

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: MAY 28 - 30, 1993

IOWA STATE REPORT

AUGUST 30, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

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

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs	3
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	4
2.4.1 Staffing	5
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes	5
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	7
2.4.4 Claims Collection	7
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	8
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	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
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	14
4.1 Overview of the Existing System	14
4.2 Justification for the New System	15

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	17
4.7 MIS Participation	17
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	18
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	18
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	18
6.1 System Profile	18
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	19
6.2.1 Operating Environment	19
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	20
6.2.3 Telecommunications	22
6.2.4 System Performance	22
6.2.5 System Response	22
6.2.6 System Downtime	23
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	23
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	23
7.1 X-PERT Development Costs and Federal Funding	24
7.1.1 X-PERT System Components	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major X-PERT Development Cost Components	25
7.2 ABC and X-PERT Operational Costs	26
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	27
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	28
7.3 Iowa Cost Allocation Methodologies	28
7.3.1 Historical Overview of X-PERT Development Cost Allocation Methodology	28
7.3.2 ABC Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	29

APPENDICES

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

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	3
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	4
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	7
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	8
7.1	Major X-PERT Estimated Development Costs	25
7.2	X-PERT Expenditures to Date	26
7.3	X-PERT Annual Operating Costs	27
7.4	ABC Food Stamp Operational Cost per Case	28
7.5	Cost Allocation Trends by Program	29
7.6	ABC Food Stamp ADP Billing Cost Pool Relationships	30
7.7	Recent RMS Allocation for Major Income Maintenance Programs	30

APPENDIX A - State of Iowa Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Iowa Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	X-PERT Estimated Project Costs	A-5
A-7.2	ABC Operational Costs 1989-1990	A-6

IOWA STATE REPORT
Site Visit: May 28 - 30, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: ABC System (1983-1984); FAMIS Enhancement (1987-1989) X-PERT Enhancement (1990-1995)

Start Date: 1983

Completion Date: 1995

Contractor: EDS (ABC System)

Transfer From: Concept only from Washington, D.C.

Cost:

Actual: \$600,000

Projected: \$783,269

FSP Share: \$210,600

FSP %: 35.1%

Number of Users: 961

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: IBM 3090 300J MVS/ESA, VM/SP

Workstations: IBM 3174

Telecommunications Network: SNA backbone

System Profile:

Programs: FSP, AFDC, Medicaid, Refugee Assistance

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS) has two major groups, an administration group that provides fiscal management, support services, and data management and a second group that provides services. Both groups are headed by deputy directors who report to the Director of Human Services. Programs administered by DHS include: Mental Health and Mental Retardation Commission; Medical Services; Economic Assistance; and Adult, Children, and Family Services. The Division of Economic Assistance is responsible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Welfare Reform, Homelessness, and the Food Stamp Program (FSP). Local welfare offices report to regional offices, which in turn report to the deputy director.

The Division of Data Management (DDM) is a part of the Administration group and provides programming and maintenance support for DHS systems. The DHS system uses hardware that is located at the State Data Center. This hardware is operated by the Information Services Division (ISD) of the Iowa Department of General Services.

The recent recession has had a negative impact on Iowa's financial situation. Although no major cuts have been made in public assistance programs, the lack of growth in the DHS budget means that DHS has had to manage more clients on the same amount of money. One staff reduction occurred in the Systems and Programming group and two in the Policy area.

Iowa is mainly rural with a total population of 2,787,424 according to the 1990 census. Approximately seven percent of the population receive FSP benefits. The level of unemployment in Iowa has remained fairly constant in recent years, at around 4.5 percent. The 1991 unemployment rate was 4.6 percent. This compares very favorably with the highest recent rate in Iowa, 8.5 percent in 1982.

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

- Iowa's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was between 5 percent to 9.9% percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Iowa reduced the 1992 State budget by \$176.7 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Iowa decreased by 1.28 percent. This was twice the national average of a 0.6 percent decrease.
- Iowa implemented changes to increase revenues by \$225.1 million for FY 1993. These changes included increases in sales and personal income taxes.
- The regional outlook indicated that the Plains region was outperforming the national economy. All States in the region had job gains between June 1991 and June 1992.

- Under Welfare Reform, the State is undertaking a major initiative to streamline welfare within Iowa. The State is preparing a number of waivers related to policy modifications. There are 12 initiatives in AFDC, most of which will be matched in some way by FSP.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The FSP field staff report to an Income Maintenance supervisor, who reports to the Human Service Area Administrator (HSAA). Each HSAA is responsible for several counties. There are 104 local welfare offices located in 99 counties, within 5 regions. Each region is directed by a regional administrator, who reports to the deputy director of the Services group. In each regional office there is a benefit payment administrator (BPA) who is responsible for the income maintenance programs. There are three to five program specialists in each regional office. Any questions go to the BPA and from there to the central office. There is also an Office of Field Support that serves as a liaison between the supervisory chain of command and the field staff

Iowa's average monthly benefit issuance per household has increased over the last five years, as shown in Table 2.2.¹

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$156.16	\$143.42	\$133.55	\$120.68	\$121.27

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Iowa's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.² Both total cost and average cost per household have fluctuated over this period.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$8,449,889	\$8,494,304	\$10,806,997	\$9,128,093	\$10,177,108
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$9.21	\$9.89	\$13.21	\$11.34	\$12.07

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

The ABC system was developed to provide automated benefit calculation once the worker determined non-financial eligibility, to enhance the monthly reporting subsystem, to generate notices of decisions of eligibility and benefit level and create automated interfaces for recoupment, and to facilitate the implementation of regulatory changes. The system was expected to save the worker time, reduce the potential for errors, and automatically calculate mass changes.

