

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: MAY 17 - 19, 1993

DELAWARE STATE REPORT

October 18, 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	5
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	10
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	10
3.4 Current Automation Issues	10
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	11
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	11
4.2 Justification for the New System	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components	19
7.2 DCIS Operational Costs	20
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	20
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	21
7.3 Delaware Cost Allocation Methodologies	21
7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology	21
7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	22

APPENDICES

A State of Delaware 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	4
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	6
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	6
7.1	DCIS Operating Costs	20
7.2	DCIS FSP Operating Costs	20

APPENDIX A - State of Delaware Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Delaware Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	Allocated Cost Pools	A-5

DELAWARE STATE REPORT

Site Visit May 17 - 19, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Delaware Client Information System (DCIS)

Start Date: 1981

Completion Date: 1985

Contractor: Electronic Data Systems

Transfer From: Developed in house

Cost:

Actual:	\$5,126,418
Projected:	\$1,945,096
FSP Share:	\$ 849,759
FSP %:	16.6%

Number of Users: 448

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe:	IBM 9000/320
Workstations:	Memorex/Telex 3270-type
Telecommunications Network:	Fourteen 9.6 KB leased line multi-dropped circuits

System Profile:

Programs:	Food Stamp, Medicaid, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, State Programs
------------------	--

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) is the cabinet level agency responsible for the administration of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and other assistance programs in Delaware. Within DHSS, the director of the Division of Social Services (DSS) oversees activities in three areas:

- Financial Assistance
- Administration
- Medical Assistance

The following organizational units report to the deputy director of Financial Assistance: Policy and Program Development, Staff Development, Employment and Training, and Operations. The Policy and Program Development Unit is responsible for State level administration of FSP and other assistance programs.

Systems support for DSS is provided by both the Information Systems (IS) group within the DSS Administration area and the State level Office of Information Systems (OIS). OIS reports to the Budget Office. DSS IS is responsible for application support and user interface and OIS operates the mainframe computer on which the Delaware Client Information System (DCIS) resides. DCIS supports the FSP, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, General Assistance (GA), and other State Programs.

The State population in 1990 was 668,696. Approximately 4.8 percent of Delaware residents received food stamps.

The level of unemployment in Delaware decreased each year from 1982 to 1987, remained constant in 1988, and increased each year between 1989 and 1991. The State's unemployment rate decreased by over 62 percent between 1982 (8.5 percent unemployment) and 1987 (3.2 percent unemployment). In 1991, the unemployment rate was 6.2 percent.

The October 1992 report, *The Fiscal Survey of States*, provides the following information compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Delaware's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was 0.0 percent to 4.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Delaware reduced the 1992 State budget by \$11.0 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Delaware decreased by 1.08 percent. This decrease was greater than the national average 0.60 percent decrease in State government employment.
- Delaware implemented changes to increase revenues by \$500,000 for FY 1993. The source of the increase was fee income.

- The regional outlook indicated the mideast region has been strongly impacted by the recession. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 8.4 percent was greater than the national average of 7.8 percent, and the per capita increase in personal income of 2.2 percent was less than the national average increase of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

FSP administration in Delaware is integrated with other assistance programs at the local level as well as the State level. There are 13 local Social Services sites throughout the State and a total of 25 Social Services units. Each site contains one or more Social Services units. Oversight of Social Services units is provided through four administrators, who report to the DSS Operations Unit.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

The average monthly participation for FSP and other assistance programs is provided below in Table 2.1. Both individual and household participation in the Food Stamp Program increased by 62.2 percent between 1988 and 1992. The increase in the number of AFDC cases during the five-year period was 36.2 percent; the number of GA cases increased by 54.3 percent during the same period. Medicaid participation increased by 45.7 percent between 1988 and 1992.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Programs	FY 1992	FY 1991	FY 1990	FY 1989	FY 1988
AFDC					
Cases	10,335	8,981	8,025	7,434	7,589
Recipients	25,914	22,642	20,648	19,114	19,797
GA					
Cases	1,690	1,331	1,137	1,080	1,095
Recipients	N/A	1,551	1,317	1,301	1,366
FSP					
Households	17,164	14,200	11,895	10,894	10,583
Individuals	46,344	38,340	32,116	29,414	28,574
Medicaid					
Individuals	48,112	42,404	38,700	35,039	33,013

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 7.1:1 in 1988 to 12.2:1 in 1992.

Delaware's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased.¹

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$186.70	\$177.78	\$167.64	\$142.65	\$140.25

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Delaware's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.² While total Federal administrative costs increased each year during the period, average cost per household increased in 1989 and decreased each year between 1990 and 1992.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$3,442,780	\$3,094,834	\$3,061,271	\$2,743,055	\$2,548,012
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$15.30	\$16.97	\$20.71	\$20.77	\$19.86

¹ The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

² The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in FNS's *State Activity Reports* each year.

