



Analysis of Case Management Performance in Local Welfare Center

Jihyun Shin¹, Su-Sun Park^{2*}
and In-Ju Song³

¹Dept. Child Welfare, Sookmyung Women's University,
Seoul, 04310, Korea
cinzh@naver.com

²Dept. Social Welfare, Seowon University,
Cheongju city, 28674, Korea
sunybono@seowon.ac.kr

³Seoul Welfare Foundation,
Seoul, 04147, Korea
sijcom@welfare.seoul.kr

Abstract

Background/Objectives: The case management site of the local welfare center responds to the institutional changes and evaluation. The site already follows the standardization process through the evaluation index, manual, etc., and while the contents, which are addressed in the evaluation index and manual can contribute to consolidating the foundation of site's case management and building the system, the problems that they are not coincided with the performance of specific case management performance generated in the practical process are being found. In this study, to solve this problem, the results of analyzing the standardized performance through the system and literature were presented.

Methods/Statistical Analysis: In this study, the quantitative statistical analysis on the case management performance was made with the questionnaires constructed based

on the literature analysis. The questionnaire for the survey was completed by comparing and reviewing the opinions of 20 persons in charge of case management in the local welfare center on the items for the performance evaluation with the contents of related literatures. Data analysis was done by analyzing case management and performance in preceding studies. By analyzing the first content and preceding studies, studies on the welfare centers and statistical analysis were carried out. Next, standardized case management content, performance and experienced case management were compared. Lastly, measures to complement case management and evaluation were also suggested.

Findings: First, in the intake stage, it represented that all the officers in charge of the case management explained the case management to the person subject to case management. Second, in the assessment stage, the officer in charge of case management met the person subject to case management averagely for approximately 50 minutes. Third, in the service planning stage, the goal that the case manager and the subject agree on were found to be economic problem resolution, family problem resolution, personal problem resolution, social problem resolution and legal problem resolution. Fourth, among the unofficial resources used by organizations in the intervention stage, a major resource was the neighbors around the case management subject. In terms of local community resources, religious organizations or local residents were commonly used. Fifth, the time it took from the termination and evaluation stage to the ending of the case was approximately 19 months. In 81% of the cases, there was a follow-up measure taken.

Improvements/Applications: First, it is necessary to quantify and measure all the efforts that were made by the case manager and client to resolve the problem. Second, connecting the client with unofficial resources under the concept of performance must also be included. Third, making local community networking vibrant should also be recognized as a benefit of case management.

Key Words : Case Management, Performance Analysis, Evaluation Index, Practical Process, Local Welfare Center

1 Introduction

The objective of social work case management arranged by¹ is to allow the client to function and to emphasize their well-being by coordinate and providing the individual having multilayered and complex desires with the high quality service in the most effective and efficient way. According to the social welfare center evaluation index², the evaluation items are divided into four categories that cover case management systems, expertise of personnel, expertise of implementation, and linking case management resources. The recognized scope covers writing a journal, various recording forms, meeting minutes and official letters asking for service synchronization. In the area of case management in the public sector, the focus is on case management as a comprehensive and efficient service delivery system³. As a result, of a total of 18,006 organizations that include comprehensive social welfare center, welfare center for the handicapped and welfare center for the elderly, most of them were delivering services to clients through case management⁴.

As standardization is already going on through evaluation indices and manuals, the content covered in the indices and manuals can help lay the groundwork of case management, but specific and comprehensive case management performances are not aligned with these guidelines³. They⁵ noted that there are limits to managing cases by just result-oriented indices alone. Therefore to complement this, a qualitative indicator of service satisfaction level was used. The anticipated improvement measure and index composition measure presented by⁶ argue that an evaluation must reflect the stance of the case manager. Evaluations that reflect the case manager's desire to meet needs and focus on practice rather than ranking are presented.