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

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

When the system was enhanced in 1988 in order to become Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified, the same system objectives were cited. The sections below present areas of program performance where changes occurred.

2.4.1 Staffing

Since the ABC system was implemented, the average monthly caseload has increased and the number of caseworkers and issuance workers has decreased. Currently, there are 671 income maintenance workers who register cases, complete applications, and perform on-going casework. The 671 caseworkers all have terminals, as do the 151 eligibility worker supervisors. Clerical workers do not all have terminals, nor do receptionists who perform registration activities in some offices. There are 101 issuance centers which handle coupon inventory and issue food stamps. The level of staffing varies according to the organization of the office, but does not exceed 101 issuance workers total. There are 38 area administrators.

Eligibility workers were mostly generic prior to the implementation of the ABC system. It is up to the area administrator and county supervisor to determine how the office will be organized.

The current operations staff is two positions short because of a State hiring freeze. With financial resources, additional staff can be obtained from the State schedule of contractors. DHS prefers to hire people from within the State but finds it difficult to compete with salaries in the Des Moines area. Experienced systems people generally work for the large insurance companies in the area, so the State hires lower level staff from the local universities and trains them.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes

Of the 14 regulatory provisions shown in Exhibit A-2.1, two were implemented on time, one was not applicable, one was already implemented, and the remainder were implemented late, although some of these provisions were retroactive to the implementation date, once they had been implemented. DHS provided the following explanations regarding specific provisions:

- Exempting Annual School Clothing (CFR 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)). Not applicable. Iowa does not provide school clothing allowances.
- Household Resource Exemption for PA/SSI Mixed Households (CFR273.8(e)(17)). Implemented one month late because USDA direction was not clear.
- Shelter Expense for Households with Homeless Members (CFR273.9(d)(5)(i)). Implemented October 10, 1992. Effective November 1, 1992. This provision was incompatible with State existing policies which had to be changed.

- Combined Initial Allotment, Normal Time Frames (CFR274.1(b)(2)). This requires changes to both State policy and computer programs and has not yet been implemented (as of 4/28/92).
- Combined Initial Allotment, Expedited (CFR 274.2(b)(3)). This became effective February 1, 1992 and required changes in both State policy and the computer programs. DHS experienced difficulty in formulating specifications for the technical staff and awaited resolution of USDA discussions of a possible law change deleting requirement.
- Migrant Vendor Payments Exclusion (CFR 273.9(c)(1)(ii)). This was implemented in September 1989, retroactive to September 1, 1988, the implementation date. It required changes in State policy. DHS received late instructions from USDA.
- Advanced Earned Income Tax Credit Payment Exclusion (CFR 273.9(c)(14)). Implemented in March 1989. Required changes to State policy. DHS received late instructions from USDA.
- Dependent Care Deduction Increase (CFR 273.9(f)(4)). Not implemented on time because DH received late instructions from USDA. Required changes to both State policy and computer programs.
- Elimination of Migrant Initial Month Proration (CFR 273.10(a)(1)(ii)). Received late instructions from USDA effective upon signing bill (6/6/89). Required changes to State policy.
- Limitation on the Number of Replacement Issuances (CFR 274.6(b)(2)). Implemented February 1, 1992. The only change DHS needed to make to comply with this provision was to increase the limitation on the replacement of food coupons destroyed in a household misfortune to "to in 6 months." However, Iowa could not implement this provision until an earlier set of Federal regulations had been adopted.
- Destruction of Unusable Coupons within 30 Days (CFR 274.7(f)). This provision had a low priority and was delayed due to a lack of staff. Three employees must count the stamps and two of the three must immediately destroy them, and two finance employees must be available to verify the first employee's counting/destroying effort. This is performed as soon as possible after the FNS-471, Report of Food Stamps Received in Payment of Food Stamp Claims, is completed and two issuance employees are available to verify.

Regulatory changes are reviewed by the FSP policy staff, who submit a Service Request if a system change is needed. Proposed changes are submitted to field staff for review and comment and then the service request is submitted to Management Information System (MIS). While MIS is reviewing the change, policy begins to develop the manual

instructional material and policy change. If there is a system change, the policy coordination unit prepare the user manual instructions. A training plan is developed along with a plan for testing and sign off of the changes.

Problems the State encounters in making regulatory changes to the system include:

- Late notification from Federal FSP management
- System complexity
- Priority conflicts
- Staffing restrictions
- Receipt of wrong figures from the Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) regarding the routine Thrifty Food Plan

The ABC system is table-driven making the implementation of mass changes easier than it was before the ABC system. However, in the implementation of other regulatory changes that require programming changes, timeliness of implementation suffers.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Iowa's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has fluctuated between 1988 and 1992, although the 1988 and 1992 rates are very similar.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	10.76	8.50	11.82	10.63	10.64

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Iowa's claims collected as a percentage of claims established decreased from 1987 to 1989, increased in 1990 and again in 1991. The percentage of claims collected is affected by the total number of claims established, whether the individual is still receiving benefits, the amount of available assets, and other factors.

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of collections and the percentage of claims established that were collected. Over the 1987 to 1991 period, the dollar value of claims collected actually decreased.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$1,252,311	\$1,283,068	\$1,522,413	\$2,465,182	\$1,358,560
Total Claims Collected	\$898,209	\$788,221	\$729,933	\$741,938	\$716,687
As a % of Total Claims Established	71.7%	61.4%	47.9%	30.0%	52.7%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

The ABC system was FAMIS-certified in 1989 after the implementation of the FAMIS enhancements. These enhancements included the purchase of terminals for caseworker use. FNS conducted a post-implementation review of the original ABC system in 1984.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of the ABC system functionality, complexity, and level of integration.

3.1 System Functionality

Applicants for AFDC, FSP, Medicaid, and Refugee Assistance apply for benefits at the local welfare office. They may apply for benefits from a specific program or they may request that they be considered for all programs.

