

**STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY**

**SITE VISIT: OCTOBER 12 - 14, 1993**

**KANSAS STATE REPORT**

**August 23, 1994**

**FINAL**

**Prepared for:**

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

**FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>STATE PROFILE</b> .....	1
<b>1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT</b> .....	2
<b>2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS</b> .....	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation .....	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs .....	4
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs .....	5
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance .....	5
2.4.1 Staffing .....	6
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change .....	6
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate .....	7
2.4.4 Claims Collection .....	7
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews .....	8
<b>3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM</b> .....	8
3.1 System Functionality .....	8
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity .....	13
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio .....	13
3.4 Current Automation Issues .....	13
<b>4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....	14
4.1 Overview of the Previous System .....	14
4.2 Justification for the New System .....	14

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities . . . . .	15
4.4 Conversion Approach . . . . .	15
4.5 Project Management . . . . .	16
4.6 FSP Participation . . . . .	16
4.7 MIS Participation . . . . .	17
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation . . . . .	17
<b>5.0 TRANSFERABILITY . . . . .</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1 System Profile . . . . .	19
6.2 Description of Operating Environment . . . . .	20
6.2.1 Operating Environment . . . . .	20
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance . . . . .	20
6.2.3 Telecommunications . . . . .	21
6.2.4 System Performance . . . . .	21
6.2.5 System Response . . . . .	22
6.2.6 System Downtime . . . . .	22
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans . . . . .	23
<b>7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION . . . . .</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1 KAECSES Development Costs and Federal Funding . . . . .	23
7.1.1 KAECSES System Components . . . . .	24

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components . . . . .	25
7.1.2.1 Hardware . . . . .	25
7.1.2.2 Contractor Costs . . . . .	25
7.1.2.3 State Personnel Costs . . . . .	26
7.2 Operational Costs . . . . .	26
7.2.1 Cost Per Case . . . . .	27
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices . . . . .	27
7.3 Kansas Cost Allocation Methodologies . . . . .	27
7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology . . . . .	27
7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics . . . . .	28

## APPENDICES

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

**LIST OF TABLES**

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation . . . . .	4
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued . . . . .	5
2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs . . . . .	5
2.4 Official Combined Error Rate . . . . .	7
2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected . . . . .	8
7.1 KAECSES Budgeted Cost Components . . . . .	25
7.2 KAECSES Operational Costs . . . . .	26

**APPENDIX A - State of Kansas Exhibits**

**Exhibit No.**

A-2.1 Response to Regulatory Changes . . . . .	A-2
A-6.1 State of Kansas Hardware Inventory . . . . .	A-4

**KANSAS STATE REPORT**  
**Site Visit October 12 - 14, 1993**

**STATE PROFILE**

**System Name:** Kansas Automated Eligibility and Child Support Enforcement System (KAECSES)

**Start Date:** 1984

**Completion Date:** 1989

**Contractor:** Systemhouse, Inc.

**Transfer From:** Arizona

**Cost:**

**Actual:** \$20,280,522

**Projected:** \$11,937,168

**FSP Share:** \$ 6,110,186

**FSP %:** 30.1%

**Number of Users:** 3,000 (estimated)

**Basic Architecture:**

**Mainframe:** IBM 3090/400E

**Workstations:** IBM 3270 terminals

**Telecommunications**

**Network:** Three T1 lines from Topeka to 56 KB lines to 9600 baud tail circuits

**System Profile:**

**Programs:** Food Stamp, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, Child Support Enforcement, Social Services, and General Assistance

## 1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

Public assistance (PA) programs in Kansas are State-administered, and the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services (SRS) is the cabinet-level State agency responsible for administering these programs. SRS is divided into several divisions and commissions, which include:

- Mental Health and Retardation Services
- Youth and Adult Services
- Workforce Development
- Management Services
- Administrative Services
- Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services
- Rehabilitation Services
- Income Support and Medical Services

Each office reports directly to the Secretary of SRS, as do several administrative support groups and area directors throughout the State.

Support for public assistance programs is provided through the Income Support and Medical Services (ISMS) Commission and the Administrative Services Commission. The Director of Income Maintenance (IM) reports to the Commissioner of ISMS and oversees policy staff for the Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, General Assistance (GA), and other Social Services program areas. Child Support Enforcement (CSE) staff report to the ISMS Commissioner. The Kansas Automated Eligibility and Child Support Enforcement System supports each of these program areas.

The Division of Information Resources (DIR) director reports to the SRS Commissioner of Administrative Services. DIR provides technical support to operate, maintain, and enhance the Department's systems.

The Department of Administration, a cabinet-level agency in Kansas, also has a role in providing public assistance support. Although DIR maintains and supports the State's public assistance system, the mainframe computer on which the system resides is located at the State data center, which is operated by the Department of Administration's Central Data Processing (CDP) Unit.

State staff characterize Kansas as partially rural and partially urban. The largest urban area in the State is Wichita. The State is divided into 105 counties; less than 125 individuals receive food stamp benefits in 15 of the counties.

The State population in 1990 was 2,485,600. Approximately 5.8 percent of the population were food stamp recipients.

The level of unemployment in Kansas decreased from 1982 to 1989, increased in 1990, and remained constant in 1991. Between 1982 and 1989, the State's unemployment rate decreased from 6.3 percent to 4.0 percent; however, the 1986 unemployment rate of 5.4 percent represented

a 0.4 percent increase from the 1985 level. The State's unemployment rate increased to 4.4 percent in 1990 and remained at that level in 1991.

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

- Kansas' nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was between 5.0 and 9.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Kansas reduced its FY 1992 budget by \$24.7 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Kansas increased by 1.47 percent. This change differed in direction from the national average 0.60 percent decrease in State government employment.
- Kansas' FY 1993 net revenues increased by \$354.1 million. The largest components of the increase were a \$221.8 million increase in sales taxes and a \$111.9 million increase in personal income taxes.
- The regional outlook for the Plains States indicated that the region is outperforming the national economy. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 5.4 percent was lower than the national average of 7.8 percent. The region's per capita personal income increase of 2.9 percent was higher than the national average of 2.4 percent.

## **2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS**

KAECSES provides integrated support for the Food Stamp Program and other program areas; furthermore, State and local level administration among assistance programs also are integrated. At the central office, the Food Stamp Policy Unit reports to the Policy Administrator who in turn reports to the Income Maintenance Director. FSP system support is provided by DIR and CDP.

Local administration of the Food Stamp Program is achieved through the area and local offices. There are 12 area offices that are supervised by area directors. Area directors report directly to the SRS Secretary and are responsible for overseeing activities in the 106 local offices throughout the State. There are four chiefs that report to each area director. The Income Maintenance Chief is responsible for local office FSP operations and works with State policy staff. There is one local office located in each county; one large county is supported by two local offices.

### **2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation**

Food Stamp Program participation in Kansas increased dramatically between 1988 and 1992. The number of FSP households increased by approximately 50.2 percent between 1988 and 1992. During the same period, the number of individuals receiving food stamp benefits increased by 45.9 percent.

Changes in participation levels for the FSP and other public assistance programs for the last five years are provided in Table 2.1. While participation increases are evident for each program area, the magnitude of the increases varies among programs. Relatively small increases occurred during the five-year period in the number of CSE cases (19.2 percent) and AFDC cases (19.5 percent). The largest increase during the period, 91.1 percent, involved the number of children participating in Foster Care. The percentage changes in GA and Medicaid participation were similar in magnitude to the FSP five year participation change. GA cases increased by 54.2 percent, and the number of individuals receiving Medicaid assistance increased by 46.2 percent.

**Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1988</b>
<b>AFDC</b>					
Cases	28,786	27,053	25,810	25,532	24,090
Individuals	84,642	80,011	77,015	74,616	70,963
<b>Foster Care</b>	2,100	1,864	1,661	1,314	1,099
<b>GA</b>					
Cases	6,069	5,526	5,047	5,028	3,937
Individuals	7,839	7,178	6,544	6,809	5,693
<b>FSP</b>					
Households	68,310	61,010	55,019	49,732	45,488
Individuals	175,719	158,030	143,479	130,324	120,442
<b>Medicaid</b>	178,154	162,839	143,636	127,880	121,869
<b>CSE</b>	114,000	107,127	97,618	108,143	95,613

**2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs**

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs improved from 9:1 in 1988 to 18:1 in 1992.

Kansas' average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, increased overall; however, there was a slight decrease in the benefit level between 1988 and 1989.<sup>1</sup>

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

**Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$163.37	\$156.90	\$147.48	\$135.12	\$136.64

**2.3 FSP Administrative Costs**

Kansas' Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.<sup>2</sup> Total costs increased between 1988 and 1989, decreased in 1990, and increased in 1991 and 1992. The average cost per household decreased each year except 1991. Overall, the average Federal administrative cost per household decreased by approximately 40 percent during the five-year period.

**Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$7,242,567	\$6,669,960	\$5,882,699	\$8,022,209	\$7,984,346
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$8.91	\$9.25	\$9.00	\$13.58	\$14.75

**2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance**

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

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

<sup>2</sup> The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

## **2.4.1 Staffing**

Kansas has utilized a generic caseworker approach since approximately 1980. The following number and type of staff currently support the integrated program areas: 490 full-time eligibility workers (EW), 18 part-time EWs, 65 EW supervisors, five issuance workers, and approximately 200 clerical staff who provide part-time support in applicant screening and registration functions.

State staff indicated that State staffing levels have increased slightly over the last five years; however, staff believed that the implementation of KAECSES in 1989 had a positive effect on EW productivity. Between 1988 and 1992, the net increase in eligibility workers in the State was about 20 persons, most of whom were specialized workers in hospital units that support the Medicaid Program. During the same period, the number of households in Kansas receiving public assistance increased significantly. State staff indicated that without KAECSES workers would not have been able to handle the increased caseloads. Kansas staff stated that the duplicated caseload per worker increased from about 250 at the time KAECSES was developed to approximately 350 currently.

## **2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change**

As detailed in Exhibit A-2.1 in Appendix A, Kansas was unable to meet Federal implementation dates for several regulations. State staff indicated that the most significant problem in implementing regulatory changes in a timely manner was the lack of personnel to develop and implement the changes. This was cited as the reason for not implementing the following regulations by the required dates:

- Code 1.3: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act, regulation 273.8(e)(17), excluding as a resource for FSP purposes, household resources exempt by PA and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) in mixed households
- Code 1.4: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act, regulation 273.9(d)(5)(i), specifying the use of a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members
- Code 2.1: Administrative Improvement and Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act, regulation 273.8(e)(5), etc., extending resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles
- Code 4.2: Issuance, regulation 274.6(b)(2), providing a limitation on the number of replacement issuances

In addition, State staff indicated other reasons for not meeting required implementation dates for specific regulations. For code 2.2: Administrative Improvement and Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act, regulation 274.2 (b)(2), State staff indicated that the change was determined to be a low priority item and has not yet been implemented. Regulation 274.2(b)(3), code 2.3: Administrative Improvement and

Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act, was not implemented on time because of problems encountered in developing specifications for technical staff. This legislation was especially difficult to implement because KAECSES calculated allotments on a monthly basis. The State has not implemented the change in KAECSES to date; instead, a manual process was developed to enable the State to meet legislative requirements.

### **2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate**

Kansas's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, increased between 1988 and 1989 and decreased each year since 1989. State staff expected that KAECSES implementation would reduce the error rate; however, the 1992 error rate of 6.89 percent was higher than the 1988 error rate before KAECSES was implemented.

**Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate**

	<b>1992</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1988</b>
Combined Error Rate	6.89	7.40	7.99	8.47	6.21

### **2.4.4 Claims Collection**

**Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
<b>Total Claims Established</b>	\$1,528,596	\$1,220,888	\$1,185,090	\$1,887,422	\$1,640,832
<b>Total Claims Collected</b>	\$642,535	\$550,339	\$550,465	\$480,207	\$715,786
<b>As a % of Total Claims Established</b>	42.0%	45.1%	46.5%	25.4%	43.6%

**2.4.5 Certification/Reviews**

KAECSES was fully implemented by July 1989. Both the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) have reviewed the system. KAECSES received Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification in December 1989. The FNS post-implementation review was conducted in November 1989.

**3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM**

This section provides an overview of the various functions of the KAECSES system, discusses its complexity and level of integration, and describes how it supports the Food Stamp Program in Kansas.

**3.1 System Functionality**

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

- **Registration.** Registration procedures vary by area and local office due to differences in size, workload, staffing, and preferences. Most often, the initial point of contact for an applicant is the receptionist or clerical support worker at a local office. The applicant completes a paper application form which is returned to the receptionist in person or mailed back to the local office. The applicant then meets with a screener who determines whether the applicant is eligible for expedited benefits.

Registration clerks enter registration data into KAECSES. Information entered during registration includes name, date of birth, Social Security number (SSN) if available, relationship to head of household, programs to which the household is

applying, and address information. The applicant does not need to be present for this activity. Moreover, registration can occur before or after the EW conducts the applicant's intake interview.

At the time of registration, a statewide phonetic name search is conducted for each household member to determine whether the individual currently participates or has previously participated in program areas supported by KAECSES. After the participation search is completed, the system assigns a case number. For previous participants, the system allows the assignment of the old case number and the transfer of historical data into the current record.

Interviews with eligibility workers may occur on the same day in some offices; however, interviews may be scheduled for a future date in other offices. The registration clerk is responsible for entering interview information -- including the date and time of the interview and the worker assigned to the case -- into the system. The system monitors the status of scheduled interviews and can automatically deny the case when the applicant does not attend a scheduled appointment.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Eligibility determination is performed on-line using the system after information from the paper application form has been entered into KAECSES, policy decisions have been recorded, and the interview has been conducted. The system facilitates application entry by presenting only the screens that are relevant to and required for the specific case. The system also provides on-line help and on-line edits for each screen.

The applicant and the worker are responsible for selecting the program areas to which the applicant applies. The system determines eligibility only for these program areas.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** Benefit calculation is performed by KAECSES and authorized by the EW. The system automatically produces notices to be sent to applicants indicating the results from eligibility determination and benefit calculation; however, workers are required to add some information to the notices before they can be mailed.
- ***Benefit Issuance.*** Virtually all food stamp benefit issuance in Kansas is accomplished by mailing coupons to recipient households. Over 99 percent of food coupons are mailed to client households from the central office. In Wichita, over-the-counter issuance at the local office is used for expedited benefits only. This represents less than one percent of total statewide issuance. Coupons are mailed to recipient households through certified mail or first class mail. Certified mail is used for approximately 40 percent of issuances. Situations in which certified mail is used include benefit allotments over \$300, issuances to certain zip code areas, and issuances to households who have reported undelivered coupons in the past.