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Areas of Food Stamp Program performance that could potentially be affected by the automated systems that support the Program include:

- Staffing
- Responsiveness to Regulatory Change
- Combined Official Payment Error Rates
- Claims Collection
- Certification/Reviews

2.4.1 Staffing

Local office staff in Delaware includes both full-time State staff and seasonal workers. The State uses a generic worker approach. Full-time State staffing levels have not changed since DCIS was implemented; however, in the past few years, there have been increases in seasonal staffing. Nevertheless, Delaware's increasing caseloads over the last five years have resulted in higher average caseloads for workers. On average, a worker now handles 300 Food Stamp Program cases. This is more than twice the standard caseload of 140 cases per worker, which was determined based on 1988 workloads and management decisions. Current staffing levels in Delaware include 138 full-time and 16 seasonal eligibility workers (EWs); 25 eligibility worker supervisors; 36 full-time and five seasonal support staff with clerical, data entry, receptionist, and application registration responsibilities; and four senior Social Services administrators responsible for overseeing several Social Services units each.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Delaware's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, decreased slightly each year between 1988 and 1991 and increased in 1992. The variation in the error rate throughout the period was small.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	8.38	8.09	8.28	8.41	8.54

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of claims established, the total value of claims collected, and the percentage of claims established that were collected. Claims established decreased between 1988 and 1990 and increased in 1991 and 1992. Claims collected decreased in 1989 and increased in each subsequent year.

Delaware's claims collected as a percentage of claims established nearly doubled between 1989 and 1990, decreased significantly in 1991, and increased in 1992. The percentage of claims collected is affected by the total number of claims established, whether the individual is still receiving benefits, the amount of available assets, and other factors. For instance, the high percentage of claims collected in 1990 probably reflected the collection of outstanding claims that had been established in 1988 and 1989.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$322,829	\$316,103	\$190,910	\$202,697	\$264,067
Total Claims Collected	\$208,866	\$188,436	\$172,166	\$93,470	\$121,767
As a Percent of Total Claims Established	64.7%	59.6%	90.2%	46.1%	46.1%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

DCIS has been reviewed by both the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The FNS post-implementation review was conducted in 1985. DHHS reviewed the system and provided Financial Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification in 1989.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of DCIS functionality, complexity, and level of integration. It also discusses some of the current automation issues in Delaware.

3.1 System Functionality

Major features of DCIS functionality are described in this section. Areas addressed include:

- **Registration.** The registration process begins with the applicant completing a paper application. Clerical staff serving as registration workers use terminals to enter applicant information into the system. Data entered into the system for each household member includes: name, Social Security number (SSN), date of birth (DOB), alien status, address, and telephone number.

The State uses a Master Client Index (MCI) and conducts an on-line search for each household member at registration. The automated search uses the applicant's MCI identifier, SSN, and name or partial name to determine if the client currently participates or previously participated in the Food Stamp or AFDC Programs. Participation records are maintained on the system for three years. The food stamp disqualification file also is checked at registration. Workers may perform on-line searches against the State Department of Labor (DOL) and Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) files using a "hot key" to access the other systems.

Registration workers perform several functions manually. They review potential matches and indicate whether a record is to be included in a case file. Registration workers also determine whether applicants are eligible for expedited service and schedule client interviews with eligibility workers.

- **Eligibility Determination.** Eligibility determination in DCIS is mostly automated, but the worker has to perform some functions manually as well. The system provides for on-line entry of application data and on-line screen level edits; however, DCIS does not support interactive interviewing. Clerical staff enter information into the system after the interview using an input sheet completed by the eligibility worker as the data source. The system tracks verifications and provides information about pending verifications to the worker on-line. There are

ten data entry screens and workers page through the screens, bypassing screens where data is not required. The system allows multiple assistance groups, for different assistance programs, within a household, but workers are required to determine which individuals comprise an assistance group. The system automatically determines eligibility.

- **Benefit Calculation.** The system calculates benefits, and the worker verifies the system's calculations. Supervisory approval is not required to authorize benefits.
- **Benefit Issuance.** All Food Stamp Program benefits in Delaware are issued through an authorization to participate (ATP) system. The automated system creates monthly issuance files for on-going cases and daily files for expedited cases and other special issuances. The system prints ATP cards, which are provided to client households and exchanged for food coupons at financial institutions. In some emergency situations, local office workers can issue manual ATP documents.

The automated system performs several other functions that support benefit issuance. It prevents issuance until all application data are complete and provides for expedited issuance within two days of application. The system also provides staff with an on-line display of the issuance history and the basic information needed to complete Federally required issuance reports.

Issuance problems (such as undelivered or stolen coupons and returned ATPs) are handled centrally rather than by workers at local offices. To replace benefits, the original ATP is cancelled and a replacement is issued. The system supports benefit replacement by linking the document number of original and replacement documents.

- **Notices.** DCIS provides both system-generated and worker-initiated notices to clients. Notices for the Food Stamp Program are not combined with notices for other assistance programs supported by the system. For many client notices that are automatically generated by the system, workers have the option of supplementing notice content by entering additional information into the system. Notices are used to communicate with clients in a variety of situations including: application approval or denial, case closure based on recertification information, warnings that monthly reports were not received, benefit increases or decreases, and other information related to household eligibility and participation.
- **Claims System.** The claims system in Delaware is a separate system that is not integrated with DCIS. Information is exchanged between the two systems to enable recoupment through DCIS. DCIS calculates the recoupment amount, subtracts it from the client's benefit issuance, and generates a notice to the client regarding the overpayment or underpayment.

The eligibility worker is responsible for establishing claims in the system and determining the collection method. In establishing a claim, the eligibility worker enters the cause of the underpayment or overpayment and whether fraud is suspected into the system.

- **Computer Matching.** Delaware performs both on-line and batch computer matching. On-line computer matching to check for duplicate participation is performed at registration, at recertification, and when a new member is added to a household. Workers can perform on-line searches against the State DOL and DMV files as well. At the time the case is opened, matching is performed against the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) database during overnight batch processing. State wage and Unemployment Insurance (UI) data matching are performed quarterly and monthly, respectively. In addition, batch matching is performed against the following data sources: State Data Exchange (SDX) for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits; Social Security Administration (SSA) for benefits, self-employment, wages, and validation of SSNs; and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for income and assets.

