

Standard 8-1.A-C

(from Best Practices Standards 2014-2016 effective through 12/31/16)

8-1. Services are provided by staff with limited caseloads to ensure that home visitors have an adequate amount of time to spend with each family to meet their needs and plan for future activities.

8-1.A The site’s policy and procedures regarding established **caseload** size is no more than fifteen (15) families, at the most intensive level (offered weekly visits) per full time home visitor.

8-1.A	RATING INDICATORS
3	- No 3 rating indicator for standard 8-1.A.
2	- The site’s policy and procedures states that caseload size is no more than fifteen (15) families, at the most intensive service level (offered weekly visits) per full time home visitor.
1	- The site does not have policy and procedures or the site’s policy states that caseload size is more than fifteen (15) families, at the most intensive service level (offered weekly visits) per full time home visitor.

☺ Tip: Circumstances may arise when staff exceed the caseload size of 15 at the most intensive level such as when a family moves from a less intensive level of services to a more intensive level of service or when a home visitor leaves and the caseload is dispersed among existing home visitors, etc. This practice should be temporary (3 months or less) and sites are encouraged to clearly document the reasons why the caseload has exceeded the limit and the duration of this deviation.

☺ Tip: Sites should prorate caseload size based on the staff person’s Full Time Equivalency (e.g., a .5 FTE should not have more than 7-8 families on the most intensive level, or a .75 FTE should only have 11 families on the most intensive level).

8-1.B The site’s policy regarding maximum **caseload** size is no more than twenty-five (25) at any combination of service levels per full-time home visitor and a maximum case weight of 30 points.

Intent: *The maximum caseload size is no more than 25 active families who have received at least one home visit to ensure that home visitors have sufficient time and resources to serve families most effectively. Caseload sizes of 25 families and a case weight of 30 points is the maximum size. Sites should set lower caseload expectations and serve less families when the caseload includes a larger composition of families that score 40 or above on the Parent Survey/Family Stress Checklist. Other reasons for caseload reduction include items listed in the 2 rating for standard 8-2.A. Guidance regarding assigning case weight based on level of service (frequency of home visits) can be referenced in standard 4-2.A.*

8-1.B	RATING INDICATORS
-------	-------------------

3	- The site's policy and procedures regarding maximum caseload size is no more than twenty (20) families at any combination of service levels per full time home visitor and a maximum case weight of 24 points.
2	- The site's policy and procedures regarding maximum caseload size is no more than twenty-five (25) families at any combination of service levels per full time home visitor and a maximum case weight of 30 points.
1	- The site does not have policy and procedures or the site's policy regarding maximum caseload size exceeds twenty-five (25) families at any combination of service levels per full time home visitor and a maximum case weight of 30 points.

- © Tip: Circumstances may arise when staff exceed caseload size (e.g., a home visitor leaves and the caseload is dispersed among existing home visitors, etc.). This practice should be temporary (3 months or less) and sites are encouraged to clearly document the reasons why the caseload has exceeded the limit and the duration of this deviation.
- © Tip: Sites should prorate this number based on the staff person's Full Time Equivalency (e.g., a .5 FTE should not have more than 11-12 families at any combination of service levels or case weight of 15, or a .75 FTE not have more than 19 families at any combination of service levels, or case weight of 23).

8-1.C Home visitors are within the caseload ranges, as stated in standard 8-1.A and 8-1.B.

8-1.C	RATING INDICATORS
3	- No home visitor exceeds the caseload sizes, as stated in standards 8-1.A and 8-1.B.
2	- Past instances were found when home visitors exceeded the caseload sizes as stated in 8-1.A and 8-1.B, however any deviation is temporary (3 months or less).
1	- Home visitors routinely exceed the caseload sizes as stated in 8-1.A. and 8-1.B.

Using PIMS to Provide Evidence of Compliance

The report **PIMS16C: Annual Weighted Caseload** addresses this standard. Remember that as with most affiliation standards, you may need to support the quantitative data from PIMS reports with a narrative interpretation.

The summary table in the Self-Assessment Tool for Standard 8 indicates that the site needs to submit two pieces of evidence:

- A report showing the total case weight of all current home visitors by month over the past 12 months. **PIMS16C** can be used for this evidence.
- A report showing breakdowns for each home visitor's caseload for the quarter immediately prior to completing the self study, the home visitors full time equivalency, the number of families assigned to him or her, and the intensity of service each family is receiving. PIMS currently cannot generate this report; however, the information can be gathered from

PIMS16A: Monthly Caseload Management – Weighted Caseload reports for each month of the quarter requested. An example is shown below.

Tips for Monitoring PIMS Data Related to Standard

Sites will want to monitor monthly all factors related to accurate calculation of caseloads and case weights. This includes the following data:

- Enrollments and first home visits records
- Monthly contact logs
- Changes in the families’ assigned FSWs and Levels of Service
- Terminations

Report **PIMS16A: Monthly Caseload Management – Weighted Caseload** can be compared against paper records that all relevant data has been entered each month.

