutes Required to Perform Task for Each Case Type										Percent of Cases in Which Task is Performed for Each Case Type									Weighted Time (Minutes Required to Perform Task x % of Cases for Each Case Type in Which Task is Performed)								
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J		K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S		T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA
ELEMENT I: ESTABLISH SUPPORT OBLIGATION																												
ADMINISTRATIVELY																												
Do not write in this space										Please do not write in this space																		
In-state Case																												
A. Establish current support obligation administratively when no order exists																												
	64	64	64	64	62		63	45		0.6	0.65	0.5	0.5	0.75		0.65	0.95			38.4	41.6	32	32	46.5		41	42.8	
	44	44	44	44	44		44	44		0.35	0.4	0.2	0.35	0.4		0.4	0.15			15.4	17.6	8.8	15.4	17.6		17.6	6.6	
	25	20	25	25	25		20	17		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			25	20	25	25	25		20	17	
	28	20	20	20	20		20	20		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			28	20	20	20	20		20	20	
																				107	99.2	85.8	92.4	109		98.6	86.4	
																				250	227	227	234	246		227	213	
Interstate Case																												
A. Establish current support obligation administratively when no order exists																												
	128	128	128	128	90		126	90		0.6	0.65	0.5	0.5	0.75		0.65	0.95			76.8	83.2	64	64	67.5		81.9	85.5	
	90	90	90	90	90		90	90		0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01		0.01	0.01			0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9		0.9	0.9	
	50	40	50	50	50		40	34		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			50	40	50	50	50		40	34	
	56	40	40	40	40		40	40		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			56	40	40	40	40		40	40	
																				184	164	155	155	158		163	160	
																				327	292	296	297	295		291	287	
ELEMENT II: ESTABLISH A SUPPORT OBLIGATION																												
JUDICIALLY																												
Do not write in this space										Please do not write in this space																		
A. In-state Case																												
Do not write in this space																												
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying																												
	43	37	43	43	47		37	32		0.4	0.35	0.5	0.5	0.25		0.35	0.05			17.2	13	21.5	21.5	11.8		13	1.6	
2. Make court appearance, including travel																												
	90	90	90	90	90		90	90		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			90	90	90	90	90		90	90	
3. Documentation and case processing																												
	30	30	30	30	30		30	30		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			30	30	30	30	30		30	30	
4. Other tasks to establish the obligation																												
	29	29	29	29	29		29	23		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			29	29	29	29	29		29	23	
																				166	162	171	171	161		149	145	
																				309	305	312	313	298		277	272	
B. Interstate Case																												
Do not write in this space																												
1. Prepare and file petition, including copying																												
		40											0.35									14						
2. Make court appearance, including travel																												
		90					90						0.35			0.35						31.5					31.5	
3. Documentation and case processing																												
		30					30						0.35			0.35						10.5					10.5	
4. Other tasks to establish the obligation																												
		30					30						0.35			0.35						10.5					10.5	
																				66.5							52.5	
																				210							196	
C. De Novo Appeals																												
		43					43						0.35			0.35						15.1					15.1	
ELEMENT III: OTHER TASKS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF OBLIGATIONS																												
Do not write in this space										Please do not write in this space																		
A. Respond to all case-specific inquiries that involve research or verification in order to resolve the call																												
	31	30	34	35	35		30	30	29	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			31	30	34	35	35		30	30	29
B. Work other critical work list items in the caseload and update APECS, as appropriate																												
	59	45	54	54	49		45	45	45	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			59	45	54	54	49		45	45	
C. Other tasks not described above																												
	53	53	53	53	53		53	53	53	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			53	53	53	53	53		53	53	
																				143	128	141	142	137		128	127	