ABC was initially developed to enable eligibility workers to meet the requirements of monthly reporting. Initially, data entry was done by clerical workers in the local offices using terminals located in these offices. When ABC was enhanced to meet FAMIS requirements in 1988, terminals were provided for eligibility worker use.

Local welfare offices organize staff responsibilities according to their needs. Most offices have clerical personnel who serve as receptionists, perform some data entry tasks (other than for eligibility workers), and perform clerical duties for eligibility workers and social workers within the office. In some offices clerical personnel perform registration activities and in other offices registration is performed by an eligibility worker. Each eligibility worker has a terminal; clerical personnel share terminals.

- **Registration.** Each client is assigned an identification number that is unique and remains with the individual regardless of the case to which the individual is assigned. The need for expedited service is determined by the registration or eligibility worker.

Terminals are used to register applicants. A clerk or eligibility worker enters in the name, address, Social Security number (SSN), and date of birth. At the time of registration, a search is performed to determine whether the individual is known to the system and whether he or she has participated in AFDC, FSP, or Medicaid. A search is conducted for each household member that is listed on the application form at the time of registration. Since other individuals may be added to the application during the interview process, some individuals may not be included in the search at the time of registration. Even if the individual has participated in public assistance programs previously, the system does not copy the historical case record into the current record. When an applicant is registered, the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) matches are run automatically, depending upon when the match is performed (weekly, quarterly, etc.).

If the client identification number is known at the time of registration, this number is used during the search.

At the time of registration, an on-line match with Department of Transportation records is performed to see whether there is a vehicle unaccounted for. At the same time, a search of State Employment Services is performed to identify wages or unemployment insurance. Other on-line searches can also be performed at this time. Searches of public assistance files, and State wage files from Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma can be performed using the SSN of the individual.

The eligibility worker is able to skip data entry screens to go to a specific screen. There are a number of on-line edits of the information available, but not as many as the State would like. The screens do not emulate the format and sequence of the application forms that are used today. The ABC system screens look like the paper turnaround documents that were used when ABC was first implemented.

- **Eligibility Determination.** Most caseworkers enter the interview information into the system after the interview has been conducted. There are a few eligibility workers who utilize the screens to enter the client information into the system at the time of the interview. The system determines countable financial income eligibility. The worker does the non-financial eligibility. All financial eligibility processing is done in batch mode.
- **Benefit Calculation.** Benefits are calculated by the system and reviewed by the worker. The worker may authorize benefits for all newly applying cases as well as re-applying cases. New workers use a training identification (ID) so that the

supervisor can review the case. If the case is correct, the supervisor changes the ID to the supervisor ID and the case is processed.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** The existing Iowa issuance system was transferred from Santa Clara County, California in 1974 and is still being used. It is linked to the ABC system. Most issuance is mail issuance; this is supplemented by over the counter issuance for expedited service and by electronic benefits transfer (EBT). Currently EBT is used only for AFDC cases in Linn County. Iowa implemented food stamp on-line EBT in Linn County in May 1993.

Ongoing case monthly mail issuance is staggered over 10 working days. Issuance files are created daily for new approvals and restored benefits and monthly for ongoing cases. The EBT cards are issued by the eligibility with the associated personal identification number (PIN) number (provided by the local office) in a separate sealed envelope. The AFDC EBT issuance system returns unused benefits to DHS if a client has not utilized the benefits for a particular month after 180 days. The issuance system also provides automated deposit for all AFDC clients who have an account and elect automated deposit.

Some coupons are mailed by certified mail, especially those coupons within the Des Moines area. For expedited issuance, an authorization to participate (ATP) card is prepared by the field worker for over the counter issuance in county offices. EBT on-line food stamp issuance is being demonstrated in one county in Iowa. An evaluation contractor will determine the feasibility of EBT issuance. Iowa has been issuing AFDC benefits via EBT in one county for several years. It is piggybacked onto the existing automatic teller machine (ATM) network and point of sale terminals in retail outlets.

The worker can enter data regarding undelivered or stolen coupons and returned benefits through the ABC system. Replacement benefits can be requested by the eligibility worker on-line and are reissued in the next daily issuance cycle. The system provides an on-line display of the entire issuance history.

All issuances are matched with five years of on-line issuance data. Duplicate issuance situations cause processing or issuances to be halted.

Two instances were noted in which food stamps were not expedited in a timely manner. This was not caused by the automated system. In a few offices, an AFDC intake unit was scheduling interviews for expedited cases. In another office, a less than full-time office was not meeting time frames due to specialization of workers. Both situations have been corrected.

Whenever monthly food stamp issuance cannot be reconciled, expedited issuances are examined. Since ATPs are manually issued for expedited cases, and the information for the expedited issuance must be entered into the system, there is an opportunity for key entry errors. A code for expedited issuance, coupon value,

inventory date, and effective date must be entered under the correct case number. If any of this information is keyed incorrectly, reconciliation will be difficult. Each county office has implemented a manual internal tracking of expedited food stamps that is entered into the system. The worksheet identifies late expedited issuance entries and entry errors in the format of the FNS-46 report. This is submitted to the Central Office where the information is verified and reconciled for completion of the statewide FNS-46, Issuance Reconciliation Report.

The central office manually reconciles all replacement issuances. Replacement affidavits are reviewed to verify correctness and completion. The initial issuance and replacement issuance information on the system is verified with the information on the affidavits. The Central Office verifies that all required backup documentation exists and that the system has been correctly updated with the appropriate replacement information. If coding errors are identified, the Central Office corrects the system.