The system reports discrepancies exceeding given thresholds to EWs. Discrepancies are reported through both on-line alert messages to workers and paper print outs. The system requires workers to respond to all discrepancy alerts. Workers track resolution of discrepancies manually and EWs can delete the alerts once they believe that the discrepancy has been resolved.

- **Alerts.** The system generates alerts for discrepancies reported through computer matching, cases for which recertification is required, and pending applications. Workers are responsible for prioritizing alerts and deleting alerts from the screen.
- **Monthly Reporting.** DCIS performs several functions required to support monthly reporting. The system determines which cases are subject to monthly reporting. It also produces the monthly report forms that are mailed to the client and directs returned forms to the appropriate worker. DCIS also generates notices to clients whose reports are late and automatically closes the case if the monthly report is not received.

Workers review returned monthly reporting forms and take necessary actions. If the form is incomplete, a notice is generated manually and mailed to the client. Clerical workers enter information concerning receipt of monthly report forms into the system. Eligibility workers complete a form if there are any changes in household information, and data entry personnel enter this information into the system.

- **Report Generation.** DCIS provides both standardized reports and ad hoc reports. Off-line reporting capability is provided through a database file that is updated monthly. Both local office and State program management personnel have access to this reporting function. The system provides some ad hoc management

reporting capability and produces paper reports detailing activity and pending actions. DCIS also provides the basic information needed to produce FNS required reports; however, the data must be reformatted to prepare the reports.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** There is limited electronic mail (E-mail) capability in Delaware, but this function is not provided through DCIS. E-mail capabilities are provided to administrative staff, but not workers, through a system operating on a Banyan network. However, supervisors in all local offices will have access to E-mail by the end of the fiscal year. A plan is in place to extend access to all Division employees over the next three years.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

DCIS provides integrated support for the FSP, AFDC, Medicaid, and GA; however, the system, which has been operational for approximately 10 years, does not exhibit the level of functional complexity demonstrated with newer systems.

DCIS interfaces with other State systems to support computer matching and claims processing. Users can perform computer matches against State DOL and DMV files. A separate claims system also interfaces with DCIS.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

There are approximately 513 terminals in Delaware; 65 are used exclusively for training. The remaining 448 terminals support users throughout the State. A dedicated terminal is provided for each eligibility worker. Additional terminals support clerical, supervisory, and State-level program and technical staff.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

In January 1994, FNS approved Delaware's PAPD to conduct automated systems planning activities. The goal of these activities is the initiation of a project to design and implement a system that will replace DCIS. The state plans to submit an implementation APD and RFP for this development project in September 1994.

Program personnel indicated that MIS staff lack the technical skills necessary to support programmatic requirements. Improvement of staff capabilities has been hindered by a hiring freeze and a lack of resources for training existing staff.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section discusses the approaches used in Delaware during the development and implementation of the Delaware Client Information System. Since the development effort was conducted over 10 years ago, limited information was available from State staff and available documentation was incomplete.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

DCIS development was initiated in 1981 because State staff believed that the existing systems were not adequate to support food stamp and other assistance programs' requirements. Documentation describing the system that supported FSP before DCIS implementation was not available. State staff also were unable to provide information about the previous system.

4.2 Justification for the New System

DCIS was developed to achieve the following objectives:³

- Reduce error rates to meet acceptable Federal tolerance limits.
- Reduce potential for client fraud.
- Provide rapid benefit delivery to clients.
- Provide flexibility to process client information expeditiously.
- Reduce the burden on workers to enable them to spend more time with clients, pursue more adequate verification, and make referrals to appropriate services.
- Provide better controls and reports required for efficient case management.
- Provide a planning and modeling tool for assessing future client needs and assisting in budget preparation.
- Generate statistical and financial reports to be used by management for monitoring staff activities.

State staff indicated that another objective of the system development effort was to enable the Department to increase worker productivity to enable the State to handle caseload increases.

³ Source: *Delaware Client Information System (DCIS) Development Project, Briefing of Federal Representatives, June 15, 1984.*

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

The initial planning for DCIS began in 1981. The following year, the State submitted and the Federal agencies approved a Planning Advanced Planning Document (PAPD). The State, which sought contractor assistance in developing its system, released a Request for Proposal (RFP) in November 1982. In December 1982, contractors submitted bids to the State, and the development contract was awarded to Electronic Data Systems (EDS) in early 1983.

The development effort was divided into two parts. Part A functionality included: financial eligibility assessment for supported programs, benefit calculation for supported programs, data entry and edits, case number assignment, on-line inquiry capabilities at the case level, notice generation, food stamp monthly report issuance, computer matching interfaces except State payroll matching, application and recertification activity reporting, mass change capabilities, sample selection for quality control (QC) and food stamp performance reporting, issuance for all supported programs, benefit histories, FSP benefit reconciliation and reporting, and AFDC and GA accounting and reporting. Part B functionality included: technical eligibility for supported programs, data entry for quality control review findings, monthly report tracking and processing, State payroll matching, most management and statistical reporting, database archiving capability for inactive cases, and QC statistical analysis and Federal reporting.⁴

Changes in Federal requirements and other environmental influences resulted in a number of amendments to the State's original Advanced Planning Document (APD). Amendments modified the project scope and incorporated additional functionality into the system. Changes were required to meet the following standards: FAMIS requirements, basic Federal requirements for client notices, and Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) requirements.