Appendix 5, continued

ESTABLISH OBLIGATION TASKS ADMINISTRATIVELY																	
Caseload Standards																	
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate	
Weighted Minutes/Case	249.8	326.7	227.2	292.1	226.8	295.9	234.4	297.0	246.1	295.4	N/A	N/A	226.6	290.8	213.4	287.4	
Weighted Hours/Case	4.2	5.4	3.8	4.9	3.8	4.9	3.9	5.0	4.1	4.9			3.8	4.8	3.6	4.8	
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760			1760	1760	1760	1760	
Caseload Standard/Worker	422.7	323.2	464.8	361.5	465.6	356.9	450.5	355.6	429.1	357.5			466.0	363.1	494.8	367.4	
ESTABLISH OBLIGATION TASKS JUDICIALLY																	
Caseload Standards																	
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate	
Weighted Minutes/Case	309.2	N/A	305.0	209.5	311.5	N/A	312.5	N/A	297.8	N/A	277.0	N/A	305.0	195.6	271.6	N/A	
Weighted Hours/Case	5.2		5.1	3.5	5.2		5.2		5.0		4.6		5.1	3.3	4.5		
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760		1760	1760	1760		1760		1760		1760		1760	1760	1760		
Caseload Standard/Worker	341.5		346.2	504.1	339.0		337.9		354.6		381.2		346.2	539.9	388.8		

Appendix 6: Enforcement Tasks

Type of Case	Minutes Required to Perform Task for Each Case Type										Percent of Cases in Which Task is Performed for Each Case Type										Weighted Time (Minutes Required to Perform Task x % of Cases for Each Case type in Which Task is Performed)							
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J3		K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S3		T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA
ELEMENT I: ENFORCEMENT OF OBLIGATIONS																												
ADMINISTRATIVELY	Do not write in this space										Please do not write in this space																	
A. Process wage withholding - In-state Case	19	18	18	18	18	18	18	15	6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.25	6	9.5	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	3.75
B. Process wage withholding - Interstate Case	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	14	7	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.05	7	5.4	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.7
C. Preparing for and attending appeals hearings	41	39	41	40	40	43	39	39	8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	8	4.1	3.9	4.1	4	4	4.3	3.9	3.9	
D. Documentation and case processing	15	20	15	15	15	30	20	20	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	15	20	15	15	15	30	20	20	
E. Enforcement by IRS or state tax intercept process		60				60	60	60	10		1					1	1	1	10		60				60	60	60	
F. Enforcement by other methods									11										11									
1. Review and process data match worklists	22	20	21	20	20	20	20	20	12	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	12	13.2	12	12.6	12	12	12	12	12	
2. Lien processing	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	27	13	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	13	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	21.6	
3. Order to Withhold and Order to Deliver processing	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	34	14	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.8	14	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	27.2	
4. Seizure and sale (i.e., SAFE) processing									15										15									
5. Extradition processing	105	105	105	105		90	90		16	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.05	0.05		16	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	0	4.5	4.5			
6. Criminal prosecution (PSOC) processing	159	150	158	158	158	158	154	75	17	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	17	31.8	30	31.6	31.6		31.6	30.8	15		
7. UIFSA processing	57	64	55	55	55	65	65	72	18	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.7	18	22.8	44.8	22	38.5	22	45.5	45.5	50.4		
G. Other tasks in enforcing obligations administratively	34	33	24	24	23	23	34	34	19	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.4	19	20.4	19.8	14.4	14.4	13.8	13.8	20.4	13.6		
In-state = T22-T9+T55																				162.65	245.05	154.25	170.05	116.1	251	246.4	228.15	
Interstate = T22-T8+T56																				289.25	359.95	329.15	344.95	111	245.9	421.3	227.45	
ELEMENT II: JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT	Do not write in this space																											
A. In-state Case	Do not write in this space																											
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	22	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.1	22	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	2.7		
2. Make court appearance, including travel	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90		
3. Documentation and case processing	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	24	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30		
4. Other in-state judicial enforcement tasks	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	25	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	25	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3		
Instate = T31+T46+T55																				136.8	136.8	136.8	136.8	136.8	136.8	136.8	125.7	
B. Interstate Case	Do not write in this space																											
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying.		35				36			27		0.3				0.3			27		10.5					10.8			
2. Make court appearance, including travel.		90				90			28		0.3				0.3			28		27					27			
3. Documentation and case processing.		30				30			29		0.2				0.2			29		6					6			
4. Other interstate judicial enforcement tasks.		30				30			30		0.1				0.1			30		3					3			
Interstate = T38+T52+T56																				46.5					46.8			
																				223.2						73.4		