- **Notices.** The system automatically generates notices. The worker does not have the capability to add text to any of the notices. The worker cannot see what notice is generated prior to printing. The system generates two copies of each notice. One copy goes to the client; one copy goes to the worker.
- **Claims System.** The worker determines how much the client is to pay back using the Scratch Pad feature of the system. The worker completes a paper claim which is sent to the Office of Inspections and Recovery. This office records the claim in the Overpayment System (OVPY) and attempts to collect on the claim. The worker can determine the claim status by accessing the OVPY System.

FNS has indicated that Iowa should be completing more claims. Currently, claims are completed on paper in the field and sent in. The Department of Inspections and Appeals inputs the claims to the OVPY System. This system interfaces back to the ABC system providing information as to the type of claim and by what percentage to reduce benefits.

- **Computer Matching.** Computer matching is performed throughout the application and on-going case management processes and is performed in batch and on-line modes. On-line matching is considered to be more useful than batch matching when determining eligibility. Batch output gives the workers the opportunity to integrate the output into their own personal work schedule. Printouts for IEVS matches are sent to the field. Field staff check to see if the information is new to them. If so, the staff prioritize it based on the type of match for further investigation. Approximately one hour per case is needed to check out the new IEVS information. No enhancements are planned for this process over the next two years.

The ABC system offers the capability of linking with other databases and systems by utilizing a "Link" menu selection. For instance, the Public Assistance Data

Exchange screen from the Child Support Enforcement system can be accessed during registration to check whether the individual is known to the public assistance systems in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, or Oklahoma and whether there are any wages reported in those States.

- **Alerts.** Once computer matching has been performed, the system notifies the eligibility worker of data found and the worker then determines if it is known information or if verification is needed. A hard copy listing is provided for the worker to check. Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX) is the only system for which an on-line tickler is provided to the worker.
- **Monthly Reporting.** The monthly report forms are returned to the local office. Clerical staff or eligibility workers enter receipt of the form (complete or incomplete) and case number into the system to track receipt of the forms. All returned forms are provided to the eligibility worker who works the case. The eligibility worker cannot determine change/no change status from the form itself. The worker must bring up the case and compare the case information to the monthly report form, entering in information that has changed since the last report period. There are no alerts associated with monthly reporting.
- **Reports Generation.** The issuance system produces 29 reports that are used for reconciliation and reporting.
- **Program Management and Administration.** Requests for ad hoc reports are submitted to MIS via a service request form. For reports that are one-time only reports, MIS will refer the request to the Statistics Department, which has access to the off-line ABC files via tape cartridge or disk. If the report is an on-going reporting requirement, MIS will develop the report. If the report requires more than 24 hours worth of programming time, the service request must be prioritized with all other requests submitted at the monthly Priority Setting Committee. If it will require less than 24 hours, then MIS staff may proceed, integrating the new effort into their normal workload. Program staff do not always get what they need within the time needed, depending on other priorities and existing workloads.

The BENDEX screen provides a help function, where the worker can obtain information from the system explaining each field on the screen. Otherwise, the worker must know what the various screen codes mean.

The system offers an on-line policy manual through Book Manager. Federal and State policies are available by means of a hypertext function allowing the user to enter certain key fields for finding a particular policy reference. This capability is a recent addition to the system and eligibility workers have not yet been trained on it, although all currently have access to it.

Electronic mail is available through Office Vision to all public assistance staff. The staff can be in the ABC system and toggle between ABC and Office Vision using a "hot key" feature.

There is also an on-line calculator function called Scratch Pad.

The user manuals are prepared by the policy units. Data processing provides information related to the system. The problem with the paper-based user manuals is that it takes two weeks before the updates are provided to the users.

- ***Innovative Features of the ABC System.*** The system was developed in modules so changes can be made relatively easily. There are separate case and individual master files that are tied together. A case file points to all IDs of individuals associated with the case. The ID points to the case. This prevents participant duplication.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

The ABC system is written in COBOL and ASSEMBLER, and utilizes VSAM files. It has a low level of integration (although there are many interfaces to other system and automated files) and a low level of complexity due to the modular structure.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Every caseworker and supervisor has a terminal. Clerical staff, many of whom perform data entry and register applications on the system, do not all have terminals and must often use a terminal assigned to a caseworker or supervisor for tasks that require a terminal.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

Iowa is planning to enhance the existing systems (leaving the databases intact) through the use of a rules-based front-end enhancement (X-PERT). This enhancement is needed because there are many areas where the system does not support the worker. Iowa would like a system in which workers have more support in applying a consistent policy throughout the State.

After the Iowa/Colorado/IBM X-PERT pilot, in 1990, Iowa had planned to develop an request for proposals (RFP) for a total X-PERT system with hardware and software. At that time the technology was still very new and they would have received low bids from vendors who were looking for an investment into the future. Today, the same environment does not exist and if they were to complete this project, the bids would be much higher. Because of this, and for several other reasons, the State wants to develop X-PERT in-house. First, it wants its staff to learn the technology so that they *would be* able to maintain the system once it was developed. Second, since it is a new technology, it is attractive to State technical staff who are interested in maintaining technological

currency. Third, Iowa felt it spent a significant amount of time in monitoring the contractor activities for the ABC system and that it did not always get what it wanted. For X-PERT, Iowa wants to avoid the expenditure of effort required for contractor monitoring.

Since Iowa has already received enhanced funding from FNS for the ABC system and from DHHS for the FAMIS enhancements, it is ineligible to receive enhanced funding for its X-PERT front-end development project. At the suggestion of the Mountain Plains Regional Office (MPRO), Iowa went to Washington in April 1990 to meet with DHHS and FNS to obtain enhanced funding. The Federal government staff agreed to accept the regional office letter and meeting documentation as an Advanced Planning Document (APD) shell to be added to by Iowa. Iowa received approval from the Federal government agencies to develop the X-PERT system but at a 50 percent funding level. Iowa was then unable to obtain funding from the State legislature until November 1992 and until that date the project was put on hold. The project is now under development.