Issuance is supported by KAECSES and a food stamp issuance system that predates KAECSES. During the overnight batch processing cycle, KAECSES produces an extract file containing benefit allotment information. This file is used to generate documents encoded with allotment amounts that are used to control an automated machine that inserts food coupons into envelopes for mailing. Regular monthly issuance is staggered over the first 10 to 12 working days of the month. Food coupons for newly-authorized cases are mailed the day after the worker authorizes the case.

KAECSES maintains an issuance history for each case that provides information necessary to monitor coupon replacements and other issuance related details. The food coupon replacement process requires the worker to request the replacement through the system and enter the reason for the replacement. If undelivered coupons are returned, they are remailed. The system also links the original and replacement issuances, and it monitors the number of replacements because a household is prohibited from having more than two replacements within a six-month period.

Kansas currently is planning an electronic benefit transfer (EBT) system to issue benefits for the FSP and other program areas.

- **Notices.** KAECSES has the ability to generate a wide array of notices, and the system combines notices for supported program areas. Client notices generated by the system relate to the following types of information: interview scheduling, events related to household participation, events related to household eligibility, warnings that a monthly report was not received, denial because of failure to keep appointments, eligibility determination results, benefit reductions and increases, closure based on recertification information, and mass change information.

On a monthly basis, approximately 95,000 notices are generated and mailed. Most notices are generated by the system based on system actions or case situations but require some worker input (such as worker name and office hours) before the notice is complete. However, there also are notices that the system produces without any worker input, and workers can generate original notices.

State staff believe that the notice system provides several benefits and one disadvantage. Its integrated nature reduces the number of notices sent to a household. In KAECSES, notices are integrated for the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, and GA Programs, and notices also are combined for different time periods. Staff believe that integrated notices are less confusing for clients than multiple notices. The system maintains notices and provides a history of actions related to the case. State staff view the maximum length of the notice -- 34 lines of text -- as a limitation.

- **Claims System.** The claims system is fully integrated into KAECSES. The eligibility worker is responsible for establishing claims in the system by entering

the reason for the underpayment or overpayment on-line. The worker also determines the collection method. Eligibility workers can delete a claim from the system. Supervisory approval is not required for the establishing or deleting claims; however, supervisors generally review fraud cases.

KAECSES performs the following functions related to claims establishment and collection: calculates the corrected benefit amount, tracks the claim status, and generates a notice for overpayments that is sent to the client. In addition, if recoupment is selected as the repayment method, KAECSES calculates the monthly recoupment amount and subtracts it from the recipient's monthly allotment. The system provides an overpayment claims history that summarizes all claims against the case and is available to the worker on-line.

- **Computer Matching.** When an applicant is registered on the system, the system sets a flag indicating that the record is subject to computer matching the next time that matching activities are performed. Therefore, matching can occur before or after the case is authorized. Both on-line and batch matching are performed.

Kansas performs all Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) required computer matching. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) matching for unearned income is performed monthly for new cases and annually for ongoing cases, while matching against the Beneficiary Earnings Exchanges System (BEERS) for Social Security Administration (SSA) wages, Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX) for Social Security benefits, State Data Exchange (SDX) for SSI benefit information, Unemployment Insurance (UI), and State wage data are performed monthly. Workers perform on-line inquiries for wage and unemployment data. Some IRS, BEERS, and SDX discrepancies are reported to the EW on-line with more detailed information available through paper reports. BENDEX, however, is not available on-line and generates only paper output for the worker.

The State performs additional matching against other State agency data sources and is a participant in a five-state matching effort. Workers must initiate these searches outside KAECSES through a Customer Information Control System (CICS) Windows function. Kansas agencies and data sources used in computer matching include: the Department of Revenue (Motor Vehicles and Drivers' Licenses), Vital Statistics, Workman's Compensation, Child Support Enforcement, and Employment Services New Hire files.

Since 1990, Kansas has participated in the Social Welfare Data Exchange (SWDX)/PIEX with Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Data used in the on-line SWDX/PIEX matching includes wage, UI, CSE (through PIEX), FSP, and other public assistance program files.

- **Alerts.** KAECSES provides on-line alerts to the EW in several situations including: IEVS discrepancies for IRS, BEERS, and SDX data; information changes such as name changes; pending applications; claims for which collection

plans have not been established; and notices to be sent. Both the prioritization of alerts according to importance and the deletion of alerts from the screen are handled manually by the EW. If a worker has alert items that are categorized as "due today or overdue," the word "ALERTS" appears on the worker's screen when he or she enters KAECSSES as a reminder.

- **Monthly Reporting.** Kansas requires monthly reporting for nearly all FSP households. KAECSSES automatically generates and mails the monthly reporting form. The forms are returned to the local offices where clerks review them for completeness and register monthly reports in the system. Clerks send notices to households requesting missing information for incomplete reports. Eligibility workers review changes reported, and enter required information into KAECSSES.

Kansas plans to request a waiver to modify procedures for monthly reports that are not received by the required date; however, the following events currently are performed when monthly reports are late. The system generates a warning notice -- which is mailed to the client -- if the completed form has not been received by the tenth working day of the month. Prior to the end of the month, the system generates adverse action notices for households that have not submitted monthly reports. The system automatically closes the case at the end of the month if the report is not received. The proposed modification involves the elimination of the warning notice. Instead, KAECSSES would generate an adverse action notice -- specifying case closure at the end of the month -- on the 15th working day of the month for households that had not submitted monthly reporting forms.

- **Report Generation.** The original KAECSSES reporting subsystem was transferred from the Arizona Technical Eligibility Computer System (AZTECS) with minor modifications. KAECSSES provides some data required to produce Federally-mandated reports; however, the system generated reports require reformatting before they can be submitted to FNS and other agencies.

Since KAECSSES was implemented, Kansas has attempted to enhance the system's reporting capabilities. For example, the State added an on-line reporting system, SARS, for field staff use. Types of information reported through this system include timeliness, claims, mass changes, and caseloads. Ad hoc reports can be produced by SRS IM personnel using data extracts which are produced monthly from KAECSSES. In addition, local office staff have the capability to print, as needed, two weekly reports that focus attention on alerts and pending applications, respectively. The State intends to enhance ad hoc reporting capabilities with a planned shift to FOCUS in 1994.

- **Program Management and Administration.** There are several system features that assist the State in program management and administration. KAECSSES contains a function similar to electronic mail (E-mail), but it is not used. All staff in Kansas use OfficeVision for E-mail. The system also provides on-line help; however, State staff indicated that the feature is limited in scope and not widely

used by workers. The State is considering the use of on-line policy manuals in the future.

KAECSES is table driven, which makes the implementation of mass changes relatively easy. For the most part, table data changes are made by State policy staff and do not require technical expertise. KAECSES processes the new information and automatically generates and mails notices to affected households.

### **3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity**

KAECSES provides integrated support for Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, GA, CSE, and other Social Services program areas in Kansas. From an organizational and systems perspective, Kansas exhibits a high degree of integration among public assistance programs. All program areas report to the same SRS Commissioner at the State level, and the use of generic workers and a combined application form provides program area integration at local offices. In terms of system integration, data entry in KAECSES is fully integrated so that the worker does not have to perform redundant data entry for multiple program areas. KAECSES does contain multiple databases that separate CSE data from eligibility data and benefit data and places some older data into an archival database. State staff indicated that the size, integrated nature, and complexity of the system -- especially the integration of CSE -- makes the system intimidating to technical staff.