Appendix 6, continued

Type of Case	Minutes Required to Perform Task for Each Case Type									Percent of Cases in Which Task is Performed for Each Case Type									Weighted Time (Minutes Required to Perform Task x % of Cases for Each Case type in Which Task is Performed)							
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP
ELEMENT III: MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDERS	Do not write in this space																									
A. In-state Case	Do not write in this space																									
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying	30	27	32	33	30	30	26	27	33	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.1	33	12	10.8	12.8	13.2	12	12	10.4	2.7
2. Make court appearance, including travel	184	184	184	184	68	68	175	70	34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	34	184	184	184	184	68	68	175	70
3. Documentation and case processing	58	66	54	58	32	32	54	24	35	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	35	58	66	54	58	32	32	54	24
4. Other in-state tasks for modification of court orders	29	27	28	28	19	19	28	20	36	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	36	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.8	1.9	1.9	2.8	2
																			256.9	263.5	253.6	258	113.9	113.9	242.2	98.7
B. Interstate Case	Do not write in this space																									
1. Prepare and file pleading, including copying	85	107	77	77	30	30	110	30	38	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	38	17	21.4	15.4	15.4	6	6	22	6
2. Make court appearance, including travel	40	47	40	40	40	58	40	40	39	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	39	8	9.4	8	8	8	11.6	8	8
3. Documentation and case processing	28	24	28	28	45	27	28	45	40	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	40	5.6	4.8	5.6	5.6	9	5.4	5.6	9
4. Other interstate tasks for modification of court orders	33	27	33	33	20	18	33	20	41	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	41	6.6	5.4	6.6	6.6	4	3.6	6.6	4
																			37.2	41	35.6	35.6	27	26.6	42.2	27
ELEMENT IV: REVIEW AND ADJUST OBLIGATIONS	Do not write in this space																									
A. Process review and adjustment - In-state Case	132	120	180	180			180		44	1	1	1	1			1		44	132	120	180	180				180
B. Process review and adjustment - Interstate Case	186	168	210	210			210		45	1	1	1	1			1		45	186	168	210	210				210

Appendix 6, continued

ENFORCE OBLIGATION TASKS ADMINISTRATIVELY																
Caseload Standards																
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate
Weighted Minutes/Case	289.3	339.2	359.9	404.0	329.2	355.0	345.0	371.0	111.0	107.0	245.9	242.0	421.3	447.0	227.4	224.0
Weighted Hours/Case	4.8	5.7	6.0	6.7	5.5	5.9	5.8	6.2	1.9	1.8	4.1	4.0	7.0	7.5	3.8	3.7
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760	1760
Caseload Standard/Worker	365.0	311.3	293.4	261.4	320.8	297.5	306.1	284.6	951.4	986.9	429.4	436.4	250.7	236.2	464.4	471.4
ENFORCE OBLIGATION TASKS JUDICIALLY																
Caseload Standards																
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate	NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate	FC In-state	FC Interstate	SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate	ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate	ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate	MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate	MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate
Weighted Minutes/Case	525.0		520.0	223.0	570.0		575.0		250.0		250.0	73.0	559.0		224.0	
Weighted Hours/Case	8.8		8.7	3.7	9.5		9.6		4.2		4.2	1.2	9.3		3.7	
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760		1760	1760	1760		1760		1760		1760	1760	1760		1760	
Caseload Standard/Worker	201.1		203.1	473.5	185.3		183.7		422.4		422.4	1446.6	188.9		471.4	

Appendix 7: Customer Service Tasks

Type of Case	Minutes Required to Perform Task for Each Case Type										Percent of Cases in Which Task is Performed for Each Case Type								Weighted Time (Minutes Required to Perform Task x % of Cases for Each Case Type in Which Task is Performed)									
	TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP	blank		TANF	NTANF	FC	SLFC	ARRP	ARRN	MAOF	MAOP
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J3		K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S3		T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA
A. Receive, research and respond to customer inquiries, including documentation and case maintenance - In-state Case	60	45	45	45	45	45	45	32		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		60	45	45	45	45	45	45	32	
B. Receive, research and respond to customer inquiries, including documentation and case maintenance - Interstate Case	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	49		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		60	60	60	60	60	60	60	49	
C. Travel to provide customer services at a service point	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	139		0.25	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25			34.75	20.85	34.75	34.75	34.75	34.75	34.75	34.75	
In-state = sum of 7 + 10																				94.75	65.85	79.75	79.75	79.75	79.75	79.75	66.75	
Interstate = sum of 9 + 10																				94.75	80.85	94.75	94.75	94.75	94.75	94.75	83.75	

