Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

MISSISSIPPI STATE REPORT

September 17, 1993

FINAL

Prepared for:

Martha A. Mayes, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park center Drive
Alexandria, Virginia 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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 3

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 6

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rates 7

2.4.4 Claims Collection 7

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews 8

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM 9

3.1 System Functionality 9

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity 14

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio 15

3.4 Current Automation Issues 15

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION 16

4.1 Overview of the Previous System 16

4.2 Justification for the New System 16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities 16

4.4 Conversion Approach 17

4.5 Project Management 17

4.6 FSP Participation 18

4.7 MIS Participation 18

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation . 18

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY 19

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS 21

6.1 System Profile 21

6.2 Description of Operating Environment 21

6.2.1 Operating Environment 21

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance 23

6.2.3 Telecommunications 23

6.2.4 System Performance 24

6.2.5 System Response 24

6.2.6 System Downtime 24

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans 24

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION 26

7.1 MAVERICS Development Cost and Federal Funding 26

7.1.1 MAVERICS System Components 26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

7.1.2 MAVERICS Development Cost Components 27

7.2 MAVERICS Operational Costs 28

7.2.1 Cost per Case 28

7.2.1.1 MAVERICS Operational Costs Before Implementation 28

7.2.1.1 MAVERICS Operational Costs After Implementation 28

7.2.2 MAVERICS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices 29

7.3 Mississippi Cost Allocation Methodologies 29

7.3.1 Overview of MAVERICS Development Cost Allocation Methodology 29

7.3.2 MAVERICS Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics 30

7.3.2.1 MAVERICS Cost Centers and Cost Pools 31

7.3.2.2 Bases for MAVERICS Cost Pools 32

7.3.2.3 Allocation Practices - County Indirect Costs 33

7.3.2.4 New Cost Allocation Plan Proposed for Operational Costs 33

APPENDICES

A State of Mississippi Exhibits A-1

B Analysis of Managerial User Satisfaction B-1

C Analysis of Operator User Satisfaction C-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
2.2	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	4
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Administrative Costs	5
2.4	Official Combined Payment Error Rates	7
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	8
2.6	Claims Established	8
7.1	MAVERICS Development Costs by Fiscal Year	26
7.2	MAVERICS Development Cost Components	27
7.3	MAVERICS Operational Costs	28
7.4	MAVERICS Enhancement Costs	29
7.5	MAVERICS Cost Pools	31

APPENDIX A - State of Mississippi Exhibits

Exhibit No.		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Mississippi - MAVERICS Hardware	A-4
A-6.2	State of Mississippi Selected MAVERICS Software Products	A-5
A-7.1	MAVERICS Sample Cost Allocation Using New Method	A-6

Table of Contents

MISSISSIPPI STATE REPORT
Site Visit February 17-19, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name:	Mississippi Automated Verification Eligibility Reporting Information Control System (MAVERICS)
Start Date:	March 1986
Completion Date:	July 1988
Contractor:	Anderson Consulting
Transfer From:	North Dakota Technical Eligibility Computer System (TECS)
Cost:	
Actual:	$8,738,408
Projected:	
FNS Share:	$4,187,084
FNS %:	47.9%
Number of Users:	1,122 (local offices)
Basic Architecture:	
Mainframe:	IBM 3090-600J (MVS/VS)
Workstations:	Memorex-Telex 079 terminals
Telecommunications Network:	24 analog circuits, 960 BPS lines
System Profile:	
Programs:	FS, AFDC, Medicaid

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

Responsibility for the Food Stamp Program resides within the Division of Economic Assistance of the Mississippi Department of Human Services (MDHS). MDHS administers the field and State operations responsible for economic assistance programs such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp Program (FSP), Medicaid, Child Support, Child Welfare, and JOBS. MDHS also administers other programs such as Aging/Adult Services, Community Services, Family & Children's Services, and Youth Services.

Mississippi is primarily rural (52.9 percent) with a total population of 2,592,000 as of 1991. Approximately 20 percent of the population receive FSP benefits. The major metropolitan area in the State is Jackson, the capitol, with a population of 196,600. The next largest metropolitan areas - Biloxi, Greenville, and Meridian - have populations of 45,000 to 46,000. Only two of the 82 counties have more than one county office. County offices are the administrative level at which individuals apply for food stamp benefits as well as other economic assistance and social services.

Mississippi's industries produce furniture, clothes and textiles, automotive parts, and lumber and wood-related products. Agriculture remains a major part of the economy. Along the Gulf Coast, fishing, particularly for oysters and shrimp, is a major industry. The oil and gas industry also has played a major role in the State's economy. Due to the seasonal nature of the agricultural and fishing industries and the recent recession in the oil industry, Mississippi's employment opportunities are somewhat limited. Riverboat gambling has recently been introduced and is bringing more revenue into the State.

Between 1983 and 1990, unemployment rates fell from a high of 12.6 percent to a low of 7.5 percent. In 1991, the unemployment rate began to increase again, to 8.6 percent. In that year, the percentage of people in poverty was 23.7 percent, up from 22 percent 1989.[1] The lack of industry in the State makes the overall employment situation for Mississippi very bleak and is expected to continue to impact Food Stamp Program participation rates.

According to the October 1992 edition of *The Fiscal Survey of States*, published by the National Governors' Association and National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Mississippi 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.
- Mississippi made budget cuts of $75.8 million from the State's 1992 budget, mainly in areas not directly affecting public assistance.
- Mississippi increased revenues by $166 million through the expansion of the State sales tax.

[1] U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Unemployment Insurance Statistics

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The Food Stamp Program operates under the Division of Economic Assistance, which divides Mississippi into twelve Economic Assistance Areas. Each area is headed by an Area Director. Each County Welfare Director reports to a Division of Economic Assistance Area Director.

Since July 1988, the Mississippi Automated Verification Eligibility Reporting Information Control System (MAVERICS) has supported the Food Stamp, AFDC, and Medicaid programs. Within MDHS, MAVERICS application maintenance support is provided by the Division of Management Information Systems (MIS), a support group that reports to the Deputy Director of Administration. MAVERICS, like other applications that support Mississippi State agencies, is operated by the Central Data Processing Authority (CDPA). CDPA provides hardware and system software, controls and manages the statewide communication network, is responsible for the procurement of equipment for all State agencies, and sets standards for system development.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Over the last five years, household participation in the Food Stamp Program has increased approximately 17 percent, with the greatest increase occurring in FY 1991 and 1992. In contrast, the increase in AFDC participation has been much lower at 1.4 percent. Participation levels in Mississippi are provided in Table 2.1 below. The Foster Care and Child Support Programs are supported by separate automated systems that eventually will interface with MAVERICS.

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs in FY 1988 was 18:1. Since FY 1988, there has been a steady decrease in the administrative costs relative to total benefits issued. In FY 1991, the ratio of benefits issued to administrative costs had improved to 21:1.

The average monthly food stamp benefit per household in FY 1991 was $173.46, an increase of 14.6 percent ($22.05) since FY 1988 (see Table 2.2). The total annual benefits disbursed in Mississippi over the same period increased by 27.8 percent, from $304.5 million to $389.2 million.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC - cases[2] AFDC - individuals	60,989 177,535	60,030 177,107	59,865 177,878	58,998 175,845	60,121 180,734
Foster Care Cases	943	779	728	706	668
GA - cases[3] GA - individuals	189 248	161 214	160 204	176 230	177 209
FSP - households FSP - individuals	197,973 541,616	188,613 523,095	176,918 497,211	171,655 487,295	168,453 496,316
Medicaid only - individuals[4]	78,386	66,682	52,539	45,503	26,024
Child Support[5]	264,320	245,892	218,613	209,983	200,036

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household[6]	$173.46	$165.41	$154.88	$151.41

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Mississippi's Food Stamp Program Federal Administrative Costs (Table 2.3) have increased overall since FY 1988, while the cost per household decreased until FY 1990 and increased again in 1991.

---

[2] Source: State of Mississippi, February 1993.

[3] General assistance is not statewide, nor is it a part of MAVERICS.

[4] Medicaid only cases. MAVERICS does not determine Medicaid eligibility. It only tracks those who are eligible.

[5] Includes AFDC/Foster Care, Non-AFDC, AFDC/Foster Care Arrears Only, and Non-IV-D cases. These cases will be supported by the Mississippi Enforcement Tracking of Support System (METSS), a separate automated system currently under development.

[6] Source: Food Stamp Program State Activity Report, Food Stamp Program Average Monthly Benefit for each year.