KAECSES also provides significant integration of functionality and interfaces to other systems. The claims system is fully integrated into KAECSES. Interfaces to other systems for computer matching are accomplished through a CICS Windows feature that enables workers to switch to the other system with relative ease.

### **3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio**

There are over 850 full-time or part-time field staff supporting KAECSES statewide. Each clerical worker who enters registration data, eligibility worker, and EW supervisor is assigned a terminal.

State staff indicated that approximately 3,000 terminals are installed in Kansas. Terminals are provided to other users including central office policy staff, State technical staff, and area office staff. Terminals can be used to access other State systems and are used by other State agencies' staff to access their own systems and to provide KAECSES inquiry capabilities to authorized external users.

### **3.4 Current Automation Issues**

The State is planning several system enhancements, and there are a significant number of outstanding change requests and problem reports for KAECSES. The State's ability to make progress in these areas is dependent on both the number and capabilities of technical

staff in DIR. Program staff indicated that since KAECSES conversion, lack of technical staff resources has been an on-going problem.

KAECSES currently does not support interactive interviewing, a feature of the system transferred to Kansas. State staff indicated that interactive interviewing was eliminated from KAECSES because they believed that response times were too slow to support it. State staff plan to implement interactive interviewing in the future if response times improve enough to make interactive interviewing feasible.

#### **4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**

This section discusses the approaches used in Kansas during the development and implementation of KAECSES.

##### **4.1 Overview of the Previous System**

Prior to KAECSES implementation, Kansas utilized a paper-intensive, batch-oriented system to administer benefits for the Food Stamp Program and other programs. Eligibility workers completed turnaround documents after the client interview was conducted. Separate turnaround documents were used for the Food Stamp, Medicaid, and AFDC Programs. There were redundant data requirements and worker efforts among programs. Eligibility workers did not use computer terminals at all, and data entry was not performed at local offices. Turnaround documents were forwarded to one of 17 area offices where data entry was performed. Eligibility determination and benefit calculation were performed during overnight batch processing.

The previous system also required a great deal of manual work and involved excessive paperwork for EWs. Notices and interfaces with other systems all were manual. Applications were sent to a central location and were assigned a case number and tracked manually. EWs spent approximately half their time doing paperwork.

##### **4.2 Justification for the New System**

Kansas identified several benefits of automation in justifying the need for a new system. In the cost/benefit analysis section of the State's Advanced Planning Document (APD) requesting funding for system development, both tangible and intangible benefits were identified. Annual cost savings attributable to reduced agency and client errors were projected to be three million dollars across all program areas.<sup>3</sup> Several intangible benefits were identified in State APD submissions, including:

- Improved service delivery to clients
- Increased worker productivity and morale

---

<sup>3</sup> September 1988 APD, page G.2.

- Increased efficiency of operations and management
- Reduced paperwork

#### **4.3 Development and Implementation Activities**

KAECSES was the outgrowth of a study that started in 1984. Several task forces, comprised of field workers from all affected program areas, met throughout 1986 to develop requirements. The Design Phase of the project began in September 1986 and was completed in January 1987. The General Systems Design (GSD) was completed in March 1987, and the transfer analysis was completed in April 1987. Testing was conducted between April 1988 and June 1988. The system was piloted from June 1988 to August 1988. Implementation, with modifications required to meet Federal requirements, was initiated in August 1988. The system was fully implemented by July 1989.

The initial KAECSES APD was developed in December 1984, and revisions and APD Updates (APDUs) were submitted during the course of KAECSES development. Changes were required due to increases in both hardware costs and system functionality during the development period. In 1989, the estimated total cost for KAECSES increased to just over \$22 million. The hardware required to provide dedicated terminals for workers and provide one printer for each eight terminals represented a significant part of KAECSES costs. Functionality added to KAECSES included the capability to perform automatic searches of several State employment databases, changes related to the \$50 pass through for CSE, Medical policy changes for Medicaid recipients, E-mail capability, and the addition of system alerts.

Several items were identified that were necessary for system certification and subsequently were addressed by the State. These items included: disaster recovery, absent parent, 1988 Family Support Act requirements, follow-up alerts to supervisors, response time improvements, and capacity planning. State staff indicated that it was helpful to receive input from the Federal agencies regarding other States that could advise Kansas about specific items.

#### **4.4 Conversion Approach**

There was a four-month process for conversion in each county office. The first month was devoted to collecting required data and providing pre-conversion training, which included a one-day classroom session for workers. During the second month, the central site staff entered case data into KAECSES. EWs and supervisors received one week of hands-on training, and registration clerks received three days of hands-on training prior to system implementation. After completing this training, workers began entering new application and recertification data directly into KAECSES. The final two months were used to review data that had been entered into the system centrally and enter specific information necessary to convert ongoing cases.

The planned conversion approach primarily involved manual conversion of approximately 120,000 cases from the old systems. An average of 40 minutes was allotted to convert

a case. State staff indicated that this timeframe was adequate except for more complicated cases. Different definitions of households, cases, resources, and different tracking mechanisms in the previous systems for Medicaid, AFDC, FSP, and CSE also complicated the conversion process. Nevertheless, conversion occurred in an orderly manner due in part to the State's advance planning and the decision to defer recertifications during conversion in a county.

#### **4.5 Project Management**

There were two project managers during the course of KAECSES development. The initial project manager had 17 years of experience with the agency and specific experience with field implementation for multiple programs and information systems at the State level. The project manager was replaced in 1986. The new project manager had a program background and some experience with small management information system (MIS) projects.

The reporting structure for the KAECSES project manager also changed during the development period. Initially, the project was managed within the MIS area and the project manager reported to the Commissioner of Administrative Services through the Administrator for Income Maintenance. This structure was modified so that the project team was managed within the Income Support and Medical Services Commission. The reporting structure then was changed again to shift KAECSES oversight responsibility back to the Administrative Services Commission.

There also were several committees and groups that were involved in project management. The State's Division of Systems Communication (DISC) contained an oversight committee that guided all systems projects in the State to ensure coordination and reduce redundancy. The Assurance Review Committee was established for the KAECSES project. This committee consisted of policy directors for all program areas and one MIS representative. The group, which did not interact directly with the contractor developing the code, was responsible for quality assurance and acceptance testing. A working group, the Technical Assurance Group (TAG), had an active role once the development of requirements for the contractor began. This committee was also responsible for implementation and had significant involvement in acceptance testing.

#### **4.6 FSP Participation**

Food Stamp Program participation in system development involved both State policy and local field personnel. Program policy staff only were involved intermittently during project planning. State staff indicated that it would have been beneficial for policy personnel to have been more involved in the development effort, particularly in the earlier stages.

User groups, called Displaced Eclectic Computerization Ombudsperson (DECO), were used during project development. The first group, DECO-1, was established during project planning. The initial group included 12 generic field program staff: eight EWs

and four supervisors. Through implementation, a total of four DECO groups were involved in the project. During KAECSES implementation, DECO included 16 EWs, 8 supervisors, and 18 trainers who assisted in KAECSES conversion activities. Program staff were assigned to DECO full-time. DECO staff were involved in a broad range of project activities, including providing input on design and development issues; preparing documentation including requirements and design documents, APDs, and the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the development contractor; reviewing and approving plans and documents; participating in KAECSES acceptance testing activities; and training field staff.

