

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: APRIL 12 - 15, 1993

WYOMING STATE REPORT

JUNE 28, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

**Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302**

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	4
2.4.1 Staffing	5
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change	5
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	6
2.4.4 Claims Collection	6
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	7
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	7
3.1 System Functionality	7
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	11
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	11
3.4 Current Automation Issues	12
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	12
4.1 Overview of Previous System	12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.2 Justification for the New System	12
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	13
4.4 Conversion Approach	14
4.5 Project Management	15
4.6 FSP Participation	15
4.7 MIS Participation	16
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	16
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	17
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	18
6.1 System Profile	18
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	18
6.2.1 Operating Environment	18
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	19
6.2.3 Telecommunications	20
6.2.4 System Performance	20
6.2.5 System Response	20
6.2.6 System Downtime	21
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	21
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	21
7.1 EPICS Development Costs and Federal Funding	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.2 EPICS Operating Costs	22
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	22
7.2.2 EPICS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	22
7.3 Wyoming Cost Allocation Methodologies	23
7.3.1 Overview of EPICS Development Cost Allocation Methodology	23
7.3.2 EPICS Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics	23

APPENDICES

A State of Wyoming Exhibits	A-1
B Analysis of Managerial User Satisfaction	B-1
C Analysis of Operator User Satisfaction	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs	5
2.4 Official Combined Error Rate	6
2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected	7
7.1 EPICS Operating Costs	22
7.2 EPICS FSP Operational Cost per Case	23
7.3 EPICS Time Study Program Allocations	24

APPENDIX A - State of Wyoming Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>	
A-2.1 Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1 State of Wyoming Hardware Inventory	A-4

WYOMING STATE REPORT
Site Visit April 12-14, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Eligibility Payment Information Computer System (EPICS)

Start Date: March 1985

Completion Date: October 1987

Contractor: Systemhouse, Inc.

Transfer From: Alaska EIS

Cost:

Actual: \$3,094,999

Projected: \$3,138,999

FSP Share: \$1,177,124

FSP %: 37.5%

Number of Users: 400

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: IBM 3090-300J

Workstations: COMPAQ PCs

Telecommunications Network: CICS, T1 lines, 56KB lines

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Title XIX, Medicaid Eligibility (ME)

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Department of Family Services (DFS) (formerly the Department of Health and Human Services) administers FSP for the State of Wyoming. Six regional administrators are responsible for overseeing field operations within the 30 offices located in 23 counties. The State's population in 1990 was 455,975. The two most populated counties are Natrona County and Laramie County, with more than one fourth of the State's population. Regional administrators report to the Deputy Director of Field Operations. FSP, AFDC, ME, Commodities, Child Support Enforcement (CSE), Child Care Services & Certification, Food Stamp Employment and Training, and Wyoming Opportunities for Work are located within the Self-Sufficiency Division. The administrator of the Self-Sufficiency Division reports to the director of DFS as does the deputy director of Field Operations.

Computer support is provided by the Computer Technology Division (CTD) of the Department of Administration and Information. Liaison between DFS and CTD is provided by the Administrative Unit within DFS. The EPICS Help Desk is located within this unit which also orders all EPICS job runs.

The State employs generic caseworkers, and had done so long before EPICS was implemented. There are some specialized caseworkers for foster care and some county offices have specialized intake personnel. FSP is State-administered with "county discretion."

DFS has recently experienced several changes in its funding environment. Major budget reductions have occurred, resulting in cuts to the State-funded General Assistance (GA) and Emergency Assistance Programs. Organizational changes within DFS have added a new level of management while deleting several staff positions. In addition, the State legislature is conducting departmental reviews which DFS staff fear will lead to further cuts in DFS programs.

The unemployment rate in Wyoming fluctuated between 1976 and 1991, with a low of 2.8 percent in 1979 and a high of 9.0 in 1986. The unemployment rate has been steadily decreasing since 1986, reaching 5.1 percent in 1991.

The Fiscal Survey of States, published in October 1992 by the National Governors' Association and National Association of State Budget Officers, presents the following information concerning Wyoming:

- Wyoming was one of 19 States in the nation whose nominal expenditure growth in the Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 State budget was between 0.0 and 4.9 percent.
- Wyoming did not reduce the 1992 State budget after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Wyoming increased by 3.29 percent from FY 1992 to FY 1993.

- The regional outlook provided a strongly positive picture. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 6.3 percent was the second lowest in the nation and the per capita personal income increase for the region (3.6 percent) was the highest of any region.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

There are five divisions within DFS. All but one of these divisions support FSP operations. Within the Self-Sufficiency Division the Family Support Program is responsible for management and oversight of the AFDC, Food Stamp, Commodities, and Medical Programs. The Administrative Services Division provides computer systems support for EPICS and other automated systems supporting DFS programs. The Financial Services Division is responsible for processing claims for recovery of overpayments for all assistance programs. The Division of Field Operations directs regional and field level operations. The Administrative Services Division staff serve as liaison between EPICS users and the Wyoming CTD. The CTD is located within the Department of Administration and Information, the State department responsible for mainframe, telecommunications, and operational support to all State agencies.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Household participation in FSP has increased approximately 23 percent in the past five years, with the greatest increase occurring between FY 1990 and 1991. The increase in AFDC participation has been higher at 65 percent. Participation levels in Wyoming are provided in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC - cases	8,485 ¹	6,191	5,308	5,093	5,130
AFDC - individuals		17,952	13,607	13,542	13,542
Foster Care Cases	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA - cases	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA - individuals					
FSP - households	12,646	11,988	10,844	10,255	10,286
FSP - individuals	34,586	32,544	29,707	28,338	28,999
Medicaid only - individuals	9,654	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ Wyoming estimate.