How to Run these Reports

1. From the **Reports** screen, select **Standard Reports**.
2. Select **Category** “Case Management” and **Report** “Annual Weighted Caseload”.
3. Choose a starting month and year for the one-year period and a cut-off date that is later than the end of the one-year period. Consult with your HFA or state support staff for details on what one-year period is needed for your site.
4. To generate the detailed caseloads for the most recent quarter, select **Category** “Case Management and **Report** “Monthly Caseload Management – Weighted Caseload” for each month of the last quarter.

Example 1 – Calculate Annual Weighted Caseload by FSW

Healthy Families (1L000)
PIMS16C: Annual Weighted Caseload
 January 2003 to December 2003
 Tabulated from Monthly Contact Log

FSW ID	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual Total
104	16.6	16.5	16.5	17.1	19.1	19.0	18.3	18.0	16.0	16.6	17.0	15.0	205.6
105	18.0	18.9	24.0	23.7	23.0	21.0	21.0	23.0	21.0	19.5	17.5	18.4	249.0
Total	34.6	35.4	40.5	40.7	42.1	40.0	39.3	41.0	37.0	36.1	34.5	33.4	454.5

In the above example, both workers maintained caseloads within the recommended limits of the standard.

Example 2 – Create detailed caseload report by FSW for last quarter

Using **PIMS16A: Monthly Caseload Management – Weighted Caseload** for October, November and December 2003, we can build the following table to detail that all staff met the standard for both maximum case weight and maximum number of families. Data for FSW 104 for October 2003 is shown below.

Healthy Families (1L000)
PIMS16A: Monthly Caseload Management: Weighted Caseload
 October 2003

Note: Tracking of 'Dates Skipped' is intended for program management only, but will be ignored by HFA credentialing
 Group filter not applied
 * denotes that no Monthly Contact Log is entered

Participant Name	Service Level	1st Svc Lvl Assigned	Termination Date	Dates Skipped From	To	Caseload Weight	# Days Served	# Days in Month	Adj. Caseload
FSW: 104 (n = 11)									
Aguilar, Verna	Level I	11/21/2002				2	x 31	/ 31	2
Bailey, Mildred	Level I	4/17/2003	4/13/05			2	x 31	/ 31	2
Carter, Amanda	Level P-1	10/23/2003	9/30/04			2	x 9	/ 31	0.6
Cook, Gloria	Level I	7/28/2003	4/30/04			2	x 31	/ 31	2
Dennis, Kristy	Level II	11/8/2002	1/15/05			1	x 31	/ 31	1
Glover, Antoinette	Level I	10/3/2002	9/30/04			2	x 31	/ 31	2
Maxwell, Jasmine	Level II	7/10/2002	1/22/04			1	x 31	/ 31	1
Newton, Hannah	Level II	8/27/2002	1/15/04			1	x 31	/ 31	1
Osborne, Chelsea	Level II	10/24/2002	1/15/04			1	x 31	/ 31	1
Tate, Yvette	Level I	1/23/2003	1/30/04			2	x 31	/ 31	2
Ward, Janice	Level I	4/17/2003				2	x 31	/ 31	2
Total 11 Participant(s)									17

Detailed Caseloads by FSW for 4th Quarter of 2003									
FSW 104 (FTE 1.0)									
	<i>October</i>			<i>November</i>			<i>December</i>		
	<i># families</i>	<i>x casewt.</i>	<i>subtotal</i>	<i># families</i>	<i>x casewt.</i>	<i>subtotal</i>	<i># families</i>	<i>x casewt.</i>	<i>subtotal</i>
Level P-1	1	X 2.0	= 2	1	X 2.0	= 2	0	X 2.0	= 0
Level I	6	X 2.0	= 12	5	X 2.0	= 10	6	X 2.0	= 12
Level II	4	X 1.0	= 4	4	X 1.0	= 4	4	X 1.0	= 4
Level III	0	X .5	= 0	0	X .5	= 0	0	X .5	= 0
Level X	0	X .5	= 0	2	X .5	= 1	2	X .5	= 1
Totals	11		18	12		17	12		17

FSW 105 (FTE 1.0)									
	<i>October</i>			<i>November</i>			<i>December</i>		
	<i># families</i>	<i>x casewt.</i>	<i>subtotal</i>	<i># families</i>	<i>x casewt.</i>	<i>subtotal</i>	<i># families</i>	<i>x casewt.</i>	<i>subtotal</i>
Level P-1	0	X 2.0 =	0	0	X 2.0 =	0	2	X 2.0 =	4.0
Level I	6	X 2.0 =	12.0	5	X 2.0 =	10.0	3	X 2.0 =	6.0
Level II	7	X 1.0 =	7.0	7	X 1.0 =	7.0	7	X 1.0 =	7.0
Level III	0	X .5 =	0	0	X .5 =	0	1	X .5 =	.5
Level X	1	X .5 =	.5	1	X .5 =	.5	2	X .5 =	1.0
Totals	14		19.5	13		17.5	15		18.5