#### **4.7 MIS Participation**

There were three MIS staff from DIR involved in the KAECSES development. One of these individuals was involved in the CSE portion of the system, and two were involved in developing the Automated Eligibility (AE) portion. The role of MIS staff was limited; however, because State staff were prohibited from working on the system code. State staff were not allowed to work on the system because doing so would invalidate the contract between the State and the development contractor, Systemhouse, Inc. and void

There were several areas in which various groups should have been more involved in the project. CSE staff, who were deeply involved in developing testing criteria, should have been more involved earlier in the project. In addition, the reports developed for the system suffered because of the limited involvement of State staff in forming requirements.

State staff believe that the contractor did not have adequate time to develop some components of the system. State staff indicated that the rushed development effort -- particularly with interfaces, reports, and quality control -- caused two problems. First, the State had to involve more staff in performing system fixes. Second, user satisfaction was reduced when the system did not function as expected.

There were a couple of problems associated with the contractor and the way in which the contractor was managed. The contractor developed the system at a separate location in Topeka. State staff believe that not having the contractor on-site caused coordination, communications, and control problems. While both the State and contractor had little turnover among key staff and analysts, the contractor's lower level programming staff changed frequently. State staff attributed these changes, in which less experienced staff typically were brought in to replace incumbents, to the contractor's commitments in other States. State staff indicated that the replacement programmers did not produce high quality code. The State's expectations for system documentation were not detailed in the contract with Systemhouse. Consequently, Kansas did not receive system documentation that State staff regarded as adequate.

Response time problems occurred throughout the implementation period. System response time during the pilot test was 45 seconds. When conversion began for the Kansas City area, response times for the whole State became longer. The response time problem raised capacity issues that were not anticipated. The Federal agencies subsequently insisted that additional capacity studies be conducted.

## **5.0 TRANSFERABILITY**

The State looked at or considered several systems in 1986 including those in Idaho, Alaska, and Arizona. Idaho's system was examined because of its distributed architecture. Kansas issued an RFP for an implementation contractor and asked bidders to propose a system in their responses. Just before bids were due, State program staff attended the Agency for Children and Families (ACF) transfer conference and talked with several other States. In retrospect, Kansas staff indicated that technical personnel also should have been involved in these discussions.

Kansas staff indicated that they were naive in selecting a transfer system. Instead of conducting extensive reviews of other States' systems and reviewing other States' requirements, Kansas selected a contractor that it believed had significant experience in implementing public assistance systems in other States and a good reputation from its previous transfer efforts.

Two firms responded to the RFP, and Kansas selected Systemhouse in September 1986. Systemhouse's proposed solution -- a code transfer from Arizona and subsequent development -

- met the State's requirements. At the time the transfer decision was made, the Arizona system development effort (AZTECS) had not been completed. Therefore, system functionality could not be demonstrated. Instead, Kansas staff viewed the functional capabilities of Alaska's system, which had been transferred to Arizona.

Kansas visited North Dakota and examined its system after the development contract had been awarded to Systemhouse.

State staff indicated that they view a conceptual system transfer favorably; however, a complete code transfer has some drawbacks. State staff believed that one advantage of transferring a system was that it provided a starting point for developing a system and enabled them to visualize the end product. The contractor, system code, and users provided knowledge that Kansas could not have obtained otherwise. State staff identified two disadvantages associated with a system transfer. In the case of a system like AZTECS that is still being developed, the State does not have a complete picture of the capabilities of the base system. In addition, transferring code from another State could involve a significant amount of customization.

KAECSES has not been transferred to any other states.

## 6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

### 6.1 System Profile

The components supporting the KAECSES system are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090/400E, MVS/ESA, CICS, JES3, ADABAS
- **Disk:** Hitachi (NAS) 7380 drives  
Symetrics disk array 48XX series
- **Tape:** IBM autoloader cartridge tape drives
- **Printers:** IBM 1403 impact  
Data General impact  
IBM 3805 laser  
DA laser
- **Front End:** IBM 3725
- **Workstations:** IBM 3270 terminals

- **Telecommunications:** T1 circuits, digital, 56 KB to 9600 minimum baud tail circuits

A detailed listing is provided as Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A.

## **6.2 Description of Operating Environment**

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

### **6.2.1 Operating Environment**

CDP, within DISC, operates the data center seven days a week, 24 hours a day. KAECSES is the largest user of the State equipment. On-line hours for the system are 7:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. The batch cycle window is from 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 a.m.

SRS has its own mainframe. KAECSES operates under IBM's MVS/ESA, using CICS and JES3. ADABAS is the database manager. Security software, Top Secret, supports the system, and ADABAS screen profiles by user provide additional security. Omegamon/MVS and CICS are used to monitor and tune the operating environment. The system was developed and implemented in COBOL II and NATURAL, but as modifications are made, an evaluation is performed to determine whether a conversion to COBOL would improve performance or facilitate completing the modification.

Disaster recovery plans vary depending on the extent of the failure and the type of equipment affected. The initial contingency site is shared with other State systems under DISC oversight. The secondary resource is an outside cold site.

### **6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance**

Systems support for KAECSES is provided primarily by State staff in DIR. There are seven applications staff -- two systems analysts and five programmers -- dedicated to supporting all the Kansas public assistance systems. Additional systems support is provided by two MIS managers, three systems programmers, one database administrator, six staff in network support, and nine operations staff. State staff within CDP have a very limited role in system support, and no CDP staff are dedicated to KAECSES.

Contractors also provide support for KAECSES. There are several contractors, including two programmers and one systems analyst, who are used to make necessary changes required to add or modify system functions.

The State has an acute MIS staffing shortage, and existing staff lack the background to effectively support the system. SRS hires staff from the State Department of Revenue, since Revenue has staff familiar with NATURAL and ADABAS. SRS lost its most

experienced staff members two or three years ago and has not been able to replace them with equally experienced staff.

Kansas' limited staffing resources have resulted in a significant backlog of system requests and have inhibited the development of enhancements. The current backlog is approximately 225 system requests; about 100 are more than one year old. In addition, staff efforts are focused solely on addressing problems. Kansas often has to implement new policy changes outside of the system to remain in compliance with Federal requirements.

Kansas continues with attempts to improve its system maintenance. As part of this effort, State staff are looking at Knowledgeware and the TI CASE tools. Through system changes and fine tuning, month end rollover processing has been reduced from five cycles, that required five and a half days to complete, to only two cycles. Month end processing now requires two and a half days, is initiated over the weekend, and is completed on Monday. The batch cycle takes an additional two days for month end processing, but the on-line window can be brought back up after Monday.

The program areas run and prioritize the change process for SRS. Program directives to MIS are provided through memos with specifications attached.

### **6.2.3 Telecommunications**

Kansas has upgraded its telecommunications network to improve response time and reliability. There are three T1 trunk lines out of Topeka: one to the Kansas City area, one to the Southeast, and one to the West. All circuits are digital except in areas where an independent telephone company cannot support digital service yet. The T1 lines break out into 56 KB lines, to 19.2 KB lines to a locale, and to 9600 baud lines to a building or a building complex.

Telecommunications backup plans are included in the State's disaster recovery plan. All circuits are dual routed for backup. The State contracts with common carriers for circuits at a reduced rate. As a last resort or a temporary measure, dial up capabilities can be used.