Foster care cases are supported by another system. CSE is also a separate system under development and will eventually link with the Clerk of the Courts. The number of Medicaid cases approximates the number of AFDC cases.

DFS staff noted that when there are changes in one program, they often affect other programs. For instance, when Medicaid was extended to different coverage groups, more AFDC recipients were identified. This led to an increase in FSP applicants.

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 7:6 in 1988 to 9.4:1 in 1992.

Wyoming's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased.²

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$179.71	\$166.68	\$165.42	\$148.33	\$151.64

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Wyoming's Food Stamp Program Administrative Costs for the past five years are shown in Table 2.3.³ These costs are higher than average but no information was offered to explain this fact.

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Prior to the implementation of EPICS, Wyoming's FSP system had limited functionality and relied on data entry documents. None of the automated systems supporting the FSP and other welfare programs were integrated. Basic information and statistics, such as non-duplicated case counts, were unavailable. The impact of EPICS, which is an integrated system with increased functionality, is presented below.

² The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

³ The number of households and FSP Federal Administrative Costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$2,799,902	\$2,667,979	\$2,428,396	\$2,002,140	\$2,252,555
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$19.05	\$19.59	\$19.45	\$16.88	\$19.18

2.4.1 Staffing

Most offices are staffed by an office manager, a supervisor, economic assistance workers, and clerical personnel. The office manager reports to one of the six regional administrators. Some of the offices serving small caseloads may only have one eligibility worker (EW) who performs all of the functions in the office. There were 115 EWs employed in February 1993. The average number of cases per worker was 199.

Staffing in the field offices is determined by the total caseload. The number of cases has risen since EPICS was implemented. In 1990 between 15 and 20 personnel were added to accommodate the increased caseload. The Management Review Council, comprised of regional managers, administrators, budget people, and the Attorney General's office, meet every three months to determine whether staffing changes should be made to accommodate changes in field office caseloads. Since the staff additions in 1990, the Management Review Council has decided to increase caseload per worker to keep pace with the increasing caseload total, rather than add staff.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

The need to respond to regulatory changes was a driving factor in the development and implementation of EPICS. Prior to EPICS, for example, Wyoming received fiscal sanctions when it could not implement a household member file of all names and Social Security numbers (SSN) of household members to prevent duplicate participation.

Mass changes are rarely a problem to implement in EPICS. The software maintenance staff requires 2 to 3 weeks notice before implementation. Regulatory changes, however, are rarely implemented in EPICS within 90 days because advance notices of changes are not perceived as reliable enough to do more than simply speculate about the final design and impact. The full specification, implementation, and acceptance testing cycle, therefore, is beyond 90 days for most changes. The complexity of an integrated system,

especially with Medicaid involved, contributes to this time frame. Manual procedures usually need to be available until the system catches up.

As shown in Exhibit A-2.1 in Appendix A, Wyoming implemented all but four legislative provisions in a timely fashion. For those provisions implemented late, State staff indicated that changes had to be made in their State policies or to legislation which caused the implementation to take longer. Wyoming received a waiver for the staggered issuance provision since it would have required significant changes in EPICS.

The implementation of regulatory changes receives top priority among system changes that have been requested.

The most difficult changes to implement are: changes in Medicaid eligibility, changes in database structure, the addition of data elements, and accommodating issuance for multiple months.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

In 1992, Wyoming had an error rate of 8.65 percent, a rate which it hopes to address through system changes. Wyoming's official combined error rate decreased between 1995

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$256,279	\$259,457	\$349,015	\$470,447	\$449,375
Total Claims Collected	\$199,879	\$201,987	\$225,402	\$212,936	\$163,991
As a % of Total Claims Established	78.0%	77.8%	64.6%	45.3%	36.5%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

EPICS was certified in October 1987.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

EPICS serves AFDC, the FSP, and those eligible for AFDC-Medicaid. Foster care is not a part of EPICS. The EW talks to social workers to see if child support payments or other income has been received. For child support payments, the worker has to look at printed reports for the last three months to identify any payments that are counted as unearned income. Child support is a separate system under development with no present interface with EPICS. EPICS interfaces with the Payee Analysis Intercept System (PAIS) for computer matching.

3.1 System Functionality

EPICS is an on-line integrated system that provides real-time edits for information that is entered into screens by the worker. The system determines FSP eligibility and calculates benefits. Data may be entered either during or after the interview from the application form that is completed by the client.

Most workers use a terminal that sends and receives information from the centralized mainframe. Microcomputers with additional capacity are being installed in some locations. The State envisions that eventually all workers will use microcomputers that will have some of the functionality now performed by the centralized mainframe.

Each caseworker and registration worker has a terminal or a personal computer equipped with a 3270 emulation to the central mainframe. Each office, depending on size, has one or more printers used to print the weekly and monthly reports.

- **Registration.** EPICS is used to register applicants for AFDC, FSP, and Medicaid. It has the capability to handle GA applicants, but there are few of these since there is little funding for GA. Child welfare services are now supported by a separate system that operates on the same platform as EPICS. It does not share EPICS files and there is no interaction between EPICS and child welfare. The EW, however, can access the child welfare system from the EPICS main user menu. The JOBS/Child Care system is a module of EPICS that shares the client file and several other files. It was developed separately from EPICS.

In the majority of offices, clerical personnel receive the application form and register the case. In smaller offices, the EW may perform this function. Each office has the discretion to assign work functions according to workloads and staff availability.

During registration, the applicant's name, address, date of birth, sex, race, and SSN are entered into the EPICS from the application form that is completed and signed by the applicant. Each household member is registered and the program for which the applicant is applying is entered.