Changes in the system scope also resulted in some deviations from the original schedule. Actual timeframes for key project events included:⁵

- Training was initiated in September 1983.
- The final *General Design Document* was delivered and the *Detailed Design* for Part A on-line functions was completed in October 1983.
- Conversion of current case data was completed in November 1983.
- On-line DCIS functions (e.g., screening, new application entry, and inquiry) were implemented in December 1983 following the completion of testing in November.

⁴ DCIS APD, Amendment-1, December 23, 1982.

⁵ Source: *Delaware Client Information System (DCIS) Development Project, Briefing of Federal Representatives*, June 15, 1984.

- Issuance functions and interfaces were implemented statewide in March 1984.
- Additional functions (such as, specific types of mass changes, monthly reporting and FSP expiration notices, and ATP reconciliation) were implemented during April and May 1984.

Remaining Part A functions were implemented by 1985, but Part B functions and additional requirements (e.g., client notice modifications and IEVS requirements) were not completed for several years. In July 1987, APD Amendment 9 (revision 1) delayed the development and implementation schedule for Part B. The projected completion date for Part B of the DCIS development effort was changed to July 1988. The DCIS client notice modifications were completed in 1989 and the system was FAMIS certified. Additional enhancements were made between 1989 and 1991.

4.4. Conversion Approach

The conversion approach involved bringing all offices onto the system at the same time. All open cases, as well as cases closed in the prior four months, were converted. The conversion plan entailed the automated conversion of a small percentage of data elements and manual entry of remaining data.

Initial training for eligibility workers and supervisors consisted of three weeks of classroom training. Since workers were generic and the system provided integrated support for several programs, training was not program specific. Training also included two to three days of technical training.

4.5 Project Management

The project manager for the DCIS development effort was from the Information Systems Liaison Group within DSS. The project manager's background included over 15 years of program experience combined with five years experience in MIS and project management. The project manager's past experience reflected the State's emphasis on program knowledge as a key to project success. State staff indicated that other important factors for successful project management included the project manager's planning, organizational, communication, analytical, estimation, and negotiation skills.

The project management team also included representatives from the program and MIS areas. The project management team was responsible for reviewing the contractor's deliverables and monitoring performance.

4.6 FSP Participation

Program personnel participated in DCIS development through the project management team and user groups. User groups, consisting of both eligibility workers from local offices and central office policy staff, were established during the planning phase of the project. During this period, the user groups met weekly and were involved in establishing

requirements and making recommendations to the project team. During development, user groups met monthly and reviewed project deliverables. User groups resumed weekly meetings during the implementation period and continued in the role of reviewing project progress.

4.7 MIS Participation

State technical personnel were involved in the project during all phases, and their involvement focused on analysis, testing, and quality assurance (QA) functions. State technical staff were involved primarily in establishing requirements and making recommendations; specification development, coding, and documentation activities were performed by the contractor. State systems staff participating in the development effort included a project manager, two system analysts, a programmer analyst, two system test analysts, two user test analysts, and a quality assurance manager.

The contractor, EDS, provided the following staff to develop DCIS: a project manager, four system analysts, four programmer analysts, six programmers, three specification writers, three system test analysts, three user test analysts, two QA managers, two QA/QC staff, and two documentation specialists.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

There were some problems with conversion and initial worker training for Part A functionality. The average time for case conversion was estimated to be 30 minutes, but on average, actual case conversions required 90 minutes. State staff attributed this to the system being slow and incomplete. The system was still being changed when training and conversion began. Another system problem encountered during conversion was downtime. With the increased case conversion time, EWs worked overtime to meet the overall conversion timeframes. State staff indicated that workers experienced considerable difficulty in learning to use DCIS. This was attributed to several factors such as inadequate documentation, system problems and changes, and worker fatigue.

As discussed in section 4.3, the original project schedule was delayed as a result of requirements added during the development period. The notice modifications, in particular, delayed development. A Federal court order required that DCIS notice functions be modified to meet basic Federal regulatory requirements. The State hired a contractor to perform a feasibility study and, following its completion, shifted some resources from planned DCIS development activities to the notice modification task. This delayed completion of Part B of the DCIS development effort.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

DCIS planning began in 1981, before states were required to examine other states' systems as potential transfer candidates. Therefore, Delaware did not consider transferring a system from another State and did not review other states' systems. Furthermore, Delaware staff indicated that their preference, in the absence of Federal requirements, would be customized development rather than transfer of an existing system.

Delaware's system has not been transferred to any other state.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the Delaware Client Information System. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting DCIS are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** IBM 9000/320
MVS/XA, IMS/DL/I, CICS, ACF2
- **Disk:** IBM 3380
Storage Tek 3380
Memorex 3682
Amdahl 6880
- **Tape:** Storage Tek 4674 Reel
- **Printers:** IBM 6262 Impact
Xerox 4090 Laser
- **Front Ends:** COMTEN/NCR 5660
- **Workstations:** Memorex/Telex 3270-type
- **Telecommunications:** Fourteen SNA 9.6 KB multi-dropped land lines

A detailed hardware inventory is included as Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The operating environment consists of several components. This section describes these components, which include the current operating environment, maintenance,

because of the State's lower salary levels and limited training opportunities for staff members.