Table 2.3. FSP Administrative Costs

	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost[7]	$18,117,118	$16,189,988	$16,275,721	$16,730,289
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$8.07	$7.61	$7.90	$8.32

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 and workloads,
- The ability to implement regulatory changes in a timely manner,
- The ability to make mass changes with a minimum amount of effort,
- Error rates,
- Claims collections, and
- User satisfaction.

There are many factors that affect FSP performance in these areas aside from the performance of the automated system. Changes in these areas cannot, therefore, be exclusively attributed to the automated systems that are in place. The information presented below was provided directly by the State or gathered from data reported by States to the Food and Nutrition Service. Anecdotal information that provides some indication of system impacts on program performance is presented when available.

2.4.1 Staffing

When Mississippi began shifting to the generic caseworker approach in 1985, there were 476 eligibility workers, 73 supervisors, and 343 clerical, reception, and cashier staff. Effective July 1, 1986, a statewide reduction in force took place and MDHS reduced eligibility worker staffing by approximately 200 workers. MDHS attributed the increase in AFDC errors that occurred at this time to the reduced staffing and the shift to generic caseworkers. MDHS has since been rebuilding county and field office staff. As of February 1993, there were 872 eligibility workers, 105 issuance workers, 120 eligibility worker supervisors, and 25 clerical staff.

[7] Source: Food Stamp Program State Activity Report, Fiscal Years 1991, 1990, 1989, and 1988 SF-269 data.

Table of Contents

The staff also expressed some concern about the implementation dates of some of the regulatory changes, stating that in some instances they would receive the policy memoranda from the FNS Regional Office after the rule was to have been implemented. There also have been time delays associated with clarifying and changing the original interpretation.

MAVERICS has improved MDHS's ability to implement mass changes, which occur on average twice a year. The amount of time to recalculate benefits and cost of living changes has been reduced from more than two working days to approximately eight to ten hours. The labor associated with mass changes has dropped from 30 hours to between 20 and 24 hours. Mississippi did have to change the application code to improve the efficiency of ADABAS calls during mass changes.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rates

MDHS noticed an increase in error rates when it shifted to generic caseworkers in 1985 and reduced the size of its labor force in 1986. Prior to that, Mississippi had a very low AFDC error rate. AFDC caseloads also were not as large as food stamp caseloads, so they were more manageable. Although error rates have increased for the three years following the 1988 implementation of MAVERICS, the error rate decreased in 1991. Mississippi's error rate was below the national average until 1990, when it increased to 10.07.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Payment Error Rates

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	10.08	9.27	10.07	9.74	8.07

For FY 1990, Mississippi calculated the total value for all error elements to be $29,049,921, and attributed a dollar amount to each error element (e.g. as errors in wages and salaries, shelter deduction). Mississippi estimated that the reduction for each error element that MAVERICS can expect to impact totals approximately $7.0 million per year in cost avoidance or a reduction of approximately 24% in error dollars.

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 below provides the total value of claims collected and claim collections (in dollars) as a percentage of claims established (in dollars) during the year. The year-to-year fluctuations in the percentage of claims collected and the 1988 data -- which shows that the value of claims collected exceeds the value of claims established -- occur because claims may not be collected in the same year in which they are established.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Collected	$1,102,339	$867,168	$875,854	$1,011,588
As a % of Total Claims Established	71.8%	41.4%	74.8%	102.4%

Another factor affecting the percentage of claims collected is the total number of claims established. The number and dollar value of claims established are provided in Table 2.6.[8] MDHS attributes the increase in the number of claims established between 1989 and 1991 to the implementation of the current MAVERICS system and an increased emphasis on establishing claims in the system. The number of new claims that can be established in any given year is also affected by eligibility worker staffing. This is illustrated by the decrease in claims established between 1990 and 1991, which MDHS attributes to staff vacancies.

Table 2.6 Claims Established

	1991	1990	1989	1988
Number of Claims Established	3,877	5,283	3,324	3,024
Dollar Value of Claims Established	$1,534,225	$2,093,066	$1,170,296	$987,466

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Family Support Administration conducted its Certification Review in September 1988 and certified the system in November 1988. FNS conducted a Post Implementation Review in February 1989 and approved the system in April 1989.

Both agencies made recommendations concerning the efficiency and effectiveness of the MAVERICS system The objectives of the Enhancements Project initiated in 1990 were to improve technical performance and to provide additional functional support to the users.

[8] Based on claims figures presented in the July 1992 APD.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of MAVERICS functionality, complexity, and level of integration.

3.1 System Functionality

The Food Stamp, AFDC, and Medicaid programs use a common application form. The applicant indicates the program for which he or she wishes to apply. If the applicant does not know what programs to apply to, the caseworker will provide assistance. The system does not determine the programs for which the applicant is eligible; however, the caseworker makes this determination.

State personnel involved in the initial planning of an automated system had as one of their primary objectives the elimination of paper within the public assistance process. MAVERICS has not eliminated the paper for the eligibility worker, but offers many other advantages over the previous system. Field Operations staff feel that MAVERICS provides improved caseload management for the eligibility worker.

- *Registration.* Terminals are used to register applicants. The case is established on the system and the case number is assigned by the system. The case is assigned an old case number if the client is a previous recipient. The client completes and signs an application form and submits it to the registration worker. A receptionist or clerk enters the application information into the system at the time of application or at a later time. MAVERICS searches for prior or existing participation based on the name and Social Security Number (SSN) of each household member. The clerk generally enters the date that the application is received into the system, but the receptionist may enter this information the next day.

  An automated search is conducted on each household member to determine whether the client previously participated in AFDC or the FSP. If a client participated previously, MAVERICS can copy the historical record into the current record.

  Clerical personnel screen the front page of the application to determine whether the applicant is eligible for expedited services.

- *Eligibility Determination.* A search on all household members is done during the interview if it was not done at the time of registration. Since the history file is never purged from the database, there is no time limitation for conducting this search. Eligibility workers (EW) have the capability to bypass certain data entry screens and only access the screens requiring data to be entered. There are immediate on-line data edits (on some but not all screens), and the screens emulate the format and sequence of hard copy

application forms. There are also on-line "calculator" screens to aid the caseworker. The system determines the client's eligibility.

- *Benefit Calculation.* The system automatically calculates monthly earned income and benefits, and it requires supervisory benefit authorization for all new cases and re-applications.

- *Benefit Issuance.* Two types of issuance are performed in Mississippi: over-the-counter (OTC) and mail issuance. When MAVERICS was implemented, the issuance system was automated. In the prior system, two individuals were required to staff each county issuance unit. Under MAVERICS, only one person is needed in each unit unless mail issuance is performed. Two people are still required for mail issuance because a second person is required for verification. With OTC issuance, the system prints a form indicating the benefit allotment amount, and the recipient signs the form indicating receipt of the coupons. The recipient comes to a central point in the county for the coupons. MAVERICS permits issuance by itinerant issuance workers as well. The itinerant issuance worker is provided with a listing of recipients who are to receive coupons at a specified location. Upon receipt of the coupons, the recipient signs the listing. At the end of the business day, when the issuance worker returns to the office, data concerning recipients who received coupons that day are entered into the central computer system.

  The worker enters the following types of data on-line: undelivered coupons, stolen coupons, returned benefit documents, mail issuance, itinerant issuance, and replacement benefit requests. Replacement benefits can be issued in the same day's daily issuance process. MAVERICS links the document numbers of the original and replacement issuances, displays the entire issuance history on-line, and provides information for preparation of federally required issuance reports. MAVERICS also prints a label that is mailed to counties for use in mailing coupons and checks zip codes against a table for validity. For OTC issuance, MAVERICS prints a receipt to be signed by the recipient upon receiving benefits. The system creates monthly issuance files for on-going cases and daily files for new approvals.

  Expedited issuance is possible on the same day the application is submitted.

- *Notices.* The system generates automatic notices to households and also provides the capability for generating worker-initiated notices. Only a few notices are automatic, such as the notice of expiration of certification period or of a change in the benefit amount. A small portion of the notices are combined AFDC and FS notices. The EW has the option of entering text information on all notices that are worker-initiated. Each notice permits five lines of customized text. The system puts the text into a retrievable notice history file.

The central office issues all notices. EWs can print the text and mail the notice if they wish. The EW also can complete a "manual" notice and mail it if time is an issue.

- *Claims System*. The claims system is integrated with the food stamp system and is a part of the original system. The State office enters the following claims information on-line: the cause of over or under payments, whether fraud is suspected, and recoupments that have been entered.