A search is conducted on each household member to determine if the person is known to EPICS or to other State databases. EPICS looks for the same name (or SSN), since there is no phonetic capability in the following databases:

- EPICS client file
- State Department of Employment Record
- State Department of Labor
- Workers Compensation
- Employment Security Commission

These inquiries are run in batch the evening the application is registered. If the person is registered in any of the databases, an alert will appear on the worker's screen in the morning. This is not considered a match at this time since income information has not been entered into the system during registration. The EPICS searches files based on name (full or partial), SSN, and client ID (for previous participants). Date of birth, sex, and race are secondary search criteria.

The need for expedited service is determined by the clerical or EW. Expedited benefits are authorized the same day. The issuance file is updated that evening and expedited coupons are mailed the next working day.

If the applicant was registered previously in EPICS, the EW has the ability to copy the historical record into the current case for updating.

Each individual within a household is assigned a unique client ID number by EPICS. This number never changes, regardless of household, case number, or program changes. The case number changes according to program, household entity, or timeframe, at the discretion of the EW. The same case number is used for AFDC and FSP households.

- **Eligibility Determination.** The applicant completes a data book that resembles EPICS screens that record income, resources, etc. The EW enters this information into EPICS either during the interview or afterwards. Each page of the data book references a particular data entry screen in EPICS.

Movement through the data entry screens is determined by the EW selecting the activity from a main menu. EWs can bypass screens that are not needed and go to relevant screens. EPICS provides immediate on-line edits.

- **Verifications.** On-line alerts are provided on cases that have discrepancies reported through Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS). The worker is required to resolve the difference or take some action, such as mail a notice. Alerts are supposed to be cleared once the EW has taken an action, but EPICS does not require that the worker do so. The worker can delete the alerts, but if the requisite action has not been taken, the alert will reappear.

Matching is done daily on State data files and monthly to quarterly on other State and Federal files, depending on their availability.

- **Benefit Calculation.** The system determines eligibility and calculates benefits, although the EW reviews and authorizes the benefit for the household that comprises the relevant assistance unit. Monthly income is calculated by the system. The system provides the capability to authorize a screen full of cases that are not required to submit monthly reports. EW supervisors may review the work of new workers, but the EW is responsible for authorizing both new applications and on-going cases.
- **Benefit Issuance.** Benefits are issued by direct mail to recipients from the central State office to their home address. In cases where coupons have been repeatedly lost or stolen, the coupons are mailed to a local office to be picked up by the client. Clients who do not receive their coupons must complete a replacement form at the local office. The local office transmits the form to the State office after five days. The State office then holds the request for replacement coupons for ten days before mailing replacements. This information is transmitted by SYS-M (an electronic message transmission capability with limited functionality). If the stamps come back to the State office, the issuance worker logs this into EPICS and sends an electronic form to the worker via SYS-M for completion. Clients are allowed a maximum of two replacements in six months.

Since replacement benefits are not requested via EPICS on-line, but through SYS-M, a separate utility, the information is entered into EPICS so that the document numbers of the original and replacement issuances are linked. EPICS provides an on-line display of the entire issuance history.

EPICS prints a card with the client's name, address, and coupon amount. Temporary workers manually insert the card and the coupons into envelopes. The system creates issuance files daily for new approvals and other special issuances. The bulk of the coupons are mailed within the first four days of the month.

Expedited issuance is not possible on the same day the application is submitted, but always occurs within the five-day period.

- **Notices.** EPICS generates a variety of notices for mailing. The EW selects the type of notice needed and enters in the requisite information, i.e., a date by which information must be provided by the client, etc. EPICS prompts the worker when a notice is to be sent, but does not indicate the type of notice. Workers are required to prepare a manual notice for incomplete monthly reporting, but can delete the notice before it has been printed and mailed. (Wyoming has applied for a waiver for monthly reporting.) Notices are batch processed and printed at night for mailing the next day. State FSP staff feel they have a good notice system because it cites the regulation and the manual section, but workers would prefer not to select the type of notice.
- **Claims System.** The claims process for food stamps is integrated with AFDC, Medicaid, and General Assistance. Overissuances are identified by computer matching, recertification and quality control reviews, and information from other agencies. An EW or supervisor in the field offices processes the claim once it is identified. Claims are investigated through case file reviews, in-office interviews, and third-party contacts. A standard number of demand letters is sent for all types of claims. Recoupment is used for cases of agency error, household error, and fraud. The system automatically calculates the amount of recoupment, deducts the recoupment, and generates demand letters.
- **Monthly Reporting.** Wyoming has requested a waiver from monthly reporting to be effective January 1, 1994. EPICS automatically generates and mails monthly reporting forms to all nonexempt clients. Reports are due the tenth of the month. A clerical person enters the data. EPICS generates warning notices to clients whose reports are late and automatically closes the case if the monthly report is not received.
- **Computer Matching.** Wyoming developed the capability to perform computer matching under a pre-EPICS system called the Payee Analysis and Intercept System, for which the State received approximately \$258,000 in 75 percent enhanced funding from Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) during FYs 1984-1986. The PAIS system was subsequently integrated with EPICS. Wyoming may have

been the first State to meet the requirements of the IEVS legislation. EPICS runs monthly and quarterly batch runs against selected State and Federal files to identify matches that exceed certain tolerances. When these tolerances are exceeded, e.g., the amount of civil service benefits received differs from application records by \$100 or more, an alert is generated. Information is matched daily against State data files such as Employer Security Commission, Workers Compensation, and Unemployment Benefits. A match from this source merely indicates to the EW that a person is known to one of these State systems and that further investigation is warranted.

Wyoming added an extensive State data exchange capability with other wage data bases in the State as well as an Office of Recovery Support system.