Contractors are not currently involved in supporting DCIS, and the State does not have plans for contractor involvement in the future. When the system was first implemented, however, the State retained three contractors for a period of six months to provide programming support.

OIS operates two additional data centers in Dover and Wilmington. The Dover center was created in 1982/1983 to replace the New Castle center and is the primary processing site for Delaware. It is connected to New Castle via a T1 circuit, which allows the exchange of data between the two sites. Acquisition authority for all locations resides with the Dover planning staff.

Hardware and software maintenance are scheduled as required. Hardware and software changes are incorporated based on risk factors, criticality of the change, and needs of the user. File reorganizations are performed every weekend. Complete backups of all files are done weekly; incremental file backups are performed daily. Backups are stored offsite.

A service agreement between OIS and DHSS was implemented in 1990. Under the agreement, OIS committed to providing 3 second response time 95 percent of the time, 98 percent up time for the on-line application, and timely completion of scheduled batch work 99 percent of the time.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Delaware has a small network supporting DCIS. Fourteen 9.6 kilobyte (KB) SNA multi-dropped leased lines comprise the entire network. The lines are not multiplexed; instead they are connected directly to the COMTEN FEP in New Castle.

The State has initiated work on a project to implement a Banyan wide area network (WAN) within DHSS. It is probable that the existing leased line network will be switched to the Banyan WAN in the future; however, concrete plans to accomplish this have not yet been developed.

6.2.4 System Performance

The IBM 9000/320 was installed in January 1992 and State staff believe that it is performing extremely well. Average utilization for first shift is approximately 50 percent for all workloads, with production using 25 percent of available capacity. Mainframe utilization increases to nearly 100 percent when testing and ad hoc reporting are being performed. There are dispatching algorithms, however, that allow production to have the highest priority.

Direct access storage device (DASD) space is in great demand, and authorization for additional equipment has not been approved by the State legislature. Whenever additional disk space is obtained, it is quickly filled because there are pending requests for space.

The average daily transaction count for the system is 71,500 transactions. The aggregate number of system transactions cannot be broken down by program; therefore, a transaction count, for FSP only, is not available.

6.2.5 System Response

Response times are not tracked by State staff. Both State FSP and systems personnel indicated that production response times were within the guidelines -- three second on-line responses 95 percent of the time -- established in the service agreement between OIS and DHSS.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Downtime was not considered to be a current problem in Delaware, but there were some past problems with system reliability due to power fluctuations and peripheral failures. DHSS systems personnel and OIS data center staff shared this view. Program personnel expressed some concern about periodic downtime; however, the implementation of the battery backup equipment resolved many of the environmental problems that resulted in system downtime. State staff indicated that disk failures had a negative impact on system reliability. The majority of the peripheral failure problems were eliminated when the State replaced all of the Memorex single density disks with double density disks.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Planned upgrades over the next 12 to 24 months include:

- Upgrading from MVS/XA to MVS/ESA.
- Implementing DB2 for new database development.
- Implementing SYSOUT Archival Retrieval (SAR) to provide for on-line report viewing, a feature that is expected to be used extensively.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the following topics: DCIS development costs and approved Federal funding, on-going DCIS operating costs, and cost allocation methodologies applied to allocating DCIS development and operational costs.

7.1 DCIS Development Costs and Federal Funding

Planning for DCIS was initiated in 1981 and the initial APD was submitted in 1982. The initial cost estimate for the DCIS development effort was \$1,945,096.⁶

Development costs of \$5,126,418 were incurred from 1983 through 1992.⁷ The Food Stamp Program share of these costs was \$849,759, or 16.6 percent. AFDC was allocated 77.9 percent, or \$3,993,149. The Medicaid Program was allocated the remaining share, 5.5 percent, which totalled \$283,510.

The development effort consisted of several distinct periods. The initial development effort occurred from 1983 through 1985. Development costs of \$2,016,344 were incurred during that time. The FSP share of total development costs was 3.7 percent, or \$73,766. AFDC and Medicaid shares were \$1,886,434 (93.6 percent) and \$56,144 (2.8 percent), respectively. Additional development costs of \$629,035, which were incurred between 1986 and 1988, were allocated in total to AFDC. From 1989 through 1991, a DCIS enhancement effort added \$2,481,039 to the total DCIS development costs. The FSP share of the enhancement totalled \$775,993, or 31.3 percent. AFDC and Medicaid were allocated \$1,477,680 (59.6 percent) and \$227,366 (9.2 percent), respectively.

7.1.1 DCIS System Components

The initial design of DCIS supported the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medical Assistance (Medicaid), and State Programs.

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

Contractor costs were the only DCIS development cost component for which any detailed cost information was available. In 1983, the development contractor, Electronic Data Systems, was awarded a fixed price contract with a value of \$681,403. The period of performance specified in the contract was one year. EDS responsibilities included developing both the system and detail designs; performing system testing and acceptance testing; preparing documentation; and supporting transition, conversion, site preparation, and implementation activities. The contract period was extended, and the value of the contract was increased during the DCIS project. Detailed data specifically addressing the contract extension and the funding increases were unavailable.

The costs for State personnel involved in the development effort and hardware costs associated with DCIS development were not specifically identified in available documentation. A June 3, 1983 letter from the FNS Mid-Atlantic Regional Office

⁶ Source: State Automation Study, Cost Survey.

⁷ The source of all development costs presented in this section is an April 15, 1993 spreadsheet, *Food Stamp USDA-169, FFY 1983 to 1992*.

provided approval for an RFP to acquire data processing hardware to support DCIS, but actual expenditures for hardware were not provided.