Iowa is convinced that developing procurements with stringent warranty clauses drives up the price of the bid. Contractors increase their prices when the risk increases.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

volume from the mainframe without incurring the tremendous cost of a whole new system.

4.2 Justification for the New System

There are no plans to replace the current ABC system hardware and software or the issuance system transferred in 1974, only to enhance it with X-PERT. X-PERT will add additional files and record formats, but the original system will remain in VSAM. The objective of X-PERT is to apply the policy correctly and determine non-financial eligibility. The current system does determine the financial aspects of eligibility. The eligibility worker does the countable income and the non-financial aspects of eligibility determination. The X-PERT system is designed to accommodate policy changes.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Iowa has contracted with Cap Gemini to supplement for its staff in development of the new system. This will enable Iowa staff to be familiar with the system after implementation. Iowa has invested in expert system/artificial intelligence staff training. Both technical and management staff have been to the workshops. As of the spring of 1993, the data relationships and schema had been completed for most of the components.

For the 1990 X-PERT prototype effort, user participation for the front-end rules-based development effort consisted of four field staff, three supervisors and one eligibility worker specialist, plus one representative from each policy area -- Medicaid, FSP, and AFDC. MIS provided two people. This group did a thorough needs assessment and requirements analysis. In conjunction with IBM and the State of Colorado, a prototype system was set up. The purpose of the prototype was to determine whether welfare was a good application for knowledge-based systems. The prototype was started in 1989 and completed by February 1990. Following that effort, development began in November 1992. Funding approvals have been received.

As Iowa worked through the rules for each of the programs for the X-PERT system, it found that it was easier to develop rules for AFDC, which is usually viewed as more complex than FSP. AFDC starts the eligibility determination process and "goes in a straight line" whereas the Food Stamp and Medicaid Programs "go around in circles." The State staff found conflicting requirements in FSP.

4.4 Conversion Approach

- **Training.** Iowa used a train-the-trainer approach to implement the ABC system. The central office trained 32 people from the eight districts in two groups for three and a half days each. They were trained during the day, and at night they checked live production. After the training the trainees returned to their districts and trained district staff. At the time, a paper-based approach was being used so the new system represented a significant change. The trainers spent three days in each of the local offices or else brought the eligibility workers into the district office

for three days of training. The training turned out to be inadequate and, at the end of a year, retraining was needed.

A train-the-trainer approach is still used for on-going training and is considered more effective now that all the staff is familiar with using a computer keyboard. Iowa is already considering methods for training staff for X-PERT implementation. It feels that X-PERT will require an intensive hands-on training approach since the concept of simultaneous interviewing and computer data entry is being introduced.

After training is conducted, supervisors monitor eligibility worker performance to determine whether more training is needed. Error rate reports are available to assist the supervisors in identifying retraining needs; however, high error rates may indicate larger, more complex workloads, not lack of program or system knowledge.

- **Conversion.** The State did not review any candidate systems before selecting EDS to implement the ABC system. This system was based on the Welfare Case Management System concept used in Washington, D.C. and Massachusetts. No other transfer was made. When the ABC system was developed, DHS referred to FNS Handbook 151 to identify FNS requirements. When the State enhanced the system to become FAMIS certified, they used the APPRIS as a guide.

When Iowa converted the last phase of the FAMIS certified system, it had to interface the ABC system, the issuance system, and the Child Support Enforcement System. During this implementation, no checks or food coupons were issued for five days while the three systems were converted.

Until FAMIS certification, DHS did not have terminals for caseworkers. It only had terminals for clerical workers for monthly reporting. In 1988, caseworkers began using terminals.

4.5 Project Management

The ABC project manager was the bureau chief of Economic Assistance. His level of effort on the project was 90 percent and he had the authority to make all of the critical decisions.

During the planning phase of the ABC system, the project management team consisted of one user representative each from the Medicaid, FSP, and AFDC policy groups, two MIS staff, and two eligibility field staff. This team met daily during this phase. The same representation occurred during the development and implementation phase, with different individuals participating during different phases. During planning, the team developed the APD and user requirements, developed the cost benefit analysis, reviewed the conceptual design, and developed an informal capacity plan.

Iowa contracted for the development of the ABC system. Because of its reliance on the contractor, MIS staff did not understand the system as well as they could have when ABC was implemented. Iowa would like to utilize contractors again, but would prefer to manage the project differently, to smoothly transition from contractor to State staff.

4.6 FSP Participation

- **ABC System.** There was one user representative from each of the policy units -- Food Stamp Program, AFDC, and Medicaid. There was one eligibility worker representative from the field and one eligibility worker supervisor. This group was 100 percent dedicated to the ABC project development and worked together on a daily basis over the course of the project -- from planning through implementation. The users developed the project plan, the RFP, and the APD.

During the ABC Planning Phase, the task force included two field personnel, three policy people, and two MIS personnel. Once Iowa selected a contractor, the task force also included a contractor representative.

During development, while the contractor was coding, the task force prepared the user manual and test scenarios, performed unit testing, and participated in a one-month pilot effort. The task force reviewed all of the contractor's work and also the system output.

- **X-PERT System.** For the X-PERT system enhancement, the same personnel representation is planned, but the number of eligibility workers to be included has been doubled. DHS will coordinate with advocacy groups during X-PERT development. X-PERT is not volume driven and Iowa will not be doing a capacity plan, per se.

4.7 MIS Participation

Iowa supplied two State technical staff for ABC development. These two staff members functioned as systems analysts.

In the FAMIS development effort, MIS supplied two systems analysts, five programmers, and a quality assurance person.