- **Reporting.** Batch reports are either sent to EW by the State office or are printed remotely depending on the report. Remote printing in large offices takes several hours. Some of the more useful reports include: the Worker Alert Report, the Weekly Application Status report, and the Outstanding Alert Report. The Monthly Caseload Report presents caseload by worker and shows the case number, child care indicator, job assistance indicator, program type, status, monthly reporting exemption, and benefits authorized. Workers and supervisors rely on this report.

For management evaluations by county, EPICS generates a report according to certain criteria from which cases can be selected. This report is run once or twice a year.

- **Other Features.** Wyoming makes extensive use of its electronic mail facility (SYS-M). This system is used to transmit the replacement forms for lost or stolen benefits from the local office to the State office. The State is looking at this capability as a possible source of documentation distribution and update. It has examined this resource as a possible solution for an "on-line" user manual, but has so far found it impractical.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

EPICS is integrated to serve the three major programs: AFDC, FSP, and Medicaid. It also serves a small number of GA clients.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

EPICS is designed to provide a workstation for each caseworker, issuance clerk, supervisor, and administrator. There are currently 115 caseworkers and approximately 285 clerks, supervisors, administrative personnel who use 400 workstations - 325 "dumb" terminals and 75 COMPAQ personal computers (PC).

3.4 Current Automation Issues

The State has sufficient computer capacity to perform all processing tasks for the foreseeable future, but is seeking ways to improve system functionality. One approach would be to increase worker productivity by the use of PCs and local area networks (LAN). The State is in the process of determining how best to take advantage of the available advances in technology.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

EPICS planning began in 1982 with the submission of an Advanced Planning Document (APD) for a feasibility study. EPICS was developed between 1985 and 1987 and was implemented in October 1987. Alternative system reviews were conducted in 1983. System selection was made in 1984. The only criterion for selection was that the system be Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS)-certified. North Dakota's TEC system was Wyoming's first choice, but when Wyoming realized that North Dakota had one-month budgeting and no Medicaid eligibility determination, it switched to the Alaska EIS which had two-month retrospective budgeting.

When EPICS development began, it was one of the first on-line systems of any size in the State of Wyoming. There were few people in the State at this time with the experience needed to implement EPICS.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

Before EPICS, the automated system supporting the Food Stamp Program was a sequential flat file batch system with no on-line access. The system did not determine eligibility and could not reconcile food stamp benefits. Separate systems existed for AFDC, Licensed Shelter Care, and Medicaid eligibility information. Wage cross matches were performed by an Employment Security Commission system.

4.2 Justification for the New System

Wyoming expected to achieve the following benefits with the implementation of EPICS:

- Reduce time spent processing paperwork in the field from 80 percent to 20 percent of the caseworker's job and increase time spent in client interface from 20 percent to 80 percent
- Reduce need for field clerical staff (data entry) and increase the number of caseworker positions
- Reduce error rates by eliminating data entry and adding automated edits
- Implement mass changes more quickly

- Increase the continuity of policy application throughout the State

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Systemhouse, Inc. conducted a feasibility study prior to EPICS design and development, from 1983-1984. Based on the study's conclusion that Wyoming was not ready for EPICS, Wyoming delayed the start of EPICS development until its processes and technology were better able to handle the system, i.e.:

- It changed from specialized to generic caseworkers in the scattered instances where this was necessary.
- It upgraded the telecommunications network and the training of their telecommunications and database staff in anticipation of the system.

Wyoming was the last State to have a sole source contract for the development of an eligibility determination system. They utilized Systemhouse, Inc., which had systems and program knowledge and experience in transferring eligibility determination systems. Wyoming staff felt this gave them a better chance for success.

The March 1985 APD depicted five phases:

- I. Conceptual Design Phase
- II. Transfer Phase
- III. Pilot Phase
- IV. Implementation Phase
- V. Post Implementation and Review

The system was projected to cost \$3,094,999 in 1985. This estimate was based on the transfer cost of the North Dakota system.

This plan was revised in April 1986. Additional funds were sought because of manpower shortages in the State Data Services as well as a more realistic analysis of the task of conversion based on the user's review of the system. The 1986 APD occasionally refers to the TEC system from North Dakota and occasionally to EIS from Alaska. Remaining team members recall that it was determined at this time that the EIS system was the one they wanted to transfer. The Alaska system was better suited to Wyoming's functional needs because it had two-month retrospective budgeting. The cost estimate was raised to \$3,118,999. The State agreed to acquire a large mainframe one year earlier than originally planned (at a cost of \$3.5 million) to accommodate EPICS, along with other State systems.

The 1986 APD depicted six phases:

- I. Conceptual Design
- II. Implementation Planning

- III. Transfer Phase
- IV. Pilot Phase
- V. Implementation Phase
- VI. Post Implementation Review (and certification)

The first meeting of the Project Team, including the newly acquired contractor and all State program and management information systems (MIS) staff, occurred in June 1985. The State prototyped both the North Dakota and Alaska systems, with emphasis on North Dakota, beginning in 1985. In early 1986, the emphasis was changed to the Alaska EIS. The pilot was scheduled for July or September 1986, but did not occur until October. Conversion and implementation started in January of 1987 and took six months. The system was certified in October 1987.

Wyoming did not utilize a system life cycle development methodology and had little experience in managing contractors. For the most part, the State employed a prototyping approach to development. The entire system was prototyped to the users who examined each screen one at a time. This approach resulted in a detailed analysis and design for each change made to Alaska's EIS. Wyoming did not do a requirements analysis. Since it was transferring a certified FAMIS system, it felt that the requirements were already in place. Wyoming focused instead on a system test plan and system/acceptance test scenarios based on its prototyping review.