7.2 DCIS Operational Costs

DCIS operational costs are allocated among AFDC, FSP, and Medicaid Programs. Total operational costs for the system and the share allocated to each program for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1989 through FFY 1992 are provided in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 DCIS Operating Costs

FFY	Total DCIS Operating Costs	FSP Share	AFDC Share	Medicaid Share
1989	\$720,184	\$319,077	\$306,253	\$94,854
1990	\$1,276,024	\$454,029	\$772,978	\$49,017
1991	\$1,524,585	\$339,592	\$1,150,615	\$34,378
1992	\$1,023,683	\$428,768	\$507,549	\$87,366

Table 7.2, DCIS FSP Operating Costs, presents the total costs of operating DCIS, the dollar amount allocated to FSP, the percentage of total costs allocated to FSP, and the FNS share of total costs after matching at the 50 percent Federal financial participation (FFP) rate for FFY 1990 through FFY 1992.

Table 7.2 DCIS FSP Operating Costs⁸

FFY	Total DCIS Operating Costs	FSP Share percent	FSP Share (before FFP)	FNS Share (with 50% FFP)
1990	\$1,276,024	35.58%	\$454,029	\$227,015
1991	\$1,524,585	22.27%	\$339,592	\$169,976
1992	\$1,023,683	41.88%	\$428,768	\$214,384

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

The monthly cost per case for DCIS for FY 1992 was \$2.08. This cost was calculated using the 1992 food stamp monthly caseload of 17,164 households and the 1992 average monthly FSP share of DCIS operational costs, \$35,731.

⁸ Source: *Food Stamp USDA-169* spreadsheet, April 15, 1993.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The DCIS system runs on a mainframe computer that resides in a state-owned and operated data center managed by the Office of Information Systems. OIS bills DHSS monthly for the resources used by the automated systems that support the Department's assistance programs. The bill is broken down by agency cost center and summarized by department.

A job accounting system collects resource usage statistics for each job processed. The resource usage items accumulated and tracked include:

- CPU time
- Print lines
- Tape usage
- Network usage

The billing system used by OIS applies standard rates to the units of resources used. Upon receipt, DHSS allocates the computer charges to the programs supported based on the allocation methodology described below.

7.3 Delaware Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the methodologies used to allocate DCIS development costs and DCIS operating and Department administrative costs to the Food Stamp Program.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology

The basis used to allocate budgeted DCIS development costs to FNS was not available; however, the development costs originally were allocated to the Federal agencies and the State as follows:

- DHHS/Office of Family Assistance (OFA) - 18.2 percent
- DHHS/Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) - 12.7 percent
- FNS - 17.4 percent
- State - 51.7 percent

Following Delaware's decision to develop DCIS as a FAMIS-compatible system, the cost allocation percentages from the original APD were revised. Under the revised cost allocation methodology, functions benefitting the AFDC program were allocated between

OFA and the State at a 90 percent Federal to 10 percent State division. The revised cost allocation percentages were, after Federal match, as follows:⁹

- DHHS/OFA - 60.8 percent
- DHHS/HCFA - 5.5 percent
- FNS - 8.2 percent
- State - 25.5 percent

7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

The methodology used to allocate DCIS operating costs and DSS administration costs is based on the function code. The function code is comprised of a two-position program identifier and a two-position organizational unit. The program identifier designates the public assistance program or programs which are to be allocated a portion of any cost item assigned to the function code.

Each cost item that is assigned a function code is further grouped into one of four expense categories:

- **Salaries.** All compensation to employees in return for services rendered are included in this category.
- **Other (or Non-Salary).** All non-salary expenditures incurred to support functions performed by employees (such as office materials and supplies) are included in this group.
- **Purchase of Services.** All payments to a vendor or provider of services (such as day care center management, OIS for DCIS operations) are included in this category.
- **Client Payments.** All direct payments to clients of programs administered by DHSS are accumulated in this expense category.

Salaries are connected to programs based on personnel transaction documents which are completed for every hire, termination, and transfer. These documents are completed by unit supervisors and personnel officers who assign the appropriate function code and record it on the personnel transaction document. The document is then reviewed by the Bureau of Human Services Planning employee responsible for the allocation plan.

Other, purchase of services, and client payments expenses are connected to programs on accounting transaction documents (such as, invoices, requisitions, adjustments, and cash collections). The function code associated with expense items in these categories is recorded on the accounting transaction document.

⁹ DCIS APD, Amendment-1, December 23, 1982.

Depending on the number of programs to which a particular expense is connected, the expense is further assigned one of three types:

- ***Direct.*** The cost item benefits only one program.
- ***Multi-program or Cost Pool Direct.*** The cost item benefits more than one program, but not all programs.
- ***Indirect.*** The cost item benefits all DHSS programs.

If an expense item's type is *direct*, the program code will be associated with one of eleven direct cost pools. These pools include:

- Aid to Families with Dependent Children
- General Assistance
- Food Stamp Program
- Refugee Resettlement Program (RRP)
- Medicaid - 50 percent FFP
- Medicaid - 75 percent FFP
- Social Service Block Grant
- Title XX - 5 percent Administration
- JOBS
- Special Grants
- All DHHS

If an expense item's type is either *multi-program or indirect*, the cost of the item is accumulated into one of 12 allocated cost pools. These pools, the types of organizations for which costs are accumulated into each pool, and the basis for their allocation, is presented in Exhibit A-7.1, Allocated Cost Pools.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF DELAWARE

EXHIBITS

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

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required 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 DHHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	N/A	N/A	N/A
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**	Y	Y*	Y
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**	Y	Y	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification regulations of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	Y	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification regulations of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	Y	Y*	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification regulations of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	Y	Y*	Y

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

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required 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 regulations of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary regulations 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 regulations 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 regulations of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	N/A	N/A	N/A

* These changes were implemented manually. Computer changes required to implement the provisions through the automated system have not been made yet.