The research results that emphasize the importance of organizational system and environmental system as the element having impact on the successful case management and performance are reported^{7,8,9}. As such, lots of researches related to the case management and performance are made, but since the standardized evaluation index and the contents of the manual are not coincided with the specific case management performance made in the actual practical process, it appears the problem that the confusion in the field is being increased. Therefore, in this study, to solve the prob-

lem caused by the difference between the evaluation index and the manual and the field of the case management, the standardized performance was analyzed comparing with the system and literature. Then, the questionnaire survey constructed based on the specific performances collected in the field was performed. And finally, the suggestions for the case management were drawn by comparing the actual performance investigated with the standardized performance.

2 Method and Process of Study

2.1 Method and Subjects of Study

In this study, the quantitative statistical analysis on the case management performance was made with the questionnaires constructed based on the literature analysis.

The questionnaire for the survey was completed by comparing and reviewing the opinions of 20 persons in charge of case management in the local welfare center on the items for the performance evaluation with the contents of related literatures. The item, which could be considered as case management performance and the effect in the process of involvement were extracted from the data reviewed. The questionnaires were distributed to total 45 institutions out of the 120 local welfare centers and case institutions specialized in infants randomly selected and received the questionnaires from 37 institutions (response rate: 82.2%), and the survey was conducted from the officer in charge of case management and the team leader of case management. The questionnaire that consists of intake, assessment, service plan, intervention, termination and evaluation categories have the following content as seen in the Table 1.

Table1: Composition of categories in major questionnaire

Detailed category	Number of questions
Intake	

1. Whether case management is explained to the case manager	2
2. The explanation method, if explained	
Assessment	
1. Time per session for meeting with the case manager	2
2. Initial requests by the case manager	
Service plan	
1. What is the goal agreed upon for case management	2
2. The session in which the goal was agreed upon with the case management subject	
Intervention	
1. Unofficial resources developed and used by the organization	3
2. Whether recording and evaluation is done in the process of management for unofficial resources	
3. Method of recording and evaluation for unofficial resources	
Termination and evaluation	
1. The effect of case management intervention	7
2. Time it takes until termination of each case	
3. Whether follow-up measures are taken after termination	
4. Changes in the case management subject during follow-up	
5. Time at which follow-up measure is taken	
6. How many sessions of follow-up are done on average after termination?	
7. Any other changes experienced by the case manager after intervention	

2.2 Data Analysis and Procedure

Above all, the idea for successful experience of case management and the successful experiences were collected and second, the con-

tents of case management and the performance in the existing literatures were analyzed such as case management manual, the evaluation index of the welfare center, etc. Then, through the analysis of primary contents and preceding studies, the case management contents and results, questionnaire survey (random sampling of welfare centers) and the statistical analysis (frequency and ratio) were performed. Next, the case management contents and performances experienced were compared with the standardized case management contents and performance, and finally, the measures to compliment the case management evaluation were suggested.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Intake

In case management, an approach that respects the strengths of the client is important. As such, it is also important to explain the case management so that people can participate in a proactive manner by their own accord. Therefore, we asked whether there was explanation and participation on case management during intake. 100% of respondents answered that the case manager explained the case management to the subject.

3.2 Assessment

The assessment stage is considered important in standardized case management, too. In experienced case management, the category of relationship-forming was emphasized in various manners. As such, during the quantification step in this field, the time per session it took to meet with the case management subject was measured. The average for the maximum time of meeting with a case management subject per session was 96.5 minutes (range : 50~180 minutes). The average for the minimum time spent meeting was 26.4 minutes (range : 5~60 minutes), with the average duration of the meeting being 49 minutes (range : 30~90 minutes).

Table 2: Details of initial requests

	Number of cases	Ratio
Sponsorship or sister relationships	33	89
Career counseling	4	11
Civil complaints	2	5
Learning guidance	14	38
Meals	22	59
Services provided by the organization	22	59
Social services	14	38
Psychological, emotional problem solving	24	65
Crisis (suicide or violence)	17	46
Miscellaneous	5	14
Total	157	100

The above table 2 shows sponsorship and sisterhood relationship to take up the highest portion at 89%, followed by psychological and emotional problem solving at 65%, and meals and services provided by the organization at 59% each, crisis (suicide or violence) at 46%, social services at 38%, miscellaneous at 14%, career counseling at 11%, and civil complaints at 5%. Other requests covered issues related to familial relationships, childcare, healthcare, legal situations, residence and being financially independent.