  If an overpayment is discovered, the EW completes a paper form and sends it to the State Corrective Action/Claims Management Unit (State Office), which reviews the form for correct application of policy and approval of the amount to be recouped/collected. The Claims Management Unit makes necessary corrections. The amount is determined manually outside of MAVERICS. Once the claim has been established, approved, and established in MAVERICS by the State Office, the State Office mails a copy of the approved claim form back to the county. It is the county's responsibility from that point. At the county level, the EW can modify the claim and put in the effective date and plan of action but cannot "establish" the claim.

  The corrected benefit allotment amount is calculated by the eligibility worker, who enters data into a paper claim. The worker can override the State Office calculations for recoupment. As long as there is activity, MAVERICS maintains the record indefinitely. The system purges inactive files after 90 days.

  The system tracks the claim status, calculates the monthly recoupment amount (if recoupment is the selected collection method), subtracts the recoupment amount from the recipient's monthly benefit issuance, generates a notice to the client about the overpayment or underpayment, and automatically creates a collection record (to be completed by the collection unit) once the claim has been established. All paper claims must be approved by the County Director.

  The collection method is determined by the eligibility worker and the State Office worker. The collection system deducts recoupments as part of the issuance process, provides a screen displaying complete collection/recoupment history to the EW, and generates a hard copy notice of the claim demand letter to the EW and the client.

  Demand letters are sent by the State Office once the claim is established. Clients have the opportunity to choose the payment method. If the client does not select a repayment method within ten days, the system automatically sets up a recoupment plan.

- *Computer Matching*. MAVERICS performs matching against the following sources prior to initial certification:

- State Data Exchange (SDX) for SSI benefit information,
- IRS for income and asset information,
- Beneficiary Earnings Exchanges System (BEERS) for SSA wages,
- Mississippi State Employment Security Commission,
- BENDEX (Beneficiary Data Exchange), and
- SSA validation of SSNs.

Duplicate participation checks are performed by the system on-line at application, on-line after initial application, and when a new household member is added. MAVERICS checks duplicate participation against the State database, adjoining counties' databases, and adjoining States' databases (occasionally for Florida and Illinois).

All discrepancies are reported to the EW. Discrepancies are reported in the form of on-line alert messages to the worker's screen and individual hard copy printouts (monthly). Mississippi does not set thresholds for reporting discrepancies. Most discrepancies are due to differences in reporting periods. Since the income reported to Social Security and the monthly income in MAVERICS will never match, a number of alerts that need to be verified are generated.

The system captures the employer ID for each source of earnings reported by a food stamp recipient to reduce discrepancies when matching files of employer wage reporting.

The EW cannot delete discrepancy items or alerts in MAVERICS, but the worker can move them to a history file. The system requires that the EW respond to all discrepancy alerts. MAVERICS monitors the time spent on discrepancies based on the date it was created and the date the EW marked the discrepancy as changed or no change.

Match resolutions are tracked by MAVERICS and reported to the EW and the EW Supervisor. A weekly report of outstanding items is provided to the supervisor.

- ***Alerts.*** MAVERICS provides an outstanding alerts report which can be printed weekly by the supervisor, but supervisors often do not print the report because it ties up the local printer. On-line alerts that exist as of that weekend are available to the worker. The system provides two reminders to EWs: that requested information has not been received, and that data needs to be verified.

On-line alerts consist of:

- Discrepancies reported through the Information Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) if the EW is working the case,
- Notices to be sent,
- Notice that redetermination is due,
- Notice that the application is pending,
- Notice that the case is transferred from one worker to another,
- Outstanding notice situations,
- Verification is pending,
- Monthly report is due, and
- Monthly report has been received and needs to be worked.

Two types of alerts exist: worker-set alerts and system-generated alerts. All IEVS alerts are system generated. Each county gets a weekly report of IEVS alerts. Alerts related to IRS and BEERS/BENDEX are on paper (to provide confidentiality); the SDX, BENDEX, Wages, and unemployment are on-line.

Alerts are prioritized (ranked in seriousness) by MAVERICS according to due date. Alerts can be deleted in groups or individually.

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** MAVERICS generates monthly reporting forms automatically at the time of monthly rollover. The forms are sent out with AFDC checks or mailed separately for food stamp only recipients. The monthly report forms are sent to the county office by the seventh day of each month. Before MAVERICS implementation in 1987, monthly reporting was a batch system for generating the forms. The system did not include tracking, automatic closure, and notice of non-return.

  MAVERICS produces the monthly report forms for mailing, directs the returned forms to the EW, generates warning notices to clients whose reports are late, and automatically closes the case if the monthly report form is not received.

  MAVERICS provides automated screens to indicate the status of monthly report forms and automatically generates a second notice of non-return. If a monthly report has not been received 10 days later or if it is incomplete, the case is closed. This occurs on the 17th day of the month.

  Clerical workers enter monthly reporting information into the system. Data entered includes the case number and the process month; MAVERICS automatically enters the date the report was received. The EW reviews the report to determine its completeness and updates MAVERICS if there has been a change. If a report is incomplete, the EW returns it to the household. The system prints a list that breaks out the cases by county at rollover. This is used to make sure that all cases are completed. One copy is provided to

the supervisor, and the other copy goes to the EW. For incomplete monthly reports, EWs are required to prepare manual notices to be mailed to clients indicating what information is missing.

- *Reports.* Each month a list of the active caseload for each EW is printed. The report includes closures, recertifications and redeterminations, overdues, monthly reporting cases, and new IEVS alerts.

- *Program Management and Administration.* The system also provides electronic mail for State offices, county directors, and some supervisory personnel. It is used to disseminate policy changes and notifications of policy changes statewide. The system is not a true E-mail system, and EWs do not have access to it.

  Although MAVERICS offers no special state-of-the-art technological features to the worker, it has improved the worker's ability to manage their work and has eliminated some labor intensive activities.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

MAVERICS determines eligibility and calculates benefits for AFDC and Food Stamp recipients. For Medicaid-only applicants, eligibility is determined manually. Eligible Medicaid recipients then are entered into the system and tracked by MAVERICS. The level of program integration is relatively low.

While Mississippi lacks a General Assistance program, it does have a general relief program. Funds for this program are appropriated by the County Board of Supervisors to the County Human Services Offices for allocation in emergency situations to individuals and families in need. Not all counties request or receive funds. The dollar value is extremely low. The general relief caseload is not included in MAVERICS.

The child support caseload reflected in Table 2.1 includes AFDC/Foster Care, Non-AFDC, AFDC/Foster Care Arrears Only, and Non-IV-D cases. These cases are not in MAVERICS, but will be included in the METSS system that is under development and which will interface with MAVERICS. METSS will reside on the same computer as MAVERICS but is considered a separate system. MAVERICS will make referrals for IV-D services. Absent parent information will be transferred to METSS overnight. MAVERICS also will provide the AFDC grant dollars to METSS overnight. METSS will process the information and transfer the results back to the MAVERICS collection information file. Once the JOBS system has been developed and implemented, MAVERICS will interface with this program as well. After all of the interfaces are completed, the level of integration and complexity of MAVERICS will increase.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

MAVERICS is designed to provide a workstation for each caseworker, issuance clerk, supervisor, and one workstation for every three clerical workers. There currently remains a small number of eligibility workers who do not have a workstation.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

Mississippi would like to implement several enhancements to MAVERICS. These enhancements include:

- Integration of the claims processing and tracking system, which currently is a separate stand-alone system
- Interfaces between MAVERICS and METSS, the soon to be implemented system that supports the JOBS program and Title IV-D (child support)
- Development of an on-line policy manual with Federal regulations and policies for county offices
- Automation of the State Medicaid Programs to determine Medicaid eligibility for non-AFDC cases

System processing changes have focused on improving system performance and increasing system response time for the eligibility workers. System changes, as well as policy changes, have taken priority over functional improvements.

Early in MAVERICS implementation, MDHS recognized the desirability of increased computer capacity and direct access storage, as well as the need for changes in the system applications to enhance system performance. In 1989, after making some system architecture modifications (discussed later in the systems section), Mississippi submitted an Advanced Planning Document Update (APDU) requesting Federal funding for additional computer processing power (CPU), direct access storage (DASD) capacity, and additional staffing (through the State's CDPA) to make the system operate more efficiently. Conditional approval was received in 1990, contingent on the submittal of a cost allocation methodology that included the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), so that HCFA would pay its fair share for Medicaid functions.

In late 1992, Mississippi received approval for a new computer. Once more DASD has been added, Mississippi will be able to proceed more quickly in implementing the required changes and the desirable enhancements to MAVERICS.