The same MIS development complement used in the FAMIS certification process will be used for X-PERT. Programming staff and "knowledge engineers" will be drawn from the State staff.

Iowa, in partnership with Colorado and IBM, developed a prototype X-PERT system. There were three IBM "knowledge engineers" during prototype development. Contractor staff will be used in this capacity during X-PERT development.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

There were no problems encountered during development and implementation.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Iowa did not review other State systems before selecting EDS as its automation contractor for the ABC system. EDS transferred the Welfare Case Management System in concept as implemented by Washington, D.C. and Massachusetts. EDS used the Massachusetts system as a prototype for data collection, screens, fields and codes for ABC. No other system could interface with the Iowa issuance systems, reporting, claims, and other back-end components and the State did not want to change these components. The issuance and reporting system was developed in 1974 from the Santa Clara system. The reporting system in particular is special to Iowa. It tracks fund source for all funds. The "scratch pad" component available to the workers was brought in from Arizona.

During the ABC-FAMIS enhancement effort, Iowa considered the transfer of Louisiana and of the TEC system. The Technical Eligibility Computer (TEC) system caused performance concerns and used more resources than Iowa was willing to dedicate. The Louisiana system did not have the functionality that Iowa required. Therefore, Iowa enhanced its existing system.

X-PERT concepts originate from the prototype developed by IBM, Colorado, and Iowa in 1990. Napa and Merced Counties in California were also studied for ideas and concepts.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

6.1 System Profile

- Mainframe: IBM 3090J
OS/MVS/ESA and VM, JES3, CICS
- Front End IBM 3745
- Disk 5 IBM 3380, 22 STK 8380
- Tape 22 IBM cartridge tape drives
- Printers IBM 3820 page printer laser
2 Xerox laser printers

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

This section contains a description of the current operating system environment, including maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. Current system activities and future plans are also discussed. Programming support for ABC and for the future X-PERT system is provided by the DHS Data Management Division. The existing ABC system resides on VSAM and IDMS. IDMS is not a relational DBMS. Iowa does not plan to replace this system.

Iowa's Information Systems Division of General Services manages the State Data Center. ISD monitors the network and performs database monitoring and all security and recovery activities. Iowa has an extensive array of minicomputers throughout the Central departments. ABC, however, is on the mainframe with remote terminals.

Within DHS, program staff and MIS staff do not view themselves as separate entities. MIS is not viewed as supporting the program staff. They seem to have a very unified way of viewing their working relationships-- all working toward the same goals and objectives in concert.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

Iowa's ABC system formerly ran seven days a week, 24 hours a day. Until the State installed the cartridge tape drives, the batch window often threatened the start of the on-line system. However, the cartridge tape drives have shortened the ABC batch cycle from 10 to 14 hours to an average of five hours. As an example of the time savings, one job that used to run for over two hours is now completed in five to 20 minutes. Iowa was also able to reduce the ISD operations staff after implementation of the cartridge drives.

The on-line system is operational from 7 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. daily. System preventive maintenance and database maintenance are run on weekends. The dynamic files of the database are backed up daily; the entire system is backed up quarterly. Records that have not had any activity in two years are purged and archived off-line.

Sixteen State agencies share the IBM 3090 300J with three central processors. This system is augmented by a variety of departmental minicomputers from multiple vendors. Forty-three State departments share the State Data Center. This includes all State agencies except the Department of Transportation. The 3090J is partitioned to run both the MVS and VM operating systems. The VM partition controls office automation, while the MVS processors control transaction processing and network traffic and also support ABC. Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A is an inventory of Iowa hardware.

Of the 163 gigabytes of disk space on the system, the ABC system utilizes an average of 12.5 percent. There are separate databases in the ABC system for case and individual data. They are cross referenced internally and a worker can access files or records in either database transparently. This is one of the innovations of the Iowa system. There

are currently 358,526 records in the case database and 1,172,511 in the individual database. Record size varies from 1284 bytes to 5450 bytes of information. Because of the VSAM structure of these records, there is an infinite amount of growth available to the individual database.

The database is VSAM, as per the initial development effort in 1984. The system is very modular, calculations are in separate modules and notices are controlled by modules within each user program area. Notice language is modified by the user (program) requests. The individual is identified by a unique identification number (key) that stays with the individual for a lifetime. The household (case) number may vary as the composition of the household fluctuates.

Iowa is one of five States in the Midwest that have cross-State matching to prevent duplicate participation. There is matching within all State programs, motor vehicle records, State tax records, and State employment records to prevent abuse. This process is facilitated by all State systems being in one location, and, in some cases, on the same computer.

ABC is written in COBOL. There are less than 400 non-report programs in the system and fewer than 100 report programs that are run on a regular basis. Only two programs contain over 20,000 lines of code. There are five programs containing between 10,000 and 20,000 lines and 100 programs with between 5,000 and 10,000 lines of code. The vast majority of the software is in modules of less than 5,000 lines of code, about half have under 2,000 lines of code.

SPSS is used for off-line and ad hoc reporting. All other report requests must be in written form and go through the request process. The bulk of the ad hoc SPSS reports are for the legislature or local FSP management. All data and statistics are verified and approved through the Office of Statistics before release.

A disaster recovery plan is in place and the State would use the Department of Transportation site if disaster struck the current central site. The current data center is earthquake- and tornado-proof. A new site is currently under development to house all State systems in the case of an unforeseen catastrophe.

A credible security plan is in place that tracks all transactions to the terminal and user.

Program and MIS staff coordinate closely for all system enhancements and changes. All teams are jointly managed and both user and MIS analysts work in close proximity to each other.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

While X-PERT is under development, DHS plans to supplement its automatic data processing (ADP) operations staff with contractor personnel off the State schedule. These personnel will be under the direction of State staff.