### **6.2.4 System Performance**

The normal load on the IBM 3090 is 65 percent of capacity. During peak hours, the mainframe operates at 93 percent of capacity. Direct access storage device (DASD) has been at a premium recently, and the ADABAS database manager is not equipped to process the peak transaction loads from KAECSES. Kansas staff hope that the new release of ADABAS will alleviate some of the problems.

Several changes have been made to improve system performance. The telecommunications network has been upgraded to support digital transmission at faster speeds. The DASD controllers have been dual routed for reliability and speed. A new

Symetrics disk array was added in 1993 to hold more data in cache. The addition of the disk array has reduced response time as well.

Average transaction volume for KAECSES is 560,000 transactions per day. This generates seven to 20 additional database calls per transaction and eight to 10 million database transactions per day.

### **6.2.5 System Response**

System response has presented intermittent problems in Kansas. Planned response time was six seconds. Initially during the pilot, normal response time was 45 seconds. Response times were reduced to a tolerable level during the period following conversion until about a year after implementation. Most of the improvements in response time during the first few years were due to CICS tuning and telecommunications improvements. More new programs then were added to the system, the system was used more often, caseloads continued to increase, and the State added more functionality. All these factors resulted in slower response times.

A memory upgrade project, which added 128 MB of extended memory to the mainframe, was completed in 1992 and resulted in improved response time and throughput. Average response time for inquiries, participation searches, and eligibility determination currently are between five and ten seconds. At peak processing times, response times increase to 15 to 20 seconds. State staff indicated that users find these response times to be acceptable; however, field staff have abandoned interactive interviewing pending further improvement in response times. At present, only changes are entered on-line.

Some actions have been performed to improve response times. To accommodate the transaction volume, two changes were made. The mainframe was divided into two separate CICS regions to eliminate a communications bottleneck. Second, the State split the KAECSES database into six databases to take advantage of how ADABAS functions. The percentage of transaction volume accounted for by security transactions was reduced from about 30 percent to between four and five percent.

To keep internal response time at an acceptable level, the database must be reorganized monthly. Internal response time currently is at 0.342 to 0.461 seconds. The exception is eligibility determination and benefit calculation. Due to its complexity, the process generates multiple internal transactions that skew the tracking times.

### **6.2.6 System Downtime**

State staff did not express any concerns regarding system downtime. There is some planned downtime for the system. Planned downtime occurs on the last Monday each month when month end rollover processing is performed and at least three nights a month when the on-line system becomes unavailable at 5:00 p.m. instead of 6:30 p.m. Planned downtime, however, is not considered to be a problem in Kansas. The State has manual processes in place that can be used when the system is down.

## **6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans**

There are several areas in which Kansas is planning enhancements; State staff are preparing or have submitted APDs. Two of these APDs are for initiatives related to the Child Welfare and the JOBS/Child Care Programs. A third APD is for an EBT system to issue benefits for the FSP and other programs. Another APD relates to the CSE portion of KAECSES. Plans have been to enhance the system to meet Federal requirements. The planned CSE system enhancements will be done using CASE tools from TI and the Application Development Workbench (ADW). TI is being used as a consultant to train knowledge engineers for this project. Knowledge engineer training has been completed. Administrative Services is working on an APD related to automation through the addition of local areas networks, electronic mail, and word processing.

There are plans to provide on-line access from KAECSES to other State systems. State staff indicated that these plans call for on-line access to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles and Bureau of Wages systems in 1994 and the Social Security database in 1995.

Kansas continues to tune and redesign the system to improve performance. The State is considering the use of CASE tools to alleviate system maintenance problems in the longer term. Distributed processing is being considered as a means of improving both system response time and performance. In addition, State staff envision that more functionality will be handled at the local level using personal computers in the future.

## **7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION**

This section addresses the following topics: KAECSES development costs and level of Federal funding, KAECSES operational costs, cost control systems and methods, and cost allocation methodologies for development and operational costs.

### **7.1 KAECSES Development Costs and Federal Funding**

The total budgeted cost of KAECSES, as documented in the January 1989 APDU was \$22,076,051. Of this amount, \$21,824,791 was to be reimbursed at the enhanced rate and \$251,260 at the regular rate. The share of the budgeted amount allocated to the FSP was 30.291 percent, and the total amount allocated to the Food Stamp Program was \$6,610,947 for enhanced funding and \$76,109 for regular funding. The FNS share was \$4,958,211 at the 75 percent Federal financial participation (FFP) rate and \$38,054 at 50 percent FFP. The total budgeted FFP was \$4,996,265.

KAECSES was fully implemented in July 1989. The total actual development cost of KAECSES through June 1989 was \$20,280,522. The amount allocated to the FSP was \$6,110,186, which was approximately 30.13 percent of total KAECSES costs. This amount included \$5,914,153 that was to be reimbursed at the 75 percent FFP rate and \$196,033 at 50 percent FFP. After applying the FFP rates, the FNS share of KAECSES

costs totalled \$4,533,632; this total represented \$4,435,615 in enhanced funding at 75 percent FFP and \$98,017 in regular funding at 50 percent FFP.

Estimated KAECSES development costs changed during the course of the development effort. In the December 1984 APD, the projected development cost was estimated to be \$2,373,442, excluding hardware costs. The KAECSES budget was revised in June 1985, and total projected development costs were estimated at \$11,937,168. Hardware costs accounted for \$9,759,000 of the total budgeted amount. In a January 1987 APDU, the KAECSES budget was revised to allow for increased personnel and contractor costs. Total projected development cost at this time was estimated at \$13,698,925, and the FNS share -- with a 30.291 percent cost allocation and 75 percent FFP -- was \$3,112,156. FNS approved the January 1987 APDU and the total budgeted costs in April 1987.

As development proceeded during 1988, there were two additional cost increases. The January 1988 APDU increased the total projected cost for KAECSES to \$14,583,545 due to increases in hardware and software costs. The FNS share was estimated to be \$3,304,355. Further cost revisions were made in September to reflect increases for personnel, contractor, and State CDP facilities costs. These changes increased the total projected development cost to \$19,485,541 and raised the FNS share to \$4,404,672.

The budget was revised again in the January 1989 APDU. The increases in development cost reflected increased hardware cost. Total projected cost at this time was \$22,076,051, with FNS FFP of \$4,996,265. The FNS share reflected a 30.291 percent cost allocation and Federal funding at both the 75 percent and 50 percent FFP rates.

In June 1990, the total actual KAECSES development cost was determined to be \$20,280,522, and the total FNS share at 75 percent FFP was \$4,435,615. By this time, FNS had approved a total of \$4,377,081 for enhanced funding at 75 percent FFP.

### **7.1.1 KAECSES System Components**

KAECSES supports AFDC, FSP, Medicaid, and CSE as well as State Social Services and GA Programs. The system consists of 15 major functions:

- Administrative Functions
- Intake Processing
- Eligibility Determination
- Monthly Reporting
- Verification Procedures
- WIN/CWEP Registration
- Title IV-D Interface
- Quality Control
- Mass Update
- Purge Filing
- Issuance
- Benefit Reconciliation

- Fiscal Budgeting Reporting
- Security
- Claims/Collections

### 7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

Table 7.1, KAECSES Budgeted Cost Components, summarizes budgeted expenditures as documented in the January 1989 APDU.