EPICS was tested in two counties using test case scenarios that were developed based on requirements, regulations, and special situations.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Workers were brought into the central office for one week to be trained on terminals using the test cases that had been created for the pilot test. EWs received one week of training as did supervisors. Two hundred caseworkers were brought into the State office for training. Training took place immediately preceding conversion. After caseworkers returned to the local offices, State staff and, in some cases, contractor staff went to the local offices to provide assistance. The majority of caseworkers easily accepted and learned EPICS. Caseworker performance was monitored after training by supervisors who reviewed the weekly caseload report, workloads, alerts, and error rates.

To convert cases, a new application form had to be completed by the recipient. The application form was mailed to the recipient who could either complete the application and return it by mail or could come into the local office. In the two weeks prior to conversion, EPICS project staff went to the county office to review the applications. Caseworkers then did the data entry. EPICS staff stayed at each office the whole month to assist with the process. Wyoming believes that the review of the application forms prior to conversion resulted in unexpectedly low error rates following EPICS conversion.

Conversion staff worked from 8 a.m. to midnight and received overtime pay. The supervisor from one county would go to the next county to assist with conversion.

Approximately 10,000 active cases were converted. There was no automated conversion of any portion of the food stamp caseload. Data entry for an expedited food stamp case would take approximately five minutes; a case involving combined programs would take twenty minutes to enter. Completion and review of the combined application form required most of the time.

Wyoming staff indicated that many problems were encountered during conversion, related to technical problems with the telecommunications and system operation.

4.5 Project Management

Two project managers were assigned to EPICS -- one from the applications area and one from CTD. Overall responsibility for the project resided in DFS. Both managers were 100 percent dedicated to EPICS. The project manager from DFS was responsible for the preparation of the APDs and functional/user specifications. All DFS team members reported to the DFS Project Manager. Technical project staff reported to the CTD project manager. The project manager reported to the Administrator and User Committee. Project management success was attributed to excellent communication and organizational skills. During EPICS development and implementation, there were no changes in this project management structure. The only major personnel change was in the contractor's project manager.

The Project Director travelled to Alaska, North Dakota, and Vermont to review candidate systems.

The contractor was managed by Program staff although the contract oversight was provided by CTD. There were ongoing communications and on-site meetings with FNS and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) during the system development and implementation phases.

4.6 FSP Participation

FSP administrative staff were involved from the beginning of the planning effort for the new system. There were 17 users representing AFDC, FSP, and Medicaid present throughout the planning, development and implementation phases. They reviewed, approved, and provided input to the EPICS project team. The same formal group met biweekly. There were two supervisors from the field and 15 people from AFDC, FSP, and Medicaid (since there are no FSP-only staff). State staff felt that more hands-on field staff should have participated in the EPICS project, possibly preventing some of the problems that were encountered in the field when EPICS was implemented.

The users developed user and system requirements, reviewed the conceptual design and capacity study, and reviewed and selected candidate systems. Program personnel in conjunction with contractor technical staff developed the capacity plan. Wyoming attributes its success to the high degree of user involvement at both the local and State

levels during EPICS development and implementation. Active user involvement during development led to a high level of user acceptance once the system was implemented.

Program staff reviewed the screens and documentation for over 50 percent of their working week. They also developed test scenarios for EPICS cases and screens. These test scripts are still used to benchtest all significant new enhancements. Program staff were used as trainers after the acceptance testing was completed. Four staff are still retained on the user help desk. These staff currently develop specifications for enhancements, document training needs, and assist in testing enhancements.

The User Group met once or twice a month from 1983 to 1987.

4.7 MIS Participation

The CTD project manager was also a member of the user group.

Originally, the State Data Center was to perform the Alaska transfer and do the coding and the testing. Untimely resignations and a hiring freeze made it necessary for Systemhouse, Inc., to perform most of the coding. The State, however, dedicated a project manager/analyst and a lead technical analyst to the effort. CTD is currently responsible for all programming and testing for the system and employs contract staff as necessary to support EPICS. The State relied heavily on contractor support since it had little technical experience with CICS and ADABAS/NATURAL.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

When Wyoming decided to transfer Alaska's EIS, the project was delayed two months until it was able to read the Alaska tapes. The initial mainframe was then determined to be too small. The State approved funds one year earlier than planned to obtain a larger mainframe that would accommodate EPICS as well as other State agencies. The delay was made up by additional contractor staff, overtime, and efficiencies resulting from the prototyping methodology. Implementation was also facilitated by the contractor knowledge of the system, the application software, and the transfer process.

Although the pilot started a few months late, the system implementation date remained on schedule and was completed for \$200,000 under budget.

Other problems encountered during the project included:

- Untimely resignations and a hiring freeze that inhibited State MIS staff from performing the programming
- Implementation of new Federal regulations during the transfer to include IEVS
- Customizing the EIS system for Wyoming to meet State requirements

Wyoming has yet to review the FNS APD Handbook 901 since it does not need to submit an APD. Wyoming staff suggested that FNS and DHHS coordinate their regulations and policies, such as the regulation related to vehicle resource limit.

Wyoming has had a positive relationship with FNS regional office staff, but no contact at all with FNS Headquarters staff.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Wyoming switched from the North Dakota to the Alaska system to accommodate Wyoming's two-month retrospective budgeting and because Alaska had made enhancements in EIS that included the addition of Medicaid.

Wyoming examined seven State systems before selecting North Dakota and Alaska. Its major requirement was the transfer of a system that was fully operational and certified. The emphasis was on eligibility determination and benefit calculation (ED/BC), as opposed to reporting and benefit issuance, which were of secondary importance at the time.

The State systems reviewed included: Colorado, Utah, Alabama, Georgia, Vermont, North Dakota, and Alaska. Most of these States used older technologies, were stand-alone Food Stamp Program systems, or were not yet certified by DHHS and FNS. Wyoming was also interested in obtaining a contractor experienced in transferring systems. Although Alaska was initially discounted because of its remote location, it was reconsidered because of the enhancements that had been made to the system after it was transferred to North Dakota. Based on these enhancements, Wyoming chose to transfer the Alaska EIS.

