

For: State and County Offices

Distributing FY 2005 BU-533R County Office Workload Reports

Approved by: Deputy Administrator, Management



1 Overview

A Background

In October 2005, County Offices reported FY 2005 year-end workload data on FSA-55 and transmitted to Kansas City Application Development Center (KC-ADC) through the State Office. KC-ADC compiled data and provided the National Office with the results for review and analysis. Following National Office review and verification with State Offices, corrected data was provided to KC-ADC and FY 2005 COWM formulas were used to generate output reports. These reports have been:

- reviewed for reasonableness and accuracy of data reported and application of work measurement formulas
- released to State and County Offices.

B Purpose

This notice informs State and County Offices of the following:

- year-end review analysis
- report descriptions, uses, and distribution
- using workload reports for staffing calculations.

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Disposal Date | Distribution |
| July 1, 2006 | State Offices; State Offices relay to County Offices |

Notice AO-1349

1 Overview (Continued)

C Action

State and County Offices shall:

- review all output reports received
- notify BUD if a report was not received.

Note: Timely notification will expedite delivery of missing reports. KC-ADC will begin distributing the reports the week of January 23, 2006.

D Contact

Direct questions about this notice to Carol Fleming, BUD, at 202-720-9865.

2 FY 2005 Year-End Review

A FY 2005 Year-End Review Analysis

The FY 2005 year-end workload review was completed at the National Office level October 31 through November 11, 2005, with assistance from State and county level employees. The workload report file was transmitted back to KC-ADC on November 17, 2005, after all corrections had been entered. In general, many of the County Office workload reports were reviewed without question.

The following were problem areas that continue to cause significant delays in the review process.

- “Time” work items continue to be a reporting problem. Many County Offices simply enter the validity figure or higher in the report even though they had little or no activity related to the operations included in the work item. The National Review for some of these work items consists of a comparison of the workdays or hours entered in these work items to the national work measurement average. The State Office Review should make the same comparison before transmitting the County Office reports. If the County Office exceeds the validity for a work item, justification or documentation to support the unit count should be provided to the State Office, or the State and County Office should agree on a revised unit count more in line with that State’s work measurement average. Documentation as required by 12-AO (Rev. 21), Exhibit 19, should be forwarded to the National Review. Specifically, work item 2113, Geographical Information System, was a work item that County Offices seem to misinterpret as to activities that should be captured. Clarification was provided in 12-AO (Rev. 21), Exhibit 13 on activities that should and should not be included in the workday count. Other work items that many County Office entries appeared to be high when compared to other related information in the workload report were work items 117, Assisting with BWEP, work item 118, Providing Information for Reinsured Companies, work item 532, Conservation Services Performed for NRCS, and work item 1207, Phase II Tobacco Settlement.

Notice AO-1349

2 FY 2005 Year-End Review (Continued)

A FY 2005 Year-End Review Analysis (Continued)

- Manual counts for work item 112, FOIA Requests Where Fees Are Waived, work item 1415, Land Use Determinations and Referrals, work item 1416, Spot Checks and Nonacreage Determinations, work item 1417, Recording HELC/WC Land Use Determinations, continue to be an ongoing problem. It appears that while State Offices when questioned about certain unit counts agree that they should be adjusted have not in the past, informed the County Offices of the change to their unit count or the correct information that should be captured in that particular work item. For that reason, many County Offices continue to report the same erroneous information each time they complete their reports. The problem persists when State Offices overlook these repetitive errors by not reviewing county reports thoroughly during the State Office review process.
- Environmental work items appear to be under-reported in work items 562, 563, and 564 (FLP Environmental Evaluation) activity. Unit counts for these work items must be entered in WLS to be captured by the workload queries. When compared to the number of direct and guaranteed loan eligibility determinations in work items 802 and 902 and several servicing work items, it appears that many units are not counted by the queries because either the program activity or WLS has not been completed.
- Web queries for FLP work items were not loaded by KC into the FSA-55 workload reports but were provided to the National Office for use by the reviewers. The decision was made in conjunction with KC programmers working on FLP because of their concerns that the results of the web queries may be skewed as the result of the County Office's interpretation of instructions to load information into the web-based software. This subject will be revisited at mid-year and year-end for FY 2006 workload reporting and instructions will be provided by BUD at that time. Instructions will also be issued at that time as to the responsible person for accessing the web queries, therefore avoiding the issue of overloading the mainframe with requests for query results.
- BUD received many requests for web-query units to be provided to County Offices in advance to assist with estimating future activity. KC-ADC is unable to provide web-query numbers to the field in advance of the April and October reports for County Offices to assist in WL reporting. BUD will provide assistance for FY 2006 mid-year and year-end estimates by amending the workload reporting instructions in 12-AO. To correct erroneous estimates for 2006 estimate, BUD had KC-ADC change estimates for work item 302, Maintaining Basic Farm and Producer Data, and work item 1402, Producer's Certification of HELC and WC, to the same unit count that was in the actual column. The balance of estimates for web-query work items were revised as needed during the review process.