Within the Income Maintenance Divisions, one person from each division serves as liaison with MIS. Service requests to initiate change to MIS are submitted from FSP through the liaison.

DHS has a change control committee that is comprised of FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid program staff; field staff; and other DHS program staff. The purpose of this committee is to review change proposals and to set priorities. The committee meets monthly. Program specifications are provided to the manual writers so that changes in the manual can be ready when the system change is ready to be implemented. Both can then be implemented at the same time.

When appropriate (depending on size and complexity of change), the user is required to prepare a mini cost-benefit analysis and determine the feasibility of the change. A subset of the standard system life cycle development steps are followed, including: unit testing, piloting, user acceptance testing, and quality assurance.

Quality assurance is the responsibility of the Data Management Unit. Quality assurance staff who review the changes are comprised of MIS, program, and, if appropriate, field staff who requested the change.

The Priority Setting Committee meets monthly. It is comprised of the bureau chief of Systems and Programming, representatives of each division, and field representatives who chair Corrective Action Subcommittee for Data Processing (Program Improvement Project Plan). There are five subcommittees and one is the Data Processing Committee. It is chaired and co-chaired by field staff. This is one mechanism by which field staff have a voice on system support.

The timeframe to implement changes depends on the complexity of the change, how much time and effort is required, and the level of departmental priority. There tends to be a large backlog of service requests for changes not mandated by regulations. These are usually nice-to-have changes, but not a high priority.

The most difficult changes to implement are those that are not the same for everyone. For instance, a change that affects a very small segment of the population will generally be more difficult to implement. One example is the staggering of food stamp issuance over 30 days for the Indian population instead of the normal 15 days for the rest of the State. Sometimes non-FSP regulatory changes are given a higher priority than FSP-required changes, especially if there is a non-system way to implement the FSP change or if the FSP change is small. There is a constant negotiation of priorities among the programs.

System documentation is considered satisfactory. PANVALET is used to maintain system changes.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Fewer than 1,000 of the 5,100 terminals attached to the Iowa system are used for ABC. There are over 3,100 remote terminals and 1,936 local terminals routed through 606 modems or multiplexors and 353 controllers to an SNA gateway, via SNA/SDLC protocol. There are 99 counties and 104 remote locations for the ABC system. There is a T1 backbone throughout Iowa. Sixty-seven 56KB lines radiate out from this backbone to numerous 9600 baud local lines. Some areas of the State are still converting to 9600 baud from 2400 baud. This will enhance response time significantly for these remote stations.

Most of the State departments use minicomputers as distributed departmental computers. These minicomputers span the gamut of hardware vendors. Some office automation for the Department of Human Services is handled through a Honeywell Bull minicomputer that is connected to the central mainframe via the capital fiber network.

With X-PERT, each worker will be able to perform interactive interviews using his or her microcomputer. Since this will be an entirely distributed function, the load on the mainframe will actually be reduced.

6.2.4 System Performance

Food Stamp Program personnel are not responsible for monitoring the performance of the system. The State Data Center provides a Network Control Help Line for field personnel to report terminals and lines that are down and response time problems. If it is a system problem, the call is immediately transferred to the DHS MIS section. DHS does not formally monitor system response time.

6.2.5 System Response

The system is generally slow at 8 a.m. when everyone is signing on. After that time, response time is rarely a problem. Whenever it is, the Information Services Division of the State Data Center upgrades the equipment to improve system performance. ISD monitors response time and capacity on an on-going basis and periodically increases capacity when necessary. DHS shares the system with other agencies, which is generally not a problem except when the legislature is in session.

Telecommunications are managed through the IBM CICS, using RACF for security and JES3 for batch access. The system services close to 1,000 terminals or microcomputers around the State. The average daily transaction rate is 110,000 transactions for the ABC system in general. This results in multiple database accesses for each transaction. An exact count of database accesses is unavailable. Internal response time varies from 0.69 to 0.87 seconds, depending on the transaction and the time of day. This is well within the planned performance of two seconds. Within the State capital complex, response time is sub-second to the user. Out in the remote counties of Iowa, response time may vary because of the local carrier's equipment.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Downtime is not a problem. The system is available 99.95 percent of the time.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

The State plans to develop an enhancement to the existing system, X-PERT, that is a rules-based system designed to provide interactive interviewing. Microcomputers with WINDOWS will be used and either LANs or a direct connect to the mainframe will be implemented. DHS also plans to add increased functionality for some of the medical programs which are now handled manually. Medical Management Information System (MMIS) claims processing will continue to be provided by a fiscal agent.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section of the report identifies the system development costs, operational costs, and cost allocation methodology of the DHS ABC system as they relate to the Food Stamp Program. Additionally the following topics are addressed:

- X-PERT system planning and development costs
- Current Iowa Food Stamp system operating costs
- The cost allocation methodology applied to planning, development, and operating costs

Iowa's ABC system currently supports the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, and Refugee Assistance Programs. The ABC system was developed in 1983-1984 and has been operational since 1985. The original Advance Planning Document submitted in June 1984 estimated ABC development costs to be \$783,269 and estimated that FNS would share 35.1 percent or \$274,927 of these costs.³ The 35 percent FNS allocation was based on preliminary results of time studies of income maintenance workers in field operations. The total development cost of the ABC system was approximately \$600,000. A limited amount of ABC development cost information is available from Iowa.

The ABC system was FAMIS certified in 1989 when system capabilities were expanded significantly. The 1987 FAMIS APD projected enhancement costs of \$413,343 for development and \$1,348,580 for hardware and the FNS share at \$143,757 for development and \$469,025 for hardware, a total of \$612,783 or 34.78 percent of total project cost.⁴ The FNS Federal financial participation (FFP) for FAMIS enhancement was 75 percent.