Wyoming utilized about 75 percent of the Alaska code. Every module was changed to some degree. Wyoming also added Medicaid and interfaces to the Wyoming Office of Recovery System (ORS) and PAIS and made changes to accommodate regional office differences and State programs such as GA. Wyoming has further enhanced EPICS with Jobs Assistance System (JAS) and Foster Care (FSX).

Wyoming had eliminated authorization to participate (ATP) cards before implementation of EPICS and so changed the system to reflect this. The State also eliminated some special Alaska components, the mass change program portion, including cost of living changes (COLA) changes, and some reporting requirements. COLAs and other mass changes are handled outside EPICS. The Wyoming development effort took 33 percent of the level of effort required by Alaska to develop the original system. The system was implemented in less than two years and \$200,000 under budget.

Wyoming continues to attend the TEC system User Group meetings when TEC system users transfer code and concepts. No transfers have been recorded to date from Wyoming.

- **Hardware.** Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A shows the ADP equipment that supports EPICS. Wyoming has 283 GB of total DASD, of which EPICS uses four packs, or 6 percent. EPICS is the largest user of DASD among all State systems. EPICS uses 20 percent of the State's 3090-300J mainframe. It ranks first or second in total data center usage. Of the eight tape drives available, EPICS uses all of them only in the monthly cycle. The average usage is four drives. Over 300 tapes are allocated to EPICS per month. The batch cycle is from 7 p.m. to 2 a.m.; the batch cycle runs concurrently with the on-line for four hours. The on-line is up 23 hours daily.

Local regional managers can acquire whatever hardware is necessary to keep their staff productive. They are responsible for their budget. They purchase hardware from the State approved purchase list. Thus there may be several brands of microcomputers throughout the EPICS system in local offices. The State office supplements these purchases as money is available.

- **Software.** The EPICS system operates under the latest releases of IBM MVS/ESA, CICS, JES2, and ADABAS Version 5.2.4 with NATURAL. Wyoming tries to keep within three months of the latest release of all their software. This keeps them from compatibility problems associated with "catch-up." Wyoming did not experience any problems in going to later releases of Software AG products.

Wyoming has implemented a "traceable back door," a simple substitution facility for correcting and adjusting the database with an audit trail. This has saved the MIS and database staff countless hours in repair and recovery of data. An authorized FSP staff person can correct/change the database on-line whenever necessary.

- **MIS Staffing.** There are problems associated with attracting and retaining qualified MIS personnel and support staff in Wyoming due to its isolated location and generally low salaries. There is only one other in-State competitor for mainframe MIS personnel; however, the State has lost three staff members to this system in the last three years. On the other hand, 11 new staff members were added to the State data center in the last year. In addition, there is an insufficient number of funded positions within the State to keep EPICS fully supported. The State contracts with two firms in Denver that have employees knowledgeable in ADABAS, CICS, COBOL and NATURAL to fill this need.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

The Wyoming MIS staff devised a system whereby EPICS jobs look for run parameters entered by the authorized FSP staff. The jobs then run, given the parameters input from the user, rather than having the user send job requests to the State MIS staff, or requesting JCL changes. These parameters might pertain to dates, districts, workers, cases, or combinations of data.

The central processing unit (CPU) and telecommunications equipment are shared among all programs and agencies in the State. There is a single State Data Center (CTD Division of DA&I) where all State systems are housed. All equipment is purchased. Cartridge tapes are used because they are more durable and their data retention is more reliable, according to the Wyoming State Data Center staff.

6.2.3. Telecommunications

Wyoming uses a fiber and copper network to connect the campus of buildings in Cheyenne. The rest of the State uses T1 lines to eight nodes and copper telephone lines from there to the remote sites. Trunk lines run at 56KB digital where available. All other lines are 4800 to 9600 baud with dial-up always available for back-up. A conglomeration of small private companies service many of the remote locations. All sites have telephone lines, but not all workers do. Some workers are on call through cellular phones.

There are approximately 325 dumb terminals and 75 PCs, reflecting a ratio of terminals/PCs to workers of one to one. Eventually, the PCs will access the central mainframe from a LAN.

6.2.4 System Performance

There are approximately 122,000 CICS transactions daily which translates to 2.1 million database transactions. A transaction in EPICS is a field in a screen.

The EPICS architecture is very well suited to Wyoming's caseload size. Many larger States would have difficulty emulating some of its operating procedures, such as concurrent processing of on-line and batch or single State data system for all Agencies.

It would take a 50 to 100 percent increase in Wyoming caseload to threaten the capacity of the current telecommunications network.

6.2.5 System Response

Response time is largely below one second and almost always below four seconds. Peak processing times are 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. and 2 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The FSP staff is learning to use SUPERNATURAL to prepare their own ad hoc reports. This sometimes ties up the database and affects response time. The State data base administrator believes that the FSP staff regards this as an acceptable trade-off. All other instances of system slowdown are dealt with promptly. All transactions are monitored and CICS or software problems are dealt with at once.

EPICS is sometimes too slow during the four working days before the end of the month. The system is on-line from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Because it occurs rarely, unscheduled system downtime is not an issue in Wyoming.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Wyoming is currently transferring the Vermont Child Support System.

The JAS Reports are in the same database as the system for Foster Care.

Wyoming has prepared an APD and RFP for an electronic benefits transfer (EBT) system that would combine food stamp issuance and the special supplemental food program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) voucher system in a smart card application (off-line).