Notice AO-1349

2 FY 2005 Year-End Review (Continued)

A FY 2005 Year-End Review Analysis (Continued)

County Offices must make every attempt to provide realistic estimates. The estimated units for work items are used when preparing the next Agency budget for submission to the President's budget. The reviewers continue to spend a majority of time making changes to the estimates for many work items because the instructions issued by the National Office in 12-AO (Rev. 21), Exhibit 17 were not reviewed and followed. There are some work items, such as disaster programs, where future activity may vary from State to State and in those cases State Offices are responsible for providing County Offices with proper direction.

3 FY 2005 Workload Reports

A Report Descriptions and Uses

The following reports are generated for year-end workload for:

- County Offices:
 - **Report 1, County Office Workload and Funding Report – Units Reported by State and County** provides updated workload by county. This report may be used by the State Office to analyze individual County Office workload and in conjunction with proration worksheets in Exhibit 1 to analyze staffing needs. The County Office may use this report to assist in distributing program assignments within the County Office.
 - **Report 14, County Office Workload Summary** is an HRD report used for information purposes only. Report 14 is only a partial workload report.
- State Offices:
 - **Report 2, County Office Workload and Funding Report – Summarized Work Items by State** provides State total of units and normal workdays (NWD's) for current and subsequent FY and can be used to analyze total workload.
 - **Report 3, County Office Workload and Funding Report Source Data – Units Reported County Summary by Work Item** provides a list of workload units and NWD's by county within work items for State and can be used to analyze or compare workload by county within the State.

3 FY 2005 Workload Reports (Continued)

A Report Descriptions and Uses (Continued)

- **Report 7, County Office Workload and Funding Report CFY 2005 Report and SFY 2006 Work Plan Counties Alphabetically by State** provides a list of county allocation for workload activities. It can be used to review County Office ranking in the nation. Allocations for counties involved in shared management will be inaccurate since most administrative work items are captured in the headquarters County Office. Many administrative work items have been omitted from the reports because they are available in BRIO.
- **Report 7A, County Office Workload and Funding Report Regular Measured Workload Counties Alphabetically by State** is used by the State Office as a guide in selecting work measurement counties.
- **Report 8, County Office Workload and Funding Report FY 2005 Report and FY 2006 Work Plan – Counties Ranked by SFY NWD by State** provides a list of county allocations for workload activities with supporting data ranked by subsequent FY. It can be used to compare past FY expenditures with new FY allocation guide.

B Output Report Distribution

KC-ADC distributes copies of all State and County Office reports to the State Office. Extra copies of Report 1 will be provided and shall be distributed to each County Office. Reports are scheduled to be mailed beginning the week of January 23, 2006. Distribution of Report 14 has been delayed and will be mailed as soon as possible.

4 Using Workload Reports

A Report Uses

Workload reports may be used as a tool to:

- balance program activity within a County Office
- ensure equitable distribution of staffing to County Offices within the State.

If States use Report 1 as a tool to distribute staffing, it is extremely important that program specialists and DD's be consulted or included in the process. The workload reports provide a view of overall work completed in each County Office, no matter who completes the activity. Therefore, close analysis is required by each State before use.

4 Using Workload Reports (Continued)

B Prorating for FP's and FLP's

It is important to note that the workload reports provide activity completed in each County Office without consideration for who completed that activity. Employees, both CO and GS, are working together to provide service to their producers. However, because there exists separate payroll allotments and staff ceilings for Federal and non-Federal employees, it becomes necessary to look at proration of workload to ensure that:

- available employees are distributed proportionately among County Offices
- program activity is distributed equitably within the County Office.