3.3 Service planning

The service planning stage starts with the client and case manager agreeing on the goal in relation to the identified issue. The session in which the goal is agreed upon was verified.

Table3: Goals agreed upon in case management

Agreed upon goals	Frequency	Ratio
Personal issue resolution	30	81.1
Increased confidence	13	43.3
Self-sufficient problem-solving	22	66.7
Increased control over personal life	6	16.2
Changes in the perception of the issue	10	27
Miscellaneous	3	8.1
Family problem-solving	31	83.8
Problem-solving related to children	23	62.2
Problem-solving related to spouse	8	21.6
Reinforced family function	19	51.4
Miscellaneous	3	8.1
Social problem-solving	22	59.5
Improved interpersonal relationships	20	54.1
Changed perception of society (and country)	1	2.7
Miscellaneous	2	5.4
Economic problem-solving	35	94.6
Financial stability and independence	26	70.3
Resource synchronization such as sponsorship	31	83.8
Miscellaneous	2	5.4
Legal problem-solving	18	48.6
Legal issue resolution	10	27
Acquisition of legal information	17	45.9
Miscellaneous	0	0
Miscellaneous	2	5.4

The goals agreed upon during the service planning stage between the case manager and the subject (as seen in the table 3) shows that financial problem-solving accounts for the most at 95%, followed by family problem-solving at 84%, personal problem-solving at 81%, social problem-solving at 60%, legal problem-solving at 49%, and miscellaneous at 6%. Other agreed upon goals included

employment issue resolution, easing of stress, and maintenance of health.

Table4: The session in which the goal was agreed upon between the case manager and subject

	Maximum session where goal was agreed on	Minimum session where goal was agreed on	Average session where goal was agreed on
Maximum	10	3	7
Minimum	3	1	1
Average	5.3	2.08	3.41
Standard deviation	1.72	0.83	1.28

According to the table 4, the sessions it took for the case manager and the subject to agree on the goal was an average of 3.41 sessions (range: 1~7 sessions). The minimum sessions for agreement on the goal was an average of 2.08 sessions (range: 1~3 sessions), and the maximum sessions for agreement on the goal was an average of 5.3 sessions (range : 3~10 sessions).

3.4 Intervention

The existing evaluation system lacks the recognition of unofficial resources. The evaluation looks at whether they have a resource list. There is no evaluation as to whether the case manager, through his efforts, develops unofficial resources so that the client can proactively make use of it. In the field of case management, the reason why it was reviewed whether there was recording and evaluation in the development and management process for unofficial resources is because they can become important content in the performance of case management. It can also become an important factor that shows the gap between reality and evaluation. In 84% of the cases, recording and evaluation occurred during the development and management of unofficial resources. In 13% of the cases, there was no recording or evaluation. The method in which unofficial resources were recorded, managed and evaluated was as follows. For records, journals, logs and list of resources were used. The case manager and client would sometimes make the record together.

Internal evaluation on official resources covered the number of major resources, number of times of synchronization, problem-solving degree through resources and whether unofficial resources were converted into official resources. The time of evaluation for unofficial resources happened during case management or after termination.

3.5 Termination and Evaluation

Termination and evaluation are the result of case management as shown in table 5. The effect of intervention in the service closing stage shows financial problem-solving to take up the highest portion at 94.6%, followed by personal problem-solving at 89.2%, family problem-solving at 81.1%, social problem-solving at 56.8%, legal problem-solving at 51.4% and miscellaneous at 13.6%.

The effects of case management intervention included being unable to reach the user, the subject being older than the target demographic, moving away from the target region, subsidies for medical bills, landing a job, when the subject wishes for a closing and self-evaluation results in accordance with the scale score.