Table of Contents

10 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

MAVERICS was tested in Rankin County. The test period had to be lengthened from one month to two months because retrospective budgeting and rollover could not be tested in one month. Many changes had to be made as each new county was implemented because MAVERICS had problems handling the increased volumes. As each new county was added, the system would run out of workspace and response time problems occurred. Other problems, such as the need to increase the maximum number of members in a household, also were identified during testing.

Statewide implementation was accomplished in July 1988, and by April 1989, Mississippi had received written notification from both DHHS and FNS of MAVERICS certification and acceptance. Both agencies, however, suggested system improvements. The total system life cycle cost at this time was estimated to be $50,871,458, more than double of the original estimate of $23.3 million.

In January 1990, Mississippi submitted an APD Update and request for funding for enhancements to MAVERICS as recommended by both DHHS and FNS for equipment upgrades, additional staffing, and upgrades to the telecommunications network.

The State provided training for all county staff -- clerks, eligibility workers, and supervisory personnel -- in phases. Clerical personnel and eligibility workers received one week of training, and supervisory personnel received two weeks of training. Since all counties except one had shifted to a generic caseworker approach prior to the implementation of MAVERICS, the training for MAVERICS focused on the system. Generic training is now performed locally by the area directors. The "buddy" system is also used for this type of training.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Case information was converted at the county level. Whenever possible, data was automatically converted. Information that had been entered into the old AFDC batch system was put into MAVERICS. Food stamp only cases had to be entered manually, and Food Stamp issuance records had to be converted manually. Each county had to load issuance cards for all active cases into the system over a two-to-three-day weekend in Jackson. The most difficult cases to convert were combination cases and cases with missing pieces or errors. On average, it required 30 to 45 minutes to convert each case.

The conversion began in January 1987 and was completed in March 1988. In October 1987, an interim CPU, the size of an IBM 3090-200, was installed. The database had to be segmented at that time.

4.5 Project Management

The Project Manager was drawn from the MIS staff and reported to the Executive Director of MDHS. The Project Manager was 100% devoted to the project.

4.6 FSP Participation

User Work Groups were established that included participants from the State and the county offices. The groups consisted of four eligibility workers -- from county offices statewide -- and one County Director.

4.7 MIS Participation

MIS staff involved in the MAVERICS Project included the Director, Data Services, the Project Director, four analysts, and two programmers.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

The major problems experienced during implementation were related to Mississippi's caseload and CPU capacity. The capacity problem was not anticipated during the transfer, but was identified after the first several counties were implemented. Further implementation had to be halted until additional CPU capacity and DASD could be added. In addition, Mississippi segmented the database (ADABAS and CICS regions) to improve system performance and response time.

State staff believe that the State has experienced considerable delays in their system project schedule while awaiting Federal approval of their Advanced Planning Documents (APDs). The State has had to wait as long as six months for approvals. The considerable impact of the delays is related to the State legislature and the State funding cycles. In one instance, the State had approved and set aside funding for a CPU, but when Federal approval and funding were delayed the State funding was lost. To obtain State funding, MDHS must document the request in the three-year information system project work plan and in the Agency's overall budget. To obtain funding in 1994, the projected cost must be placed in the work plan in 1992. When Federal approvals are delayed, the State agency must reapply for the State funds, delaying the project even further.

In one instance, a request for funding additional DASD was submitted a year ago, but has had to be "reapproved" several times. Apparently FNS approved it and allotted a specific time frame for the bid and acquisition to take place. But the DHHS units, HCFA and Administration for Children and Families (ACF), did not approve the APD in time for the State to meet FNS's specified time frame.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

When MAVERICS was transferred from North Dakota, the anticipated caseload was approximately 160,000 Food Stamp cases and 60,000 AFDC cases. At that time, the number of Medicaid recipients was unknown. The original North Dakota system was designed to handle approximately 115,000 cases. When MAVERICS implementation began, Mississippi did not know that the system was inadequate for their caseload. Implementation had to be stopped in order to segment the database into four ADABAS and CICS regions. This split allowed Mississippi to gain more computer power. The segmentation of the database into four database regions was an innovative solution to a complex problem.

From 1984 to 1986, the State of Mississippi undertook a planning effort to design a paperless eligibility determination system. After two years with little success, the Federal government put an end to further funding of the development effort and recommended instead that the State transfer the North Dakota TEC system that previously had been transferred from Alaska. The only State requirement was that the two systems utilize the same type of hardware. Mississippi at the time had IMS, but they were willing to train their systems personnel in ADABAS DBMS. The State utilized the requirements that had been prepared for the previous system in order to identify changes that would need to be made in the North Dakota system. Although MDHS personnel were disappointed that they were unable to reduce the amount of paper that was required in the eligibility determination process, they believed that the transfer helped the State keep up with regulatory changes. MDHS staff indicated they would probably still be developing their own system if they had not decided to transfer an existing system. State officials believed they had underestimated the staffing requirements for the development effort.

State system personnel report that transferring an existing system involves both advantages and disadvantages. One disadvantage identified was that transferring an existing system limits the inventiveness and utilization of newer, more efficient technologies. The advantages of the transfer were that it:

- Facilitated implementation although it constrained some desired functionality,
- Limited the debate and demands for a more complex system,
- Provided a system that met Federal needs with respect to functionality, and
- Reduced the costs of development, even though significant modifications were required.

Mississippi may have been the first State to transfer the Alaska-developed system from North Dakota. At the time of the transfer, a number of other States also were examining the North Dakota system, including Hawaii, Arizona, Utah, and Wyoming.

Mississippi transferred about 25% of the nearly 80 system functions. Most of the functions needed to be customized to meet Mississippi requirements, and some functions needed to be fully developed. Major functional changes that were required included:

- Inclusion of Medical Assistance processing,
- Change from one-month to two-month retrospective budgeting,
- Tracking for AFDC redeterminations,
- Selective use of monthly reporting,
- Support of supervisory approval of eligibility worker decisions,
- Improved handling of AFDC Extended Medicaid coverage,
- On-line food stamp issuance,
- Modification of interfaces to meet Mississippi requirements,
- Support for three months prior Medicaid coverage for AFDC cases, and
- Accommodation of different policy for AFDC start date.

The major performance enhancement activity performed on the North Dakota system was related to splitting the database in order to obtain the computer performance needed to handle Mississippi's caseload.

Mississippi plans further enhancements to MAVERICS, such as:

- Addition of a high-level master client index,
- Addition of a date to indicate destruction of manual case folder information,
- Additional automation in archiving and reporting processes,
- Automatic notices to clients,
- Automatic claims calculations and tracking,
- On-line interface to SSA,
- Enhanced reporting capabilities,
- Additional improvements to workload management reports,
- Interfaces with IV-A and IV-F, and
- Interactive interviewing.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the MAVERICS system. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the system operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

• Mainframe:	IBM 3090-600J MVS/VS, JES2, CICS, ADABAS
• Disk:	Amdahl 3380
• Tape:	IBM 3420
• Printers:	Xerox IBM 3203 Line Memorex-Telex 387 (remote)
• Front Ends:	Amdahl
• Workstations:	Memorex-Telex 079 terminals
• Telecommunications Network:	24 analog circuits, 9600 BPS lines

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The operating environment for MAVERICS consists of several components. This section describes these components, which include the current operating system environment, maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. The section also discusses plans for the future of the system.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

MAVERICS runs seven days a week, 24 hours a day. On-line operations are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. This schedule is not always maintained since batch processing sometimes exceeds the planned batch window, which is between 7:00 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. System database maintenance, monthly report production, and issuance processing occasionally extend into the on-line hours. An IBM 9000 and an upgrade to ESA are planned in the next 12 months to alleviate this overflow.

The State Computer Center houses an IBM 3090-600E which is used by all State agencies with mainframe-based applications. It also houses an IBM 3090-600J which is dedicated to MDHS MAVERICS production, MAVERICS development support, METSS development, and JAWS development. Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A indicates the number and types of equipment installed in Mississippi in support of

MAVERICS and all other State systems. DASD is currently at a premium (98% capacity), but 30 new disk packs have been approved by both the State and FNS/ACF. This purchase will allow 25% leeway until Medicaid eligibility determination is added to MAVERICS, METSS is implemented, and the MAVERICS interface with the child support system is completed. At that time, additional DASD will be necessary.

The MAVERICS system runs under IBM MVS/VS and JES2. The production system runs five CICS regions and four separate ADABAS databases. This technological innovation was necessary because of the unanticipated transaction volume in MAVERICS versus the system's State of origin. There are over 400 non-report programs in MAVERICS. Software is written 90% in COBOL and 10% in NATURAL. Many of the Software AG products are used for database management and tuning. A list of major software products can be found in Exhibit A-6.2 in Appendix A.