** 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 Delaware Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
9000/320	IBM	Purchase/Lease	24 channels, 64 megabyte (MB) main storage, 22 MIPS
DISK			
3380	IBM	Purchase/Lease	3880 Controllers (4) Drives (10)
3682	Memorex	Purchase/Lease	3888 Controllers (2) Drives (8)
3380	Storage Tek	Purchase/Lease	8880 Controllers (1) Drives (4)
Solid State - 6880	Amdahl	Purchase	Controllers (1) Drives (1)
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives - 4674	Storage Tek	Purchase/Lease	Controller (1) Drives (6)
PRINTERS			
Impact	IBM	Purchase/Lease	6262 (1)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase/Lease	4090 (1)
FRONT END PROCESSORS			
FEP	COMTEN/ NCR	Purchase/Lease	5660 (1)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Terminals	Memorex/ Telex	Purchase/Lease	3270-type (513)

**Exhibit A-7.1
Allocated Cost Pools**

COST UNITS	COST POOL	ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY
Division of Business Administration and General Services (DBAGS): Welfare Fraud Units	Welfare Fraud Unit - DBAGS	A time study conducted each quarter accumulates effort by program benefitted. The salaries accumulated into the cost pool are allocated based on the computed percentage of effort devoted to each program.
Division of Business Administration and General Services: Social Service Grants Client Payments Section Contracts Management/Program Monitoring	Claims & Collection, Client Payments, Special Projects, Contracts Management, and Social Service Grants - DBAGS (A)	
Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation (DPRE): Director's Office Bureau of Human Services Planning	Bureau of Human Services Planning - DPRE	
Division of Social Services: Economic Services	Economic Service Workers - DSS	
Division of Social Services: Common Support	Common Support - DSS	
Division of Social Services: Planning, Review, and Evaluation (PRE) Programs, Policy & Development Unit (PPDU)	PPDU & PRE	
Division of Social Services: Systems	Systems	
Division of Business Administration and General Services: Office of Management Services	Office of Management Services - DBAGS	
Division of Social Services: Multi-Program	Multi-program Regional	

**Exhibit A-7.1
Allocated Cost Pools**

COST UNITS	COST POOL	ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY
DHSS Personnel and Staff Development (staff development only)	Staff Development	The Staff Development Report is used each quarter to accumulate training hours directly associated with each program benefitted. All accumulated training hours that benefit more than one program are allocated to each program based on the time studies of the organizational units benefiting from the training. The expenses of the Staff Development units are allocated based on the computed percentage of hours devoted to each program.
Department of Health and Social Services: DHSS Director's office Deputy Director - Management Information Services Program Managers Fiscal Control Contracts Operations Administration DHSS Personnel and Staff Development (personnel only) Division of Business Administration and General Services: Controller's Office	Indirect Cost Fund	The Federal portion is allocated to Federally-supported programs in proportion to the direct salaries spent on those programs.
Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation: Quality Control Unit	Quality Control - DPRE	A time study is conducted each quarter to accumulate effort by program benefitted. The total salaries accumulated into the pool are allocated based on the computed percentage of effort devoted to each program.

APPENDIX B

STATE OF DELAWARE

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 represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Delaware. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Delaware. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about 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 Delaware	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
133	63	47.4%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	32	50.8%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Delaware. The number of responses, however, is low and produces a small sample that may not be representative of the randomly selected group.

Summary of Findings

Overall, respondents are somewhat satisfied with the computer system in Delaware. They generally find it provides acceptable response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use. Nevertheless, the responses indicate some workers have problems with particular features of the system. A large majority of the workers think that the system is a great help to them, but a majority thinks the system sometimes or often adds stress to the job.

Since Delaware's current system has been operational since 1985, 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	9	28.1
Good	23	71.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	24	77.4
Good	7	22.6

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	2	6.3
Sometimes	20	62.5
Often	10	31.3

Although nearly 72 percent of eligibility workers surveyed think that overall system response time is good, EWs believe that response time deteriorates during peak periods and slow response times occur periodically. Over 77 percent of EWs feel that response times are poor during peak processing periods, and nearly 94 percent think that response time sometimes or often is too slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	3.1
Sometimes	7	21.9
Often	24	75.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	3	9.4
Sometimes	26	81.3
Often	3	9.4

A large majority of eligibility workers believe that the system often is available when they need to use it, but over 90 percent of EWs also think that the system is sometimes or often down. The system downtime, however, does not seem to be intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	4	12.5
Good	26	81.3
Excellent	2	6.3

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	67.7
Sometimes	9	29.0
Often	1	3.2

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	80.0
Sometimes	5	16.7
Often	1	3.3

How often is the system's data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	54.8

The eligibility workers generally think the system's data and computations are quite accurate; however, approximately 45 percent believes that the system sometimes or often contains out-of-date information.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	53.1
Sometimes	14	43.8
Often	1	3.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	78.1
Sometimes	5	15.6
Often	2	6.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	70.0
Sometimes	6	20.0
Often	3	10.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	74.2
Sometimes	7	22.6
Often	1	3.2