This proration provides the State Office with a way to review total activity associated with FP and total activity associated with FLP as a starting point for distributing their county level Federal and non-Federal ceilings. An FP/FLP Proration Worksheet has been posted on the WM/WL Homepage. Access the web page according to 12-AO (Rev. 21), paragraph 9914. The worksheet as posted fits general cases and was created to simplify and expedite the process. However, State and County Offices must be aware of individual situations that warrant exception to suggested work items and formulas provided in the worksheet.

NWD's from Report 1 shall be used when filling out the FP/FLP Proration Worksheet. Some State Offices have found that using an average of the previous 2 years of workload rather than each individual year is more reflective of ongoing activity within County Offices.

The worksheet is designed to prorate certain work items by number of Federal and non-Federal paid-for workdays. **Some State Offices, after completing an analysis of operations included in various work items, have elected to use another factor agreed upon by the State Office and employees involved instead of the factor built into the worksheet.** Each State Office is responsible for making this decision; however, there must be some data to support alternative factors and not just the use of a random factor.

Example: Work measurement data could be used if the State Office feels that those County Offices are representative of the situation in most Type 1 offices.

Actual leave used by Federal and non-Federal employees may be used for work item 9076 instead of the worksheet factor if the State or County Office determines extenuating circumstances exist; that is, an employee was on extended sick leave. The same situation applies to work items 2110 and 2159 for detailed employees and consent decree details. There may be examples where Federal employees serve on an administrative or program task force or non-Federal employees participate on consent decree details.

An example of a completed worksheet is provided in Exhibit 1. If the worksheet will be used as is, only those cells that are outlined require an entry.

4 Using Workload Reports (Continued)

B Prorating for FP's and FLP's (Continued)

The entries for work items 561 and 1502 and the corresponding percentage FLP factors have been included on the worksheet as an example of suggested work items and formulas. In most County Offices, there are work items where both Federal and non-Federal employees contribute time to the associated operations. Often times, FSFL is 1 of those programs; however, these program work items may vary from State to State and may vary widely within a single State.

Example of Completed Workload Proration Worksheet

WORKLOAD PRORATION WORKSHEET

PART 1 - Office Information

STATE: MO COUNTY: CHASE

PART 2 - Determining the Administrative Proration Factor
 Divide federal workdays (work item 9065) by total workdays (work item 101 units).

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|---|----------|--|
| Work Item 9065 | | Work Item 101 | | | |
| Workdays | | Units | = | Factor | |
| 665 | / | 1988 | = | 0.334507 | |

PART 3 - Separating Report 1 into FLP and FP related NWD's
 The basic work items that should be prorated by every office are listed (562 through 9077). Consideration should be given to program operations specific to each office. Space has been provided for additional work items that may need to be split such as work item 561 or 1502 and an example of a alternative factor.

Enter total workload Report 1 NWD's - 2,263

| Work Item | NWD's | | FLP FACTOR | = | FLP NWD's | FP NWD's |
|------------------------|-------|---|---------------|---|--------------|-------------|
| 562/563/564 | 12 | | | = | 12 | |
| 800 Series | 428 | | | = | 428 | |
| 900 Series | 62 | | | = | 62 | |
| 1000 Series | 31 | | | = | 31 | |
| 101 | 189 | x | 0.334507 | = | 63 | 126 |
| 103 | | x | 0.334507 | = | 0 | 0 |
| 111 | 108 | x | 0.334507 | = | 36 | 72 |
| 120 | 37 | x | 0.334507 | = | 12 | 25 |
| 9076 | 387 | x | 0.334507 | = | 129 | 258 |
| 9077 | | x | 0.334507 | = | 0 | 0 |
| 561 | 2 | x | 0.750000 | = | 2 | 1 |
| 1502 | 24 | x | 0.500000 | = | 12 | 12 |
| | | x | | = | 0 | 0 |
| | | x | | = | 0 | 0 |
| | | x | | = | 0 | 0 |
| 2110 | 2 | | | = | 0 | 2 |
| 2159 | | | | | | |
| Balance FP | | | | | | 981 |
| PRORATED TOTALS | | | | | 788 | 1,475 |

PART 4 - Converting Workload NWD's into Staffing Levels
 On average, there are 260 workdays in a year. In order to convert NWD's into staff years, divide the NWD's by 260.

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------|---|---------------------|---|-------------|
| Program Area | NWD's | | Days Per Staff Year | = | Staff Years |
| FLP | 788 | / | 260 | = | 3.03 |
| FP | 1,475 | / | 260 | = | 5.67 |