When the North Dakota system was transferred, the ADABAS calls were ADAMINTS. MIS has converted these to ADABAS SQL. MDHS has become more efficient in using SQL constructs. The problems they found were volume related and not present for small caseloads. With a large database, doing a sort on one million records is very different from doing a sort on 5,000 records. This high volume situation was difficult to test in the pilot with its smaller caseloads.

Coding problems go back to the database structure that was transferred from a smaller State. In some situations, the North Dakota system required that multiple records be read to obtain one piece of information, a situation that degraded MAVERICS performance.

A disaster recovery plan currently is being developed. A plan exists for using fall back reporting for issuance when the system is down. This capability was used successfully when Mississippi experienced a software utility problem in July 1992. MDHS recognizes the need for a hot site backup, but the funding is not available. When the child support system (METSS) is implemented, MDHS will not train people to carry on manually in the event of system failure. Once automation is completed, reverting to manual processes for disaster recovery will not be viable.

The Security Action Plan, which was developed by a contractor and accepted, needs to be updated to address the new regulatory requirements for disaster recovery. MDHS submitted the old security plan with a new work plan outline to FNS, and this has been approved. The MAVERICS security plan that was approved with the project is the current official plan.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

The Central Data Processing Authority maintains the State Computer Center and provides technical support for all State agencies. All inter- and intra-state matching occurs during the batch window.

MAVERICS is operational; however, some functional enhancements are being developed. Requirements analysis is in process for accommodating nine digit (ZIP + 4) zip codes, Disqualified Recipient System (DRS), and Medicaid managed care. The design process has been initiated for the IV-A/IV-D and IV-A/IV-F interfaces and a claims subsystem enhancement. Some development also has been done for the IV-A/IV-D interface.

MAVERICS still requires a number of performance and functional enhancements. Enhancements are planned and coordinated by a joint committee of MIS, users, and management. Until the system has achieved a steady state of operations, the MIS department of the Mississippi Department of Human Services does not have an adequate number of personnel to provide system software maintenance and enhancement support. The magnitude of the changes is such that the MDHS has requested funding for an additional 15 systems personnel from the CDPA.

The State no longer relies on a outside contractor for MAVERICS support. All software maintenance and some development support is provided by MDHS MIS and CDPA. The MAVERICS system is supported by the Systems Analysis Group from MDHS and the State data center's telecommunications and database staff. The MDHS group has recently moved from strictly maintenance to accepting some development responsibility. All development currently planned is to be performed by MDHS staff. Development and training are done on the production machine.

Mississippi has a unique situation with respect to staffing. Unemployment is so high in the State that it is relatively easy to hire and retain staff. Extensive training is required, however, because most new State staff are unfamiliar with NATURAL or ADABAS.

An exemplary item in the Mississippi effort is the close relationship between the MIS and Program staff. Program staff came from line positions in the counties and therefore know the system and the operating environment well.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Mississippi currently utilizes 9600 BPS lines to all counties. Over 1,800 terminals and 700 printers connect centrally to Jackson, Mississippi, through modems and multiplexors, as appropriate. Some offices have just one terminal. No digital service is in use at this time. Plans are underway to upgrade to 56KB lines. Memorex-Telex is the vendor for the telecommunications apparatus.

A 10% increase in caseload would exceed the current capacity of the telecommunications network. This is the approximate historical increase over the past five years. The State currently is planning to upgrade their facilities with a new telecommunications "backbone" in the next 12 to 15 months.

6.2.4 System Performance

The Mississippi system has been at or near capacity since before implementation. The prior mainframe was running at nearly 100% of capacity. The systems staff have "tweaked" and "twiddled" to keep response time within workable limits. Approximately 500,000 to 600,000 on-line transactions are sent per day. This translates to over eight million database transactions per day. New DASD is being implemented now, and the State is in the process of requesting a new 9000 mainframe. The system has grown beyond original projections, and new enhancements being developed for Medicaid and Child Support imply continued system growth.

6.2.5 System Response

Response time represents an area in which improvement can be made. Moving from one screen to another can be slow. Response time ranges from five seconds to over one minute for an inquiry. Response time on eligibility determination ranges from 10 seconds to 10 minutes. The processing bottleneck constantly shifts from one area to another. Before the last CPU upgrade, the computer had insufficient MIPS (millions of instructions per second). The State has ordered additional DASD. Until more DASD is available, it is not possible to efficiently distribute the database over enough DASD to process eight million transactions per day effectively. Mississippi staff expects the next problem to be in the telecommunications network, and they plan to upgrade this system component. State staff expect that the processor bottleneck will recur in the future as well. Staff use ADABAS statistics, Software AG tools, and IBM tools to track the bottlenecks.

6.2.6 System Downtime

System downtime data was not available from Mississippi, but downtime was not identified as a major concern by State staff. The system is unavailable all day on the first Monday of each month because month-end batch processing requires 30 hours. In addition, there are two or three other instances each year where the batch processing continues into the on-line window. In these cases, the system is unavailable for a maximum of two and a half hours.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

The enhancements currently planned are Medicaid and Child Support. Additional enhancements also are planned in the areas of:

- Graphic User Interface (GUI),
- Intelligent workstations to move some edits to the workspace and relieve the mainframe,
- Claims,
- Reporting, and
- Additional matching interfaces.

Mississippi plans to upgrade the operating system to ESA. Additional DASD also will be needed to accommodate the enhancements.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section identifies development and operational costs for the MAVERICS system as reported in the initial APD and subsequent APDUs. It also presents a summary analysis of the cost allocation (CA) methodologies and cost allocation plans (CAP) used to allocate these costs since the inception of the system.

7.1 MAVERICS Development Cost and Federal Funding

Mississippi incurred costs for the development of MAVERICS from 1986 to 1988. The total development cost of the MAVERICS system, as documented in the July 1992 APDU, was $8,738,408. Total development costs by fiscal year for the January 1986 through September 1989 are presented in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 MAVERICS Development Costs by Fiscal Year

Fiscal Year	Development Costs
1986	$533,741
1987	$3,455,627
1988	$4,757,658
1989	$(8,619 credit received)
Total	$8,738,407

The Food Stamp Program's total share of the development cost is documented in the APDU as $4,187,084. The FNS FFP was $2,970,049 at the FFP rates of 50% and 75%.

7.1.1 MAVERICS System Components

MAVERICS was designed to support AFDC, Food Stamp, and Medicaid program areas. The initial effort, initiated in 1986, consisted of the tasks needed to transfer the North Dakota system, modify it to meet Mississippi requirements, perform system and pilot testing, and implement the system statewide. A July 1987 APD supplement provided for additional equipment, staffing, and changes to comply with Federal regulations.

An Enhancement Project was initiated following FNS approval in November 1990.[9] The 1990 APD and subsequent APD updates provided for making the following enhancements to MAVERICS:[10]

[9] Source: APDU approval letter, 11/15/90.

[10] Sources: November 1991 and July 1992 APD Updates.

Table of Contents

- Increasing State development staff to make necessary changes;
- Upgrading the operating system from MVS/XA to MVS/ESA;,
- Upgrading the mainframe to an IBM 3090-600J and adding DASD;
- Upgrading the telecommunications network; and
- Supporting continued development, training, and testing including developing interfaces to the METSS system, which supports the Child Support and JOBS systems.

The Enhancement Project originally was planned as a 29-month effort.

7.1.2 Major MAVERICS Development Cost Components

Table 7.2 presents the development costs by component incurred through September 1989. The major costs were for hardware (44%) and contractor support (29%).

Table 7.2 MAVERICS Development Cost Components

Development Cost Component	Actual Cost
State Personnel	$858,600

7.2 MAVERICS Operational Costs

MAVERICS became fully operational in October 1988. Prior to that time, detailed cost information was not tracked for the information systems supporting the AFDC, Food Stamp, and Medicaid Programs. This may be due to the systems themselves, in which many of the system functions were performed manually and were not integrated.

7.2.1 Cost per Case

MAVERICS annual operating costs for 1992 were $4,228,797, and the FSP share was $1,966,390. The FNS share of MAVERICS monthly cost was determined to be $163,866. The cost per case month -- based on monthly participation of 197,973 Food Stamp households -- was $0.83.

7.2.1.1 MAVERICS Operational Costs Before Implementation

Based on information presented in the cost-benefit analysis contained in the Supplement to the March 1985 APD dated July 1987, the total annual operational cost prior to implementation was $973,790 and consisted of postage, telephone, and system costs. The Food Stamp and AFDC programs' shares of this total were $557,349 and $416,441 respectively.