**Table 7.1 KAECSES Budgeted Cost Components**

Cost Component	Budgeted Cost
State Personnel	\$3,802,545
Contractors	3,249,664
State Central Data Processing Facilities	2,700,853
Hardware	10,181,716
Software	672,508
Miscellaneous ADP Expenses	607,921
Training	609,584
Field Staff Training	251,260
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$22,076,051</b>

The following sections provide additional detail about hardware, contractor, and State personnel costs associated with KAECSES development. These cost components account for over 78 percent of budgeted development costs.

#### 7.1.2.1 Hardware

Total hardware cost for KAECSES Automated Eligibility was projected at \$10,181,716. Hardware costs included purchasing the following equipment: an IBM 3090/200 CPU, an IBM 3090/400E CPU upgrade and related peripherals, and terminals and related peripherals.

#### 7.1.2.2 Contractor Costs

The original contract, with a value of \$3,847,931, for software development was awarded to Systemhouse, Inc. in late 1986. Of the total contract amount, \$2,876,676 was allocated to the KAECSES AE portion of the system, and the remainder was designated for

development related to CSE. An amendment to extend the length of the contract resulted in a \$497,316 increase, with \$372,988 allocated to KAECSES AE.

### 7.1.2.3 State Personnel Costs

Direct and indirect personnel costs were projected at \$3,402,097 and \$400,448, respectively. Direct personnel was divided into three main categories:

- **KAECSES Staff.** This category included a project manager, automated eligibility specialist, telecommunications specialist, and three management analysts.
- **Data Processing Staff.** Data processing staff consisted of two programmers from the Division of Information of Resources.
- **DECO Staff.** DECO staff included field personnel who participated in many functions ranging from providing input regarding system screens and reports to training other field staff.

Indirect staff costs were allocated to the KAECSES project using a rate of \$437.50 per person per quarter.

## 7.2 Operational Costs

Total KAECSES operational costs, the allocated FSP share, and the FNS share of operational costs after FFP for FY 1990 through the third quarter of FY 1993 are presented in Table 7.2, KAECSES Operational Costs.

**Table 7.2 KAECSES Operational Costs**

FY	Total ADP Operational Cost	Average Cost Allocation %	FSP Share	FNS Share at 50% FFP
1990	\$2,812,136	27.84%	\$782,977	\$391,488
1991	2,031,266	34.70%	704,851	352,425
1992	2,194,692	35.13%	770,938	385,469
1993 <sup>4</sup>	1,861,391	N/A	530,135	265,067

<sup>4</sup> FY 1993 data represent the ADP operational cost total for three quarters only; therefore, the average cost allocation percentage was not computed.

### 7.2.1 Cost Per Case

The monthly cost per case for FY 1992 was \$0.94. This cost was calculated using the 1992 food stamp monthly caseload of 68,310 households and the 1992 average monthly FSP share of KAECSES costs, \$64,244.

### 7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

All SRS expenditures are processed in two systems: the agency's internal accounting system, Financial Accounting and Reporting Management System (FARMS), and the State's accounting system, STARS. SRS maintains its own accounting system to track detailed expenditure transactions that cannot be monitored in STARS.

To process an invoice for payment, the user must code it with a program cost account (PCA) and object code. The split of the expenditure into the appropriate fund is performed automatically in FARMS. All invoices must be submitted to the Department of Administration (DA) for payment. The DA reviews the invoice to ensure that the correct PCA and object codes have been used. The invoices are then batched and processed in STARS.

On a quarterly basis, STARS generates an expenditure report that shows total expenditures, by PCA, for each month of the quarter. These costs are direct costs of the PCA, some of which are allocated to other PCAs using the appropriate cost allocation basis.

The account code structure for all expenditures is made up three types of codes:

- **PCA.** A PCA is synonymous with a cost center.
- **Fund Code.** A fund code identifies the source of the funding (e.g., FSP is identified by fund 3445).
- **Object Code.** An object code identifies the type of expenditure. Object codes are set and maintained by the State.

## 7.3 Kansas Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section describes the methodologies used by the Accounting Services Office in the Comptroller's Division to allocate ADP development and operational costs.

### 7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology

KAECSES budgeted development costs were allocated using the following standard percentages:

- AFDC, 35.226 percent

- FSP, 30.291 percent
- Medicaid, 19.316 percent
- RR, 0.106 percent
- State, 15.061 percent

These percentages were calculated using assigned weight factors from the functional areas identified in section 7.1.1 and one quarter's results from the Income Maintenance random moment sampling (RMS) time study. Actual costs incurred during any given quarter were allocated using the IM time study results for that quarter rather than the budgeted cost allocation percentages.

### **7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics**

KAECSES operational cost is either directly charged to PCA 01940, *KAECSES Maintenance*, or allocated to 01940 from one of the following cost centers:

Technique (REST) system. These percentages are used to allocate and claim administrative expenses on Federal reports. A variation of these percentages is manually compiled in another section of the worksheet and is used to allocate KAECSSES Maintenance costs in 01940 after some non-applicable amounts are removed from the Income Maintenance sample and the percentages are recomputed.

- The modified RMS percentages are presented in Worksheet IV.

**APPENDIX A**

**STATE OF KANSAS**

**EXHIBITS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Component</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Acquisition Method</b>	<b>Number/ Features</b>
<b>CPU</b>			
3090/400E	IBM	Purchase	4 processors, 128 MB main memory, 256 MB expanded memory (1)
<b>DISK</b>			
7380	Hitachi	Purchase	Triple density (TD) (6) Double density (DD) (10) Single density (SD) (22)
48XX	Symetrics	Purchase	(1)
<b>TAPE</b>			
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	autoloader (38)
<b>PRINTERS</b>			
Impact	IBM	Purchase	1403 (1)
Impact	Data General	Purchase	(1)
Laser	IBM	Purchase	3805 (1)
Laser	DA	Purchase	(1)
<b>FRONT ENDS</b>			
FEP	IBM	Purchase	3725 (1)
<b>REMOTE EQUIPMENT</b>			
Workstations	IBM	Purchase	3270 Terminals (3,000)

**APPENDIX B**

**STATE OF KANSAS**

**ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS**

## OVERVIEW

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

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

### Description of the Sample

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

Number of EWs in Kansas	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
490	63	12.9%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	46	73.0%

Although the proportion of eligibility workers selected to receive the survey is small, these workers were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Kansas. The response rate of 73 percent is good and produced a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals.

### Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are satisfied with the computer system in the Kansas. They generally find it responsive, accurate, and fairly easy to use. Two complaints are that response time is sometimes too slow and that the system is down too often.

Most respondents also think the computer system helps them do their jobs and makes them more efficient, although 52 percent feel that the system adds stress to their jobs and almost 40 percent feel that determining monthly reporting status is more difficult.

## SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

### Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	5	10.9
Good	34	73.9
Excellent	7	15.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	17	37.8
Good	27	60.0
Excellent	1	2.2

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	21.7
Sometimes	32	69.6
Often	4	8.7

The EWs who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although over three quarters (78 percent) also think the system response time is too slow sometimes or often.

**Availability**

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	4	8.7
Often	42	91.3

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	26.1
Sometimes	30	65.2
Often	4	8.7

A large majority of the EWs feel the system is available when they need to use it. A substantial proportion, however, also think that the system is sometimes or often down.