CUSTOMER SERVICES TASKS																							
Caseload Standards																							
	TANF In-state	TANF Interstate		NTANF In-state	NTANF Interstate		FC In-state	FC Interstate		SLFC In-state	SLFC Interstate		ARRP In-state	ARRP Interstate		ARRN In-state	ARRN Interstate		MAOF In-state	MAOF Interstate		MAOP In-state	MAOP Interstate
Weighted Minutes/Case	94.8	94.8		65.9	80.9		79.8	94.8		79.8	94.8		79.8	94.8		79.8	94.8		79.8	94.8		66.8	83.8
Weighted Hours/Case	1.6	1.6		1.1	1.3		1.3	1.6		1.3	1.6		1.3	1.6		1.3	1.6		1.3	1.6		1.1	1.4
Annual Workhours/Worker	1760	1760		1760	1760		1760	1760		1760	1760		1760	1760		1760	1760		1760	1760		1760	1760
Caseload Standard/Worker	1115	1114		1604	1305		1324	1114		1324	1114		1324	1114		1324	1114		1324	1114		1582	1260

APPENDIX 8: GLOSSARY

ARRN: an abbreviation for Non-*TANF* Arrears Only, which is a case in which there is not a current support obligation to the child (e.g., the child may have reached age 18 or be less than 19 if a full-time high school student) but the NCP owes past support obligations that were not paid. The case is open for the collection of arrears owed to the child. In addition, when a case involves both *TANF* and *NTANF* arrears and there is no current order, the case is also coded as ARRN.

ARRP: an abbreviation for *TANF* Arrears Only, which is a case in which there is no current support obligation to the child (e.g., the child may have reached age 18 or be less than 19 if a full time high school student) but at one time the child received services from the state (*TANF* or Medicaid), and the case is remaining open since the NCP is required to pay this debt owed to the state.

Appeal Hearing: a formal hearing conducted by a hearing officer. It gives the *NCP* an opportunity to contest actions taken by the DCSE.

Arrears: unpaid child support payments for past periods, owed by a parent who is obligated to pay.

APECS: an abbreviation for Automated Program to Enforce Child Support, the *DCSE* data system.

Central Registry: a unit within the DCSE that receives and distributes incoming and outgoing interstate cases. This unit is also responsible for processing incoming interstate *IV-D* cases, including URESA and *UIFSA* petitions, Non-*IV-D* cases, and requests for *IV-D* income withholdings.

Child: a person who is less than 18 years old (or less than 19 if a full-time high school student) who meets the eligibility criteria for *TANF* and for whom the *CP* assigns rights to the Commonwealth, or for whom the Division receives an application for services.

Client: a person receiving public assistance and/or child support services. The DCSE usually uses the term *Customer*. The DCSE defines *Customer* as a person receiving child support enforcement services.

CP: the natural or adoptive parent or stepparent with whom the child lives, or a person who has physical custody of the child and with whom the child lives, or a Virginia agency that has custody of a child.

Custodial Parent: *see CP*.

Delinquent: a case is delinquent when the *NCP* fails to pay an amount equal to the support order for one month. *APECS* identifies the client as delinquent and a Mandatory Withholding of Earnings is initiated. *See Mandatory Withholding of Earnings*.

DCSE: the Virginia Division of Child Support Enforcement.

Emancipated: a child who has reached age 18 (or 19 if a full-time high school student) and thus the *NCP* is no longer obligated to continue paying current child support. Also, a court ruling that releases a child from parental care and responsibility.

Enforcement: the use of state and federal laws by administrative agencies or courts to collect support and compel *NCPs* to comply with the terms of child or spousal support orders.

Establish Paternity: the process of determining the father of a child by administrative order, acknowledgment (voluntary acknowledgment of paternity), court order, or another method provided for under state law.

Federal Tax Refund Offset Program: a program that collects child support amounts from *NCPs* through the interception of either their federal income tax refund or another administrative payment, such as federal retirement benefits.

Foster Care: a federal/state program to place children under the jurisdiction of foster parents to protect the children's welfare.