7.2.1.2 MAVERICS Operational Costs After Implementation

MAVERICS operational costs for Fiscal Year (FY) 1988 totaled $1,041,523. In FY 1989, immediately after implementation, total operational costs were $5,600,944. Operational costs for FY 1990 through FY 1992 are provided in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 MAVERICS Operational Costs

FY	FSP	AFDC	Medicaid	Total
1990	$2,085,670	$1,838,450	N/A	$3,924,120
1991	$2,756,142	$2,420,031	$158,913	$5,335,086
1992	$1,966,390	$1,699,977	$562,430	$4,228,797[13]

The other significant component of post-implementation costs is enhancements. Table 7.4, derived from the July 1992 APDU, provides a summary of MAVERICS enhancement costs.

[13] The 1992 actuals were partially derived from the PAS Costs Schedule completed during the site visit because the APDU actuals did not cover the entire fiscal year.

Table 7.4 MAVERICS Enhancement Costs[14]

FY	FSP	AFDC	MEDICAID	TOTAL
1991	$330,054	$368,860	$5,235	$704,149
1992	$408,488	$600,323	$44,232	$1,053,043

7.2.2 MAVERICS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The operational costs related to MAVERICS can be broadly grouped in the following categories:

- Personnel (including automated data processing (ADP) management and staff, program personnel, non-program personnel, Local Welfare Office staff),
- CPU usage (including computer utilization, report generation, and program transactions processing), and
- Other ADP related costs (including CPU operations and maintenance, technical support, hardware, software, and equipment).

All of these costs are processed in the Mississippi Accounting and Control System (MACS) prior to cost allocation and are further discussed in Section 7.3.2, below.

7.3 Mississippi Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the cost allocation methodologies for allocating both development and operational costs for the MAVERICS system.

7.3.1 Overview of MAVERICS Development Cost Allocation Methodology

Whenever feasible, development costs were directly charged to the appropriate public assistance program. MDHS had planned to allocate indirect development charges based on the proportion of direct charges.[15] However, as noted in the FNS Post Implementation Review, dated April, 25 1989, very few costs were directly charged to a specific program during the development phase. Therefore, this method of allocation was deemed inadequate. In the third quarter of FY 1988, indirect development costs were allocated using fixed percentages: 51.1% for AFDC and 48.9% for FSP. Prior to that time various other percentages were used. In the April 23, 1990 Post Implementation Review, the fixed percentage of 48.9% was approved for allocating joint development costs.

[14] As stated in the July 1992 APDU.

[15] Source: 1985 Advanced Planning Document.

After MAVERICS was implemented, the allocation approach for the development of enhancements was modified.[16] Each on-line screen or batch job was assigned a percentage relative to the benefits received by each program. The costs of analyst and programmer time necessary to complete the screens and batch jobs were accumulated in cost centers and allocated according to the total percentage of benefit received by a program.

In the current environment, unless an enhancement can be 100% assigned to a program, the following cost basis is used for enhancement cost pools which benefit more than one program:

11-44: "Transaction/Job Matrix - The matrix was developed during the initial MAVERICS transfer/development effort and has been updated to reflect the current environment (performance and functional enhancements). A user work group established the benefit that each on-line screen and batch job gives to the AFDC, FS, and Medicaid only programs. The transactions are machine tabulated quarterly and summarized by program."[17]

Direct and joint cost pools for performance and functional enhancements are provided in Table 7.5, MAVERICS Cost Pools, in Section 7.3.2.1.

7.3.2 MAVERICS Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

Most personnel costs are assigned to a MAVERICS cost center via a procedure called Grant Override. Essentially, this procedure allows the person's original cost center to be overridden when a grant number is indicated on the time card. In cases where someone has devoted an identifiable portion of their time to an ADP task, that person's time can be appropriately charged to a MAVERICS cost pool when the grant override procedure is used.

When appropriate, CPU usage costs are allocated to cost pools using weighted computer charges. The costs of computer jobs processed by the CDPA are determined by a weighting process that considers time of day, priority of request, and other processing factors. All computer jobs processed by CDPA are identifiable with specific programs and cost pools. The weighted computer charges for completed jobs are used to allocate costs to the cost pools on a quarterly basis.

All other ADP-related costs are assigned specific cost centers before they are entered into MACS. For example, the cost of operational support services provided by CDPA are itemized on monthly invoices. These invoice charges, as well as all other ADP costs, are entered into MACS with the appropriate cost center codes. Invoices for computer hardware and software must be entered into MACS in a similar

[16] Source: 1990 Advanced Planning Document.

[17] 12/23/92 Update to the Cost Allocation Plan.

manner. Regardless of the charge, the correct MAVERICS cost center code must be used in order to have the cost accumulate accurately in the cost pool.

7.3.2.1 MAVERICS Cost Centers and Cost Pools

MACS accumulates all MAVERICS operational costs by using one of 21 cost centers. The cost centers are then grouped into cost pools. Where appropriate, cost pools accumulate costs for a single program. These are called 100% allocation cost pools and are coded with a "12-00" cost basis. Costs which benefit multiple programs are accumulated into intermediate cost pools and are then allocated according to their cost bases. This accumulation and allocation process may occur multiple times between cost pools before the cost is finally allocated to the specific program. The MAVERICS cost pools presented in Table 7.5 were extracted from the Cost Allocation Plan and a MACS report listing. Each pool relates to the Food Stamp Program.

Table 7.5 MAVERICS Cost Pools

COST POOL CODE/ GRANT CODE	DESCRIPTION	TYPES OF COSTS
01960	MAVERICS - Performance Enhancements, Joint	Personnel services and travel costs of staff assigned to work on performance enhancements for multiple programs. Other costs include supplies, contracted services, and equipment
160	Grant Override	Same as above
01962	MAVERICS - FS Performance Enhancements	Same as above except for the Food Assistance program only
01964	MAVERICS - Functional Enhancements, Joint	Same as above except for multiple programs and functional enhancements
164	Grant Override	Same as above
165	Grant Override	Same as above
01966	MAVERICS - FS Functional Enhancements	Same as above except only for the Food Assistance program
166	MAVERICS - FS Functional Enhancements, Payroll Override	Same as above
01967	MAVERICS - Equipment for enhancement - Joint	Cost of equipment, software, networking, and computer supplies such as tapes which are purchased for the MAVERICS enhancements

COST POOL CODE/ GRANT CODE	DESCRIPTION	TYPES OF COSTS
01969	MAVERICS - Equipment for enhancement - FS	Enhancement equipment costs that can be directly charged to FS and cost allocated from cost pool 01967 and final cost pool 92500 (Final Food Assistance Cost Pool)
01971	IV-A/IV-D Interface	Costs of coordinating IV-A/IV-D interface
171	Grant Override	Same as above
01989	MAVERICS FS Operation/Specific Costs	Operational costs that can be directly assigned to the FSP
01984	MAVERICS -AFDC/FS Production/ Operational	Costs of coordinating the activities of the MAVERICS program with the other offices and agencies during implementation
184	Grant Override	Same as above
01986	MAVERICS - FS Production/ Operational	Same as above but for the FSP only
186	Grant Override	Same as above
These costs are 100% assigned to the Food Stamp Program.		

7.3.2.2 Bases for MAVERICS Cost Pools

All MAVERICS operational costs which are not directly assigned to the Food Stamp Program are currently allocated using the following basis:

11-03: "Random Moment Sampling System - At the time of a randomly selected moment, the activity that an EW is engaged in is determined and summarized by program." Section 7.3.2.3 provides additional detail about Random Moment Sampling procedures.

Direct and allocated costs are summarized on the MACS Cost Allocation Distribution Report. This report shows the allocation basis used for each cost pool. Two new bases exist which do not appear in this report because the allocation method in which they are used has not yet been approved. The CAP describes these bases as follows:

11-42: "Number of system transactions/batch jobs - During production/operational phase of the MAVERICS program system transactions and batch jobs will be machine tabulated monthly and summarized by program area utilization." [18]

11-43: "Number of cases - The number of AFDC, Food Stamp, and Medicaid-only cases are compiled quarterly and used to allocate MAVERICS operational costs. These are costs that come from MAVERICS intermediate pools that have shared cost."[19]

The specifics of the proposed cost allocation plan are further discussed in Section 7.2.3.4 of this report.