The average time it took for each case to reach closing was asked.

The maximum time it took was an average of 55.9 months(range : 243 days~12 months). The minimum time was an average of 4.8 months(range : 5 days~12 months), with the average time it took being 18.6 months(range : 6 months~48 months)(Refer to table 5). The average time it took until closing is something that can be used to calculate the energy and effort poured into the case by the case manager. Although this may vary depending on the client, evaluating based on the number of cases and the period during which effort was made can be significant indicators for measuring efforts made.

Table5: Time it took for each case until closing

	Maximum time it took	Minimum time it took	Average time it took
Maximum	243	12	48
Minimum	12	0.17	6
Average	55.9	4.8	18.6
Standard deviation	55.8	3.9	11.8

When asked whether there was follow-up or verification after closing, 81% answered yes, indicating that measures were taken to follow up.

The changes other than the targeted issue after case management intervention were categorized as other changes. For each, the level of positives and negatives was reviewed. The positives and negatives of the level of the local community, the case manager and client were reviewed. At each level there were various changes generated. The case manager saw both positive and negative changes. The positive dimension had maturity and a sense of being rewarded, but the negative dimension had exhaustion and stress. The client appeared to undergo various changes in addition to the set goal through case management intervention. It was verified that the range of change for the client through case management can be wide. The negative effect was increased dependence.

4 Conclusion

First, it is necessary to quantify the efforts of the officer in charge of case management and the client to solve the problems. That is, it is necessary to reflect not only the qualification of the results and satisfaction but also the task to quantify the specific contents of practicing process and its contents.

Second, linking the unofficial resources to client should be recognized as performance. The officer in charge of case management should support the client to live as the member of local community by developing and linking the unofficial resources such as neighborhood and relation network rather than one-time official resources.

Third, the activation of local community networking should be recognized as a performance. That is, the contents of evaluation should be changed in order to allow the access that the total resources of the local community are increased not the evaluation that emphasizes being increase the resources of individual institution.

5 Acknowledgments

This study is a reanalysis of material and study results of 2014 Seoul Welfare Foundation Research Report Case management per-

formance analysis and case manager practice index development’.

References

- [1] NASW, *NASW Standards for Social Work Case Management*, 2013.
- [2] Social Welfare Center Evaluation Center Under the Social Welfare Council of the Ministry of Health and Welfare, *2015 Social welfare center evaluation index*, 2014.
- [3] Park S. S., Song I. J., Shin J. H., *A Study on the Development of Practice Indicators for case managers in the Community Welfare Center*, Journal of community welfare, 2015, 55, pp. 61-102.
- [4] Kim M. H., Cho S. G., Han G. Y., Min S. Y., Jeon M. J., *Study on the Standardization of Case Management Services and Cost Measurement Measures*, Seoul Welfare Foundation, 2010.
- [5] Shin D. M., Kim D. H., *Study on the introduction of comprehensive performance indicators in performance-oriented rehabilitation projects*, Korean social welfare and administrative studies, 2012, 14(4), pp. 201-229.
- [6] Kim S. G., Kim S. Y., *A study on the case management evaluation indices in welfare center evaluation with a focus on comprehensive*, senior citizen and handicapped welfare centers, Case studies, 2012, 3(1), pp.1-37.
- [7] Baek H. Y., Kim G. H., *Influence of Case Management Characteristics in Local Community Self-sufficiency Center on Self-sufficiency Performance*, Korea Social Welfare Public Administration, 2013, 15(4), pp 29~60.
- [8] Rothman J., Sager J. S., *Case Management : Integrating Individual and Community Practice*, Allyn and Bacon, 1998.
- [9] Ha K. H., Kim J. S., Jeong S. W., *An Exploratory Study on the Operating System of Case Management of Community Welfare Center*, Journal of Korean social welfare administration, 2014, 16(2), pp. 241-270.

- [10] Song I. J., Park S. S., Shin J. H., *Case management performance analysis and case manager practice index development*, Seoul Welfare Foundation Research Report, 2014.