Foster Care Case: a type of child support enforcement case in which the child is in foster care (the state has custody of the child). The child meets the eligibility requirements for *TANF* but receives foster care maintenance instead of a TANF grant, because the child is separated from his or her parents or other relatives. The DCSE pursues both parents to reimburse the state for the funds for the foster care maintenance.

In-state Case: (also referred to as an *Intrastate Case*) is a case where the *CP*, *NCP*, and child(ren) reside in the same state or the state sends an income withholding order directly to an employer in another state. *Example:* When all the parties reside in Virginia or when Virginia sends the *NCP's* employer in another state an income withholding order directly, without going through the central registry in the other state.

Intake: the process of receiving an application from a new client requesting services from a child support enforcement office.

Interstate Case: a case in which the parent, or person acting as a parent, and child(ren) live in one state and the *NCP* lives in another state or his/her income source is in another state. *Example:* State A sends an Interstate Child Support enforcement Transmittal to State B's central registry.

Interstate Judicial Enforcement: action through the court to enforce support orders in a case in which the parent, or person acting as a parent, and child(ren) live in one state and the *NCP* lives in another state or his income source is in another state. *See IV-D Case.*

Intrastate Case: *see In-state Case.*

IV-A: abbreviation referring to Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, covering *TANF*.

IV-A Agency: an agency responsible for administering *TANF* benefits to qualified individuals.

IV-D: abbreviation referring to Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, which covers the child support enforcement program.

IV-D Agency: an agency responsible for collecting from an *NCP*, including for *TANF* funds to reimburse a public agency for assistance benefits provided to the *NCP*'s child, or collecting funds from the *NCP* to enforce a private support obligation. *See also DCSE.*

IV-D Case: a case that can either be interstate or in-state. **Interstate IV-D Case:** a case in which the parent, or person acting as a parent, and child(ren) live in one state and the *NCP* lives in another state or his income source is in another state. *Example:* State A sends an Interstate Child Support Enforcement Transmittal to State B's central registry. **In-state IV-D Case:** a case in which the *CP*, *NCP*, and child(ren) reside in the same state, or the state sends an income withholding order directly to an employer in another state. *Example:* All the parties reside in Virginia or Virginia sends the *NCP*'s out-of-state employer an income withholding order directly, without going through the central registry in the other state.

IV-D Spousal Support: a legally enforceable order assessed against an individual for support of a spouse or former spouse who is living with a child(ren) for whom the individual owes support.

IV-D to IV-D: an abbreviation for a child support enforcement case in which the *CP* and child(ren) live in one state and the *NCP* lives in another state or his/her income source is in another state, and the state where the *CP* lives sends an Interstate Child Support Enforcement Transmittal to the central registry in the other state, requesting assistance.

IV-E: abbreviation referring to Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, covering the *TANF* Foster Care program that is operated by local departments of social services.

Judicial Enforcement: action through a court to enforce support orders.

Lien: a claim upon property to prevent sale or transfer of the property until a debt is satisfied.

Lien Processing: the process of acquiring a lien. *See Lien.*

Locate: a function provided by the DCSE to locate *NCPs*.

Locate Services: a service provided by the DCSE to other states and courts to find *NCPs* in child support enforcement or in parental kidnapping cases.

LOCO: an abbreviation for a case that is in “Locate Only,” for the sole purpose of locating the *NCP*. This case type is only available for use by *Central Registry*. *See Central Registry.*

Long Arm Jurisdiction: a legal provision that permits one state to claim personal jurisdiction over someone who lives in another state. In order for a court or agency to use “long arm” to reach beyond its normal jurisdictional boundaries, there must be some meaningful connection between the person and the state or district asserting this jurisdiction. *UIFSA* expands on the kind of minimum contact with a state that gives a court or agency authority (“personal jurisdiction”) over a person. For a court or agency to establish a support order or take

enforcement action legally against an *NCP* who does not live in the state, the state has to have authority over that *NCP*.

Mandatory Withholding of Earnings: an involuntary administrative means of collecting current support and arrears that is initiated when support is one-month past due. The *NCP*'s employer regularly withholds a specified amount from the *NCP*'s salary and forwards it to the DCSE.