7.3.2.3 Allocation Practices - County Indirect Costs

To determine caseworker workload in the 84 county offices, a Random Moment Sampling System (RMSS) is used. The sampling studies are conducted by the Office of Research and Statistics (ORS) section under the Office of Budgets. ORS uses a computer generated "strike schedule" to select the welfare office to be included in the study on any given work day. Consequently, every 15 minutes, an Eligibility Worker (EW) is interviewed to determine the program activities in which he or she is engaged. The data is then compiled into allocation percentages which are used to allocate costs from joint cost pools.

7.3.2.4 New Cost Allocation Plan Proposed for Operational Costs

Since the inception of MAVERICS in 1988, cost allocation plans have changed several times in order to comply with Federal mandates for improved and more accurate allocation methods. In the early operational stages, percentages based on unduplicated recipient counts were used. These percentages were then applied to intermediate cost pools to determine a program's share of joint costs.[20] Next, a method based on system transaction volume was implemented.[21] When this method was challenged, MDHS began to use RMSS, the method currently used for allocating joint operational costs.[22]

The MDHS Cost Allocation Unit recently proposed a new cost allocation method, subject to FNS approval, which uses a combination of system transaction volume and

[18] Source: 1/23/93 update to the Cost Allocation Plan.

[19] Source: 12/23/92 update to the Cost Allocation Plan.

[20] Source: July 1987 Advanced Planning Document.

[21] Source: 1990 Advanced Planning Document Update.

[22] Source: July 1992 Advanced Planning Document Update.

quarterly average caseload data, duplicated across the various programs. An example is provided in Appendix A, Exhibit A-7.1. The following steps describe the process:

1. Determine the number of times on-line screens or functions are used (computer counts).

2. Determine the number of times batch jobs are used (computer counts).

3. Segregate number of transactions in steps 1 and 2 into the following groups:

   AFDC only
   FS only
   Medicaid (MA) only
   AFDC/FS
   AFDC/MA
   AFDC/FS/MA

   For each group, a cost pool is established.

4.a. Calculate the percentage of transactions by program based on total number of transactions for each cost pool. Do the same for batch jobs.

4.b. Multiply the percentage from step 4.a by the "fixed percentage of utilization." Do the same for batch jobs. The fixed percentage of utilization is derived from historical data provided by CDPA.

4.c. The products which result from step 4.b are called the "CICS % of Utilization" and "Batch % of Utilization", respectively.

5. Add the CICS % of Utilization and Batch % of Utilization together. The percentages which result will be entered into the MACS system. Note that a portion of operational costs will be directly assignable to a specific program. (See first three groups in step 3).

6. The intermediate cost pools, the latter three groups in step 3, are allocated using caseload data as follows:

6.a. Calculate the percentage of cases for a program based on total number of cases for each intermediate cost pool.

6.b. Multiply the percentage in step 6a times the percentage derived from step 5 for that cost pool. This percentage is the program's share of costs in that pool.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

EXHIBITS

Table of Contents

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)?
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service timeframes. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N: 9/20/92	Y	Y
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	N/A	N	Y
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)	1/1/88	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)	?	N/A	N	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	N	Y
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

Table of Contents

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	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)	10/1/91	Y	N	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)	12/4/91	N: 9/28/92	Y	Y
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	N:7/21/89	N	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal timeframes. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N: 9/20/92	Y	Y

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-6.1

State of Mississippi - MAVERICS Hardware

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/Features
CPU			
3090-600J	IBM	Purchase	256 Mb Central 512 Mb expanded 6 Processors
DASD			
3380	AMDAHL	Purchase	53 Gigabytes + 30 Gigabytes in approval 4 banks of controllers redundant channeling for fault tolerance
TAPE			
3420	IBM	Shared Purchase	Shared with all State
PRINTERS			
LASER	Xerox	Purchase	1
LINE	IBM	Purchase	2
REMOTE			
079 TERMINALS	Memorex-Telex	Purchase	>1800
387 PRINTERS		Purchase	>700
274 CONTROL UNITS	Memorex-Telex	Purchase	>115
FRONT END			
	Amdahl	Purchase	2

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-6.2

State of Mississippi
Selected MAVERICS Software Products

Software	Version	Release/ Modification	Description
ADABAS	5	1/7	Database
ADASQL	1	4/2	ADABAS SQL
CAACTVE	--	2/2	Install CA Product
CA11	--	1/4	Job Restarter
CA7	--	2/9	Job Scheduler
CICS	2	1/1	Transaction Processor
COBOL2	1	3/0	Language
JCLCHCK	--	6/0	JCL Error Check
JESMAST	2	1/1	Spool Master
JES2	3	1/3	Spool
NATURAL	2	1/6	ADABAS Product
NETVIEW	1	3/0	Network
PANAPT	1	2/--	PANVALET Product
PANVALET	14	1/--	Data Set Manager
PREDICT	3	1/3	ADABAS Product
RACF	--	--/--	Security Package
TSOE	2	1/1	--
VSCOBOL	2	4/0	--
VTAM	3	3/0	--

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-7.1
MAVERICS Sample Cost Allocation Using New Method

(A) Using exhibit 1 and exhibit 2, the following transactions and batch jobs will be summarized by cost groups and percentage calculated based upon the total percentage of utilization, transactions and jobs for a given quarter.

Program	# of transactions	% of transactions	CICS % of ulitization	# of jobs	% of jobs	Batch % of ulitization	total
AFDC only	1,135	10.18%	5.66%	51	8.63%	3.83%	9.49%
FS only	463	4.16%	2.32%	109	18.44%	8.18%	10.49%
MA only	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AFDC & FS	7,227	64.82%	36.06%	132	22.34%	9.91%	45.97%
AFDC\FS\MA	2,324	20.84%	11.59%	295	49.91%	22.15%	33.75%
AFDC\MA	0	0.00%	0.00%	4	0.68%	0.30%	0.30%
Total transactions & jobs	11,149	100.00%	55.63%	591	100.00%	44.37%	100.00%

(B) The following percentages will be entered into the cost allocation system for allocating MAVERICS operational cost.

Program	% of Transactions
AFDC only	9.49%
FS only	10.49%
MA only	0.00%
AFDC & FS	45.97%
AFDC\FS\MA	33.75%
AFDC\MA	0.30%
Total	100.00%

From this step, 19.98% of the cost can be direct charged to specific grants.

(C) The balance (80.02%) of the shared cost in (B) will be routed to an intermediate pool and allocated based upon the caseload data as follows:

Intermediate pool	AFDC	FS	MA	TOTAL
AFDC & FS	11.71%	34.26%		45.97%
AFDC\FS\MA	7.71%	22.54%	3.50%	33.75%
AFDC\MA	0.21%		0.09%	0.30%
Total	19.63%	56.80%	3.59%	80.02%

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-7.1 (continued)
MAVERICS Sample Cost Allocation Using New Method

Computation:

Intermediate cost pool for AFDC\FS – 45.97%

AFDC	=	66,000 CASES OR 25.48%
FS	=	193,000 CASES OR 74.52%

25.48% X 45.97%	11.71% (AFDC SHARE)
74.52% X 45.97%	34.26% (FS SHARE)

Intermediate cost pool for AFDC\FS\MA – 33.75%

AFDC	=	66,000 CASES OR 22.84%
FS	=	193,000 CASES OR 66.78%
MA	=	30,000 CASES OR 10.38%

22.84 X 33.75%	7.71% (AFDC SHARE)
66.78 X 33.75%	22.54% (FS SHARE)
10.38 X 33.75%	3.50% (MA SHARE)

Intermediate cost pool for AFDC\MA – .30%

AFDC	=	66,000 CASES OR 68.75%
MA	=	30,000 CASES OR 31.25%

.3% X 68.75% = 0.21% (AFDC SHARE)

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISIFACTION SURVEYS

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW

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

Description of the Sample

The survey was sent to 63 eligibility workers. The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Mississippi	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
900	63	7.0%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	25	39.6%

The response rate of 40 percent is acceptable and produced a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals. Although the proportion of eligibility workers selected to receive the survey is quite small, these workers were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Mississippi.

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents were satisfied with the computer system in Mississippi. They generally found it responsive, accurate, and easy to use. Two complaints were that peak response time was inadequate and that systems data was sometimes out-of-date. There was, however, a subset of respondents who were more uncomfortable with the system and found it more difficult to use. This group could possibly benefit from additional training.

Similarly, most of he respondents thought the computer system

Table of Contents

helped them do their jobs and made them more efficient. Again, a subset of workers felt that the system added stress to their jobs. These are probably the same workers who found the system difficult to use and who might benefit from additional training.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	10	40.0
Good	15	60.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	19	76.0
Good	6	24.0

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	2	8.0
Sometimes	10	40.0
Often	13	52.0

Almost two thirds of the eligibility workers think the system response time is generally good but a significant proportion (76 percent) indicate that peak response time is poor and half think that response time is often too slow.