The State has been examining the use of SUPERNATURAL as a means for users to access the database for reports. To use SUPERNATURAL requires that the user know the 40 to 45 database files.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section of the report identifies the system development costs, operational costs, and costs allocation methodology of Wyoming's DFS EPICS, which currently supports FSP.

EPICS was first conceptualized in 1985 in an effort to integrate Wyoming's Office Family Assistance (OFA) and FSP systems. EPICS was developed between 1985 and 1987, fully operational in June 1987, and certified in October 1987. EPICS replaced an antiquated system which relied on data entry forms submitted by field offices. EPICS was a TEC system transfer from Alaska.

Prior to 1991, the Health Department's Budget and Fiscal Office handled the financial aspects of EPICS. Now this responsibility is handled by the Financial Services Division (FSD) within DFS. Due to the organizational and personnel changes, Wyoming has a very limited amount of historical cost information on EPICS planning and development costs.

7.1 EPICS Development Costs and Federal Funding

The initial APD was submitted in March 1985. EPICS planning, transfer, and development costs were estimated at \$3,094,999. The original Federal funding share was estimated to be 67 percent OFA (DHHS) and 33 percent FSP (FNS) or \$1,021,349 with a 75 percent Federal financial participation (FFP).⁴ An EPICS APD Update (APDU) was submitted on April 28, 1986 with total EPICS costs estimated at \$3,138,999. This was

⁴ EPICS APD 1985.

a 1.42 percent increase over the 1986 APD amount. Federal funding shares were changed to 50 percent for both OFA and FSP funding shares. The FSP share of EPICS development was projected to be \$1,177,124.⁵ The 1986 APDU estimated that the Wyoming Data Services Division would require approximately \$3,500,000 in upgraded mainframe facilities to support EPICS.

7.2 EPICS Operating Costs

EPICS operating costs are approximately \$2.6 million per year.⁶ EPICS operating costs consist of computer charges from Data Services and EPICS administrative costs. Due to organizational changes, detailed operating expense information prior to 1992 is not currently available. Recent EPICS annual operating expenditures are shown in Table 7-2, EPICS Operating Expenditures 1989-92.

Table 7.1 EPICS Operating Expenditures 1989-92⁷

Year	Operating Expenditure Attributed to FSP	Change	FSP FFP Share (50 Percent)
1989	982,867	-	4691,434
1990	1,348,799	37%	674,399
1991	1,439,818	7%	719,909
1992	1,520,655	6%	760,328

Operating costs have been increasing at an average of 6.5 percent over the last two years.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

As shown in Table 7.2, EPICS Food Stamp Cost Per Case, EPICS operating cost per case month ranged from \$7.98 to \$10.02 per household.

7.2.2 EPICS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The CTD submits monthly bills to DFS for data processing services provided in support of all DFS programs. Billing amounts are based on job numbers. Job numbers relate to the functions which support specific programs. Job numbers include CPU time,

⁵ EPICS APD 1986.

⁶ DFS Financial Services Division quarterly billing report summary 1991 and 1992.

⁷ SF269 ADP Operating Costs for corresponding years.

communications, and programmer analysts time. Programmers and analysts enter project time into the CTD billing system by job code.

7.3 Wyoming Cost Allocation Methodologies

The following section addresses the cost allocation methodology used for EPICS development and ongoing operations. As noted, Wyoming has not maintained detailed information on actual EPICS development costs, Federal funding shares, and allocation of EPICS development costs.

Table 7.2 EPICS FSP Operational Cost Per Case

Year	Monthly EPICS FSP Operational Costs	Average Monthly Caseload ⁸	Food Stamp Cost Per Case (Household) ⁹
1989	\$81,905	10,255	\$7.98
1990	\$112,399	10,844	\$10.36
1991	\$119,984	11,988	\$10.00
1992	\$126,721	12,646	\$10.02

7.3.1 Overview of EPICS Development Cost Allocation Methodology

According to the 1985 EPICS ADP, the 67 percent OFA (DHHS) and 33 percent by FSP (FNS) allocation was based on a Federally approved 2:1 ratio used in prior State's TEC system transfers.

The 1986 APD funding allocation 50 percent OFA and 50 percent FSP was based on time studies of Wyoming public assistance workers (PAW).

7.3.2 EPICS Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

EPICS operational costs consist of ADP billings and administrative support services. ADP billings are accumulated in the following four cost pools:

- On-line Systems, Production and Maintenance
- Batch Program Execution
- Subscription Fees, Administration
- Subscription Fees, Self-sufficiency Programs

⁸ Caseload figures provided by Wyoming for each year.

⁹ Monthly cost per case was calculated by dividing the monthly EPICS FSP operational costs by the average monthly FSP caseload.

ADP services are accumulated by job number. Monthly bills are submitted to DFS and costs are allocated quarterly to OFA programs. Program allocations of the four ADP cost centers are based on local welfare office time studies. These time studies are developed through time sheets. Welfare office income maintenance workers complete time sheets detailing time spent on a specific program. DFS consolidates time sheets and develops time study program allocations.

EPICS operating costs are accumulated into the following four cost centers:

- Salaries and Benefits
- Indirect Support Costs (e.g., postage, travel, phone)
- Direct Program Support Costs
- Contractual Services

Costs which cannot be attributed to specific OFA programs are allocated based on welfare office income maintenance workers time study program allocations.

Recent time study cost allocations are shown in Table 7.3, EPICS Time Study Program Allocations.