**Accuracy**

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	1	2.2
Good	33	71.7
Excellent	12	26.1

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	36	80.0
Sometimes	9	20.0

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	77.3
Sometimes	9	20.5
Often	1	2.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	36	80.0
Sometimes	8	17.8
Often	1	2.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	4.8
About the same	3	14.3
Easier	17	81.0

The EWs generally think the system's data and computations are quite accurate.

### Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	38	82.6
Sometimes	8	17.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	73.9
Sometimes	11	23.9
Often	1	2.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	43	93.5
Sometimes	3	6.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	36	83.7
Sometimes	7	16.3

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	44	95.7
Sometimes	1	2.2
Often	1	2.2

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	45	97.8
Sometimes	1	2.2

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	44	95.7
Sometimes	2	4.3

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	43	93.5
Sometimes	2	4.3
Often	1	2.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	39	84.8
Sometimes	7	15.2

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	40	87.0
Sometimes	6	13.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	36	80.0
Sometimes	9	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	33	76.7
Sometimes	9	20.9
Often	1	2.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	71.0
Sometimes	6	19.4
Often	3	9.7

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	72.7
Sometimes	10	22.7
Often	2	4.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	42	91.3
Sometimes	3	6.5
Often	1	2.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	40	88.9
Sometimes	5	11.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	79.5
Sometimes	9	20.5

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	57.5
Sometimes	14	35.0
Often	3	7.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	62.5
Sometimes	13	32.5
Often	2	5.0

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	87.5
Sometimes	5	12.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	9.5
About the same	5	23.8
Easier	14	66.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	3	14.3
Easier	18	85.7

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 (%)
More Difficult	1	4.8
About the same	3	14.3
Easier	17	81.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	4.8
About the same	2	9.5
Easier	18	85.7

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	8	38.1
Easier	13	61.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	3	14.3
Easier	18	85.7

The EWs generally feel that the system is easy to use. Most report rarely having difficulty performing most of their usual functions. There is a significant percentage, over 30 percent, who feel that suspected fraud cases are difficult to identify and more than a third report difficulty determining monthly reporting status.

#### **FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS**

##### **Worker Satisfaction Levels**

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	2.2
Sometimes	3	6.5
Often	42	91.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	47.8
Sometimes	21	45.7
Often	3	6.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	37	80.4
Sometimes	6	13.0
Often	3	6.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	3	14.3
About the same	5	23.8
More	13	61.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	2	9.5
About the same	6	28.6
More	13	61.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	8	38.1
About the same	8	38.1
More	5	23.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	1	4.8
About the same	3	14.3
More	17	81.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	2	9.5
About the same	3	14.3
More	16	76.2

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Worse	1	4.8
Better	20	95.2

The EWS are generally satisfied with the system although a significant percentage (52 percent) find that it adds stress to their work. Overall more than 95 percent feel that the current system is superior to the previous system.

**Client Service**

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	71.1
Sometimes	11	24.4
Often	2	4.4

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	39	86.7
Sometimes	5	11.1
Often	1	2.2

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 (%)
About the same	18	85.7
Easier	3	14.3

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	18	90.0
Fewer	2	10.0

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 (%)
More	1	4.8
About the same	18	85.7
Less	2	9.5

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	4.8
About the same	18	85.7
Less	2	9.5

The EWs found expedited service easier to provide but otherwise a majority rated the client service aspects of the current system as about the same as the previous system.

### 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	28.6
Easier	15	71.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	9	42.9
Fewer	12	57.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	17	81.0
Fewer	4	19.0

A significant percentage of respondents, 71 percent, feel that it is easier to collect overpayments under the new system but, on average, less than half perceived an improvement in fraud detection.

**APPENDIX C**

**STATE OF KANSAS**

**ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS**

## OVERVIEW

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

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

### Description of the Sample

The 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 Kansas	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
65	30	46.2%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	24	80%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in Kansas. The response rate of 80 percent is good, producing a sample whose responses should be representative of all supervisors in Kansas.

### Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and helps them in their jobs. Almost all respondents found the system easy to learn and use.

## SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

### Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	16.7
Good	15	62.5
Excellent	5	20.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	9	37.5
Good	13	54.2
Excellent	2	8.3

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	37.5
Sometimes	12	50.0
Often	3	12.5

The supervisors who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although over half (62.5 percent) think the system response time is too slow sometimes or often.

## Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	2	8.3
Often	22	91.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	5.0
About the same	2	10.0
Easier	17	85.0

All the supervisors who responded think the information in the system is either good or excellent and almost all felt that benefit levels are easier to calculate.

**Ease of Use**

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	18	75.0
Sometimes	5	20.8
Often	1	4.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	58.3
Sometimes	7	29.2
Often	3	12.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	79.2
Sometimes	5	20.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	79.2
Sometimes	4	16.7
Often	1	4.2

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	83.3
Sometimes	4	16.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	90.9
Sometimes	2	9.1

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	21	91.3
Sometimes	2	8.7

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	65.2
Sometimes	7	30.4
Often	1	4.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	10.0
About the same	6	30.0
Easier	12	60.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	3	15.0
Easier	17	85.0

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	20	100.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	5.0
About the same	1	5.0
Easier	18	90.0

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	15.0
Easier	17	85.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	5.0
About the same	6	30.0
Easier	13	65.0

A majority of the supervisors did not find it difficult to obtain information or to learn the system although a significant percentage did experience some difficulty in these areas. Those who responded rarely had difficulty performing such specific tasks as automatically terminating benefits or generating warning notices. The new system was generally perceived as being easier to use than the previous system.

**FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS**

**Supervisor Satisfaction Levels**

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	6	25.0
Often	18	75.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	37.5
Sometimes	13	54.2
Often	2	8.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	15.0
About the same	10	50.0
More	7	35.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	15.0
About the same	11	55.0
More	6	30.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	15	75.0
More	5	25.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	5.0
About the same	3	15.0
More	16	80.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	7	35.0
More	13	65.0

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	1	5.0
About the same	5	25.0
Better	14	70.0

Most of the supervisors who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work and but 62.5 percent also feel that it sometimes or often contributes added stress. A majority of the supervisors felt that the new system made them more efficient and effective and that the system was better overall but most did not feel more satisfied in their work.

### Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	7	29.2
Good	17	70.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	12.5
Good	21	87.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	40.0
Sometimes	12	60.0

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	64.3
Sometimes	5	35.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	5.0
About the same	7	35.0
More	12	60.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to make mass changes?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	5.3
About the same	4	21.1
Easier	14	73.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	3	15.0
About the same	5	25.0
Easier	12	60.0

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, with 71 percent thinking the reports produced by the system are good. However, is a significant percentage of the supervisors responding think the quality of the reports is poor and that is difficult to make mass changes to the system. Most think the support provided by the technical staff is good.

## Client Service

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	5.0
About the same	15	75.0
Easier	4	20.0

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the services received by the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	1	5.0
About the same	8	40.0
Better	11	55.0

Under the new (current) system, how do you think the average client is being served?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	8	40.0
Better	12	60.0

Most of the supervisors think the client is being served somewhat better with the current system as compared to the old.

### Fraud and Error

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	10.0
About the same	5	25.0
Easier	13	65.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	2	10.0
About the same	10	50.0
Less	8	40.0

Under the new (current) system, how many false claims are caught?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fewer	1	5.0
About the same	15	75.0
More	4	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	2	10.0
About the same	14	70.0
Fewer	4	20.0

Most of the supervisors think the current system does no better than the old system in fraud and error detection, although it does better in collecting overpayments.