Table of Contents

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Sometimes	3	12.0
Often	22	88.0

How often is the system "down"?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	11	44.0
Sometimes	12	48.0
Often	2	8.0

The eligibility workers feel the system is available when they need to use it. Apparently the times that the system is "down" are not intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system is generally available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Good	22	88.0
Excellent	3	12.0

Table of Contents

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	76.0
Sometimes	5	20.0
Often	1	4.0

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	80.0
Sometimes	5	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	14	56.0
Sometimes	9	36.0
Often	2	8.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Easier	7	100.0

The eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are quite accurate. Although most feel that cases are rarely terminated in error, a significant proportion feel that eligibility is incorrectly determined more often than rarely. In addition, one-third think the data available for matching is sometimes

Table of Contents

out-of-date. All those responding to the benefits calculation question thought that the new system made calculation more difficult, but this was only a small subset of all respondents.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	52.0
Sometimes	12	48.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	96.0
Sometimes	1	4.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	92.0
Sometimes	2	8.0

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Not Applicable	3	12.0
Rarely	19	76.0
Sometimes	2	8.0
Often	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Not Applicable	1	4.0
Rarely	23	92.0
Sometimes	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Not Applicable	4	16.0
Rarely	19	76.0
Sometimes	1	4.0
Often	1	4.0

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	100.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	84.0
Sometimes	3	12.0
Often	1	4.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	80.0
Sometimes	5	20.0

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	2	8.0
Rarely	17	68.0
Sometimes	6	24.0

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	20	80.0
Sometimes	5	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	18	72.0
Sometimes	6	24.0
Often	1	4.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Not Applicable	8	32.0
Rarely	11	44.0
Sometimes	5	20.0
Often	1	4.0

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	60.0
Sometimes	9	36.0
Often	1	4.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	3	12.0
Rarely	17	68.0
Sometimes	5	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	1	4.0
Rarely	22	88.0
Sometimes	2	8.0

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	72.0
Sometimes	6	24.0
Often	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	1	4.0
Rarely	10	40.0
Sometimes	11	44.0
Often	3	12.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	44.0
Sometimes	11	44.0
Often	3	12.0

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	5	20.0
Rarely	17	68.0
Sometimes	2	8.0
Often	1	4.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	1	14.3
Easier	6	85.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to track receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Easier	7	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Easier	7	100.0

Table of Contents

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
About the same	2	28.6
Easier	5	71.4

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
About the same	3	42.9
Easier	4	57.1

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	1	14.3
About the same	3	42.9
Easier	3	42.9

The eligibility workers generally feel that the system is easy to use. They report rarely having difficulty performing most of their usual functions. Almost half, however, indicated some difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system. There was also a significant subset (28 percent) who felt that several functions were more difficult to perform under the new system. This probably indicates that training was inadequate rather than the system is difficult to use.

Table of Contents

FSP NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	4	16.0
Often	21	84.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	52.0
Sometimes	9	36.0
Often	3	12.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	92.0
Sometimes	1	4.0
Often	1	4.0

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	3	42.9
More	4	57.1

Table of Contents

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	4	57.1
More	3	42.9

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	1	14.3
About the same	3	42.9
More	3	42.9

Under the new (current) system, how much are you able to get done now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	7	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	1	14.3
More	6	85.7

Table of Contents

How would you rate the current system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Better	7	100.0

The eligibility workers are generally satisfied with the new system although a significant percentage (43 percent) find their work more stressful now. On the other hand, 43 percent of the respondents found their work more pleasant using the new system and 57 percent described their work as more satisfying now. In addition, workers overwhelmingly judged the new system to be more efficient, productive and helpful than the previous system. It seems probable that some workers are experiencing difficulty adjusting to the new system even though they perceived it to be better than the previous system.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	20	80.0
Sometimes	5	20.0

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	25	100.0

Table of Contents

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	14.3
About the same	4	57.1
Easier	2	28.6

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the number of trips the client has to make to obtain benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	5	71.4
Fewer	2	28.6

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of time a client has to wait in the office?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	5	71.4
Better	2	28.6

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of paperwork demanded of the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	1	14.3
About the same	4	57.1
Less	2	28.6

Table of Contents

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	6	85.7
Easier	1	14.3

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	1	14.3
Fewer	6	85.7

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	3	42.9
Fewer	4	57.1

Most of the eligibility workers felt that fewer errors were made under the new system and about half thought that fewer instances of fraud go undetected. Most of the eligibility workers think the clients receive about the same level of service with the new system although all agreed that expedited service was rarely difficult to provide. A significant percentage (29 percent) felt that the burden on the client was lessened.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX C

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

Table of Contents

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 Mississippi. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Mississippi. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers perception about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The survey was sent to 30 local office supervisors. The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of Supervisors in Mississippi	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
120	30	25%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	17	56%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Mississippi. However, the total number responding, 17, is low, producing a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and helps them in their jobs. They report that their own personal job satisfaction and efficiency has increased, and that their ability to carry out their management tasks also has increased. Almost all respondents found the system easy to learn and use and agreed that it was a better system than the previous one. A significant subset, however, felt that the system added stress to their jobs. The number of respondents to some questions was low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.

Table of Contents

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	6	35.3
Good	10	58.8
Excellent	1	5.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	12	70.6
Good	4	23.5
Excellent	1	5.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	11.8
Sometimes	8	47.1
Often	7	41.2

Although the supervisors who responded think the systems response time is generally good, most of them also feel that peak response time is poor and a substantial proportion (41 percent) think that response time is often too slow.

Table of Contents

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	2	11.8
Often	15	88.2

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	47.1
Sometimes	8	47.1
Often	1	5.9

The supervisors who responded feel that the system is generally available, with only one thinking that it was down often.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not Applicable	1	5.9
Poor	1	5.9
Good	13	76.5
Excellent	2	11.8

Table of Contents

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

The supervisors who responded overwhelmingly feel that the information and algorithms of the system are accurate. All who responded feel that it is easier to calculate benefits more accurately and most (88 percent) think the information in the system 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	15	88.2
Sometimes	2	11.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	16	94.1
Sometimes	1	5.9

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	82.4
Sometimes	3	17.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	76.5
Sometimes	4	23.5

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	17	100.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not Applicable	1	5.9
Rarely	16	94.1

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	17	100.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	82.4
Sometimes	3	17.6

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to track receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

Table of Contents

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to determine monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents

Table of Contents

FSP 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	17.6
Often	14	82.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not Applicable	1	5.9
Rarely	7	41.2
Sometimes	8	47.1
Often	1	5.9

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	3	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	3	100.0

Table of Contents

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	33.3
About the same	2	66.7

Under the new (current) system, how much work are you able to get done?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	3	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	3	100.0

Most of the supervisors who responded think that the current system is better than the old one, making work more pleasant and satisfying, and making them more productive and efficient. A substantial proportion (53 percent), however, felt that the system added stress to their jobs. The number of respondents to some of these particular questions is low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.

Table of Contents

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	11.8
Good	14	82.4
Excellent	1	5.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	5.9
Good	13	76.5
Excellent	3	17.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not Applicable	2	11.8
Rarely	6	35.3
Sometimes	7	41.2
Often	2	11.8

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not Applicable	3	17.6
Rarely	11	64.7
Sometimes	3	17.6

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are the people you supervise?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	33.3
More	2	66.7

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to make mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to evaluate local office efficiency?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	3	100.0

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, with 88 percent thinking that the reports

Table of Contents

produced by the system are good or excellent. Almost everyone agrees that the support provided by the technical staff is good or excellent, but more than 50 percent feel that they sometimes or often have difficulty implementing mass changes. The number of respondents to some of these particular questions is low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.

Client Service

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	33.3
Easier	2	66.7

Under the new system how would you rate the services received by the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Better	3	100.0

Under the new system how do you think the average client is being served?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Better	3	100.0

All of the supervisors responding think that the client is being served better with the current system. The number of respondents to these particular questions is low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.

Table of Contents

Fraud and Errors

Under the new system how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	33.3
Easier	2	66.7

Under the new system how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not Applicable	1	33.3
About the same	2	66.7

Under the new system how many false claims are caught?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	1	33.3
Better	2	66.7

Under the new system how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	33.3
Better	2	66.7

Most of the responding supervisors think that the current system

does better than the old system in fraud detection and about the same in error detection. The number of respondents to these particular questions is low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.