Table 7.3 EPICS Time Study Program Allocations¹⁰

Program / Date	2nd Qtr 91	2nd Qtr 92	4th Qtr 92
FSP	38%	40%	44%
AFDC	37%	31%	33%
Title XIX	19%	18%	20%
JOBS	06%	11%	3%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

¹⁰ DFS time study report data for corresponding quarters.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF WYOMING

EXHIBITS

**Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	N	N	N
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92*	N	N	N
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	N	N
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y

**Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	N
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	Y	Y	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	N
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Waiver		
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

* These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

**Exhibit A-6.1
State of Wyoming
Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090-300J	IBM	Purchase	128 MB main storage 512 MB extended storage
DASD			
3390	IBM	Purchase	3390 - Mod 3, Mod 9 283 GB
TAPE			
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	4480 (8)
Reel Drive	IBM	Purchase	3420 Model 8 (1)
Reel Drive	IBM	Purchase	3420 Model 7 (1)
PRINTERS			
Line	IBM	Purchase	6262 (1)
Line	IBM	Purchase	4245 (1)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	4050 (2)
Microfiche	Komstar	Purchase	1
FRONT ENDS			
3705	IBM	Purchase	1
3745	IBM	Purchase	1
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
3270 Type	Various	Purchase	400

APPENDIX B

STATE OF WYOMING

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility workers in Wyoming. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Wyoming. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWS in Wyoming	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
114	62	54.4%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	34	54.8%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Wyoming. The response rate of 55 percent is low, producing a sample whose responses may not be representative of eligibility workers in Wyoming.

Summary of Findings

Most of the eligibility workers are satisfied with the computer system in Wyoming. They generally find it very accurate, responsive, and easy to learn. One complaint is that the system is down too often. Most respondents also think the computer system is a great help in their jobs. The eligibility workers generally do not have difficulty performing any of the system-specific tasks but there are minorities that did express problems with some specific tasks.

Since Wyoming's current system has been operational since 1987, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	7	20.6
Good	24	70.6
Excellent	3	8.8

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	25	73.5
Good	9	26.5

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	2	5.9
Sometimes	21	61.8
Often	11	32.4

The eligibility workers who responded generally agree that the system's response time is usually good or excellent but a majority (74 percent) also agree that response time is poor during peak periods.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	3	8.8
Often	31	91.2

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	20.6
Sometimes	22	64.7
Often	5	14.7

A large majority (91 percent) of the eligibility workers who responded think the system is generally available although a smaller majority (79 percent) agrees that it is sometimes or often down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	1	2.9
Good	27	79.4
Excellent	6	17.6

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	79.4
Sometimes	7	20.6

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	72.7
Sometimes	9	27.3

How often is the systems data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	63.6
Sometimes	9	27.3
Often	3	9.1

The eligibility workers who responded consistently feel that the operations of the system are accurate. A large majority (97 percent) of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	60.6
Sometimes	11	33.3
Often	2	6.1

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	69.7
Sometimes	7	21.2
Often	3	9.1

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	94.1
Sometimes	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	73.5
Sometimes	7	20.6
Often	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	70.6
Sometimes	8	23.5
Often	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	78.8
Sometimes	7	21.2

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	90.9
Sometimes	3	9.1

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	70.6
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	76.5
Sometimes	7	20.6
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	79.4
Sometimes	6	17.6
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	91.2
Sometimes	2	5.9
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	76.5
Sometimes	7	20.6
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	50.0
Sometimes	4	16.7
Often	8	33.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	64.5
Sometimes	7	22.6
Often	4	12.9

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	63.6
Sometimes	8	24.2
Often	4	12.1

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	82.4
Sometimes	5	14.7
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	69.7
Sometimes	8	24.2
Often	2	6.1

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	30.0
Sometimes	14	46.7
Often	7	23.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	36.7
Sometimes	11	36.7
Often	8	26.7

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

Most of the eligibility workers responding do not have difficulty performing any of the system-specific tasks such as assigning new case numbers or generating adverse action notices. However, about one quarter of the respondents reported difficulty with monitoring

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	71.9
Sometimes	9	28.1

Most of the eligibility workers who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work (88 percent).

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	85.3
Sometimes	5	14.7

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	91.2
Sometimes	3	8.8

Most of the eligibility workers who responded agree that expedited service is rarely difficult to provide.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Wyoming's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF WYOMING

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of supervisors in Wyoming. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Wyoming. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of Supervisors in Wyoming	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
26	22	84.6
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	7	31.8%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in Wyoming. The response rate of 32 percent is very low, producing a sample whose responses may not be representative of supervisors in Wyoming.

Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors responding think the system is good and helps them in their jobs. Most of the respondents found the system easy to use and also report rarely having difficulty performing their specific system-related tasks.

Since Wyoming's current system has been operational since 1987, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	7	100.0

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	6	85.7
Good	1	14.3

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	7	100.0

The supervisors who responded all agree that the system's response time is generally good although they also feel that the system response time is sometimes too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Often	7	100.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	42.9
Sometimes	3	42.9
Often	1	14.3

All the supervisors who responded think the system is generally available but more than half also feel that the system is down sometimes or often.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	7	100.0

All the supervisors who responded think the information in the system is good.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	71.4
Sometimes	2	28.6

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	2	33.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	100.0

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	85.7
Sometimes	1	14.3

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	100.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	100.0

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	85.7
Sometimes	1	14.3

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	85.7
Sometimes	1	14.3

A majority of the supervisors responding have no difficulty obtaining information from or learning to use the system. Those who responded generally do not have difficulty performing such specific tasks as generating adverse action notices or restoring benefits.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	1	14.3
Often	6	85.7

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	57.1
Sometimes	3	42.9

Most of the supervisors who responded (86 percent) think that the current system is often a great help to them in their work.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	28.6
Good	5	71.4

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	5	71.4
Excellent	2	28.6

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	50.0
Sometimes	2	50.0

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	100.0

Half of the supervisors responding report difficulty in making mass changes. Most think the reports produced by the system are good and all agree that the technical service is good or excellent.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Wyoming's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Wyoming's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.