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	61.3
Sometimes	10	32.3
Often	2	6.5

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	58.6
Sometimes	10	34.5
Often	2	6.9

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	74.2
Sometimes	7	22.6
Often	1	3.2

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	65.6
Sometimes	9	28.1
Often	2	6.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	71.0
Sometimes	7	22.6
Often	2	6.5

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	62.1
Sometimes	11	37.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	86.2
Sometimes	3	10.3
Often	1	3.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	51.6
Sometimes	14	45.2
Often	1	3.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	43.5
Sometimes	5	21.7
Often	8	34.8

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	36.0
Sometimes	9	36.0
Often	7	28.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	64.5
Sometimes	6	19.4
Often	5	16.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	80.0
Sometimes	4	13.3
Often	2	6.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	62.1
Sometimes	7	24.1
Often	4	13.8

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	37.0
Sometimes	11	40.7
Often	6	22.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	20.0
Sometimes	13	52.0
Often	7	28.0

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	69.0
Sometimes	5	17.2
Often	4	13.8

Eligibility workers' responses to these questions express the belief that the system is easy to use for many functions for the majority of workers; however, there are several functions that are difficult for a significant proportion of workers. Between 22 and 35 percent of EWs report frequent difficulties in monitoring the status of hearings, tracking outstanding verifications, and identifying error prone and suspected fraud cases. At least one third of the workers also sometimes or often have problems obtaining information from the system, generating notices, restoring benefits, updating registration data, identifying cases overdue for recertification or making payments through recoupment, and automatically notifying households of case actions.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	10	31.3
Often	22	68.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	34.4
Sometimes	19	59.4
Often	2	6.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	71.9
Sometimes	7	21.9
Often	2	6.3

Eligibility workers generally think that the system helps them in their jobs. Although over 65 percent of the workers believe that the system contributes to job-related stress, about 72 percent believe that the system usually is more helpful than problematic.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	83.3
Sometimes	5	16.7

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	70.0
Sometimes	9	30.0

A significant majority of EWs feel that there are few problems associated with providing expedited service to clients.

Fraud and Errors

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

APPENDIX C

STATE OF DELAWARE

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 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 Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Delaware. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in the State. 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 EW Supervisors in Delaware	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
24	24	100.0%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	10	41.7%

Delaware only has 24 EW supervisors; therefore, the survey was sent to the entire population rather than a sample. The small size of the population and the low response rate result in a small group of responding EW supervisors, which may not be representative. Nevertheless, the survey results include input from more than 40 percent of the EW supervisor population in the State.

Summary of Findings

Most of the EW supervisors believe that the system helps them in their jobs. A majority of EW supervisors report that overall response time, system availability, and accuracy are acceptable; however, several of the EW supervisors report occurrences of slow response time and system downtime. EW supervisors feel that the system is relatively easy to use for some functions, but there are a number of areas in which significant proportions of EW supervisors believe there are problems. Supervisors agree that the system supports certain management needs, but some supervisors feel there are areas where the system does not meet their needs.

Since Delaware's current system has been operational since 1985, 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	4	40.0
Good	6	60.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	80.0
Good	2	20.0

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	10.0
Sometimes	6	60.0
Often	3	30.0

Although a majority of EW supervisors in Delaware think that overall system response time is acceptable, 80 percent think that response time during peak periods is poor. In addition, 30 percent of the supervisors feel that slow response time is a frequent problem.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	3	30.0
Often	7	70.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	10.0
Sometimes	6	60.0
Often	3	30.0

A majority of EW supervisors report that the system often is available when they need to use it; however, most supervisors also feel that there are instances of downtime. A majority of EW supervisors think that the system sometimes is down, and 30 percent think it often is unavailable. This downtime, however, apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	10.0
Good	8	80.0
Excellent	1	10.0

Ninety percent of EW supervisors feel that the quality of the system's data is 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	3	30.0
Sometimes	6	60.0
Often	1	10.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	70.0
Sometimes	3	30.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	44.4
Sometimes	5	55.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	88.9
Often	1	11.1

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	50.0
Sometimes	5	50.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	40.0
Sometimes	3	60.0

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	80.0
Sometimes	2	20.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	55.6
Sometimes	1	11.1
Often	3	33.3

EW supervisors feel that the system is relatively easy to use for some functions, but that it presents difficulties in several areas. A majority of supervisors indicate that it is rarely difficult to

perform the following functions: learning to use the system, automatically terminating benefits for failure to file, determining monthly reporting status, and restoring benefits. In contrast, at least half of EW supervisors feel that obtaining information from the system, tracking receipt of monthly reports, and generating warning or adverse action notices sometimes or often is difficult.

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	3	30.0
Often	7	70.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	40.0
Sometimes	3	30.0
Often	3	30.0

A significant majority of EW supervisors feel that the system often is a great help in performing their jobs; however, 60 percent also feel that the system sometimes or often adds stress.

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	30.0
Good	7	70.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	10.0
Good	8	80.0
Excellent	1	10.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	1	33.3
Often	2	66.7

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	20.0
Sometimes	4	80.0

EW supervisors agree that the system meets management needs in some areas, but they have divided opinions in other areas. Significant majorities of supervisors report that the quality of the reports produced by the system is good and technical staff support is good or excellent. Four out of five supervisors, however, feel that it is sometimes difficult to meet Federal reporting requirements.

Client Service

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