Mandatory Payroll Deduction: a judicial means of collecting current support and arrears. An *NCP* owing court-ordered support may request this action, or the judge may order it for "good cause" shown or for arrears.

MAOF: an abbreviation for "Medical Assistance Only, Full Services," which is a case in which the child is receiving Medicaid or is a former *TANF* recipient. The *CP* wants full services—that is, the *CP* wants the *NCP* to provide the child with both health benefits and child support benefits. This type of case comes to the attention of the DCSE when the local social services office is providing both Medicaid and *TANF* benefits.

MAOP: an abbreviation for "Medical Assistance Only, Partial Services," which is a type of child support enforcement case in which the child is receiving benefits under Medicaid. The *CP* wants the *NCP* to provide health care so the child does not have to receive Medicaid. This type of case comes to the attention of the DCSE when the local social services office is providing Medicaid benefits.

Medicaid: medical services provided through public assistance to individuals who meet specified minimum requirements to qualify for them.

MSO: a case in which Medicaid, Partial Service is closed and the customer has applied for the *NCP* to provide health benefits ("medical services only") but not child support for the child.

National Directory of New Hires: a national database containing new hire and quarterly income data from every state and federal agency, and unemployment insurance data from state employment security agencies.

NCP: the noncustodial parent who is required to provide support (monetary or medical benefits or both) to his/her child(ren).

Noncustodial Parent: *see NCP.*

NTANF: an abbreviation for “Non- or Not Temporary Assistance to Needy Families,” which is a type of child support enforcement case in which a child is not receiving *TANF*, AFDC/FC, Non-IV-E/FC, or *Medicaid*. The case is initiated by a *CP* who is applying for full services from the DCSE, that is, both support obligations and medical benefits for the child.

NIV-D: an abbreviation for “Non-IV-D,” which is a type of child support enforcement case in which the only role of the DCSE is to collect the payments from the *NCP* and pass them through to the *CP*, for the care of the child.

Order/Notice to Withhold Income for Child Support: a standardized form used by all states to request income withholding for child support. Under the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (*UIFSA*), this form may be sent directly from the initiating state to an *NCP*'s employer in another state.

Order to Withhold and Order to Deliver: administrative procedures to enforce support arrears; they order a third party who has control over real or personal property belonging to the *NCP* either to withhold, or to turn over, the property to the DCSE.

Paternity Establishment: *see Establish Paternity.*

Putative Parent: an individual assumed to be the parent of a child (prior to establishing paternity) in a child support enforcement case.

Responding State: the state that is providing support enforcement services to the *CP* or *NCP*, or the state that receives a *UIFSA* petition or interstate request to initiate action because it is the state where the *NCP* lives or has assets.

SAFE Processing: the process of seizing an *NCP*'s property and selling it to pay delinquent child support arrears.

SLFC: a type of child support enforcement case in which the child is receiving Non-IV-E foster care. The child is in-state or local foster care (hence, SLFC), and a private caregiver has custody of the child. In this type of case, the client is the social services department that has custody of the child. The social services department makes application for DCSE services by using either an application or a hard copy "501" form. Payments from the state are considered *NTANF*; however, the DCSE will pursue both parents to recover the monies being given by the local social services department to the caregiver for the care of the child.

TANF: a federal program titled "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families" that provides monetary and medical benefits to children under age 18 (or age 19 if a full-time student in high school) if the caregiver meets minimum thresholds in income and assets.

TANF Case: a type of child support enforcement case in which a child is receiving *TANF* benefits and the *CP* wants child support benefits from the *NCP*. The state is entitled to reimbursement of the funds spent for the *TANF* benefits.

TANFU: a type of child support enforcement case in which a child is receiving temporary assistance but the *NCP* is unemployed and has no income, thus the established obligation cannot be enforced by the DCSE.

TANF/FC: *see Foster Care; Foster Care Case.*

Tax Intercept: *see Federal Tax Refund Offset Program.*

UIFSA: abbreviation for "Uniform Interstate Family Support Act." Laws, based on model legislation, enacted at the state level to provide mechanisms for

establishing and enforcing child support obligations in an **Interstate Case**.
UIFSA replaced the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (URESAs).
PRWORA, the federal welfare reform act of 1996, mandated that all states adopt
UIFSA legislation by January 1, 1998.