Due to expanding systems needs, case processing errors, and increased caseloads, the Iowa DHS is currently developing the X-PERT front-end module. This system was conceptualized in 1989 and will support decision-making at the client-worker level for income maintenance and Medicaid

³ June 1984 ABC System Advanced Planning Document.

⁴ 1987 FAMIS Advanced Planning Document.

programs. This system will utilize state-of-the-art knowledge-based technology and interface with existing system functionality. The X-PERT system is projected to become operational in early 1995. At that time, the primary food stamp system functions will switch from the ABC system to the X-PERT system. The 1990 APD estimates that the X-PERT system will provide over \$15 million in savings.⁵ This potential savings is attributed to lower mailing costs, reduced paper costs, caseworker time, and errors.

7.1 X-PERT Development Costs and Federal Funding

The X-PERT project has been underway since the fall of 1992. The 1990 APD estimated X-PERT project costs at \$2,222,898 for development and \$1,047,757 for implementation. Of the total X-PERT project cost, \$3,270,655, the FNS funding portion was estimated to be \$277,195 for development and \$130,655 for implementation.⁶ Because Iowa has already received enhanced funding, the FNS FFP will be 50 percent. The FNS funding share of X-PERT project costs were estimated to be 24.94 percent or an effective FNS funding rate of 12.47 percent (24.94 x 50 percent FFP).⁷ The 1990 APD amount for X-PERT project costs were approved by FNS in March of 1991. In 1992 an Advanced Planning Document Update (APDU) was submitted with estimated X-PERT development and implementation costs of \$3,439,279 and the FNS share at \$419,764 (24 percent funding allocation with a 50 percent FFP).⁸ The FNS funding share of X-PERT was based on the results of time studies. The 1992 APDU amounts were approved by FNS in August 1992.

The most recent X-PERT APDU was submitted in March 1993. This APDU revised development costs for the system to \$3,561,514.⁹ This was an increase of \$280,859, or 8.9 percent, over the 1990 APD and a \$122,235, or 3.5 percent increase, over the 1992 APDU. Table A-7.1 in Appendix A, X-PERT Estimated Project Costs, provides the 1993 APDU estimated project costs by Fiscal Year with Federal and State funding shares. The FNS X-PERT project funding allocation of 24.52 percent is based on the most recent

7.1.1 X-PERT System Components

X-PERT is designed to be a fully-integrated eligibility determination and management information system which meets the requirements of FAMIS and FNS. This front-end module will be used for the income maintenance programs: AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamp.

7.1.2 Major X-PERT Development Cost Components

The costs of major X-PERT development components are shown in Table 7-1, Major X-PERT Estimated Development Costs.

Table 7.1 Major X-PERT Estimated Development Costs

Cost Component	Projected Costs to Date¹¹
Development Staff	\$931,980
Printers	\$555,000
In-house Data Processing	\$399,200
Policy Staff	\$363,840
Other	\$1,311,494
Total Project Costs	\$3,561,514

The actual development cost to date of the X-PERT System Project is \$355,176. The components of this cost are shown in Table 7.2, X-PERT Expenditures to Date.

¹¹ 1993 X-PERT APDU.

Table 7.2 X-PERT Expenditures to Date¹²

Cost Component	Expenditure to Date	Percentage of Total
State Personnel Services	\$197,368	56%
Equipment	\$58,443	16%
Outside Services/Training	\$46,623	13%
Professional Services	\$29,162	8%
Other	\$23,580	7%
Total	\$355,176	100%

FNS has funded \$38,742 or 11 percent of X-PERT project costs to date. Actual cost allocations by cost component (i.e., FNS portion of X-PERT hardware costs to date) are not currently maintained by the State. Because this is a knowledge-based system and is being developed primarily in-house, one of the major development cost items is project staffing costs. Any knowledge-based system development effort requires detailed input about processes and functions from State program office personnel. The 1993 X-PERT APD staffing cost for the system totaled \$1,993,820 or 56 percent of the total estimated project costs.¹³ Therefore, the major cost component is personnel services, with \$197,368 expended to date. DHS has expended \$58,443 on hardware, consisting of five terminals and two printers, and other data processing equipment. The third major development cost component, training, was provided by an outside service and totaled \$46,623.¹⁴

7.2 ABC and X-PERT Operational Costs

Total DHS operating costs for the ABC system from 1989 through 1992 were \$7,848,149.¹⁵ Table A-7.2 in Appendix A, ABC Operational Costs 1989-1990, provides operational costs of the ABC system and the portion allocated to the Food Stamp Program. Projected X-PERT operation costs are shown in Table 7.3, X-PERT Annual Operating Costs.

¹² State of Iowa Financial Status Report, Budget Fiscal Year 1993.

¹³ March 1993 X-PERT Advanced Planning Document Update.

¹⁴ Iowa Financial Accounting System (IFAS) General Fund Budget Report 4/02/93.

¹⁵ Summary of ADP billings and indirect FSP costs 1989-1990.

Table 7.3 X-PERT Annual Operating Costs¹⁶

Category	Annual Projected Operating Costs FY 1994-98	FNS Share¹⁷
General Services	\$164,000	\$40,032
DHS X-PERT Technical Maintenance Staff	\$104,678	\$25,551
Communication Lines	\$128,000	\$31,244
Policy Staff	\$146,092	\$35,638
Total	\$542,770	\$132,466

The policy staff will be required to change and modify the system with new rules and regulations which govern the decision making process of the system.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Table 7.4, ABC Food Stamp Operational Cost Per Case, shows that the operating cost per case per month ranged from \$2.05 to \$2.53 per household from 1989 to 1992. In 1992, the cost per case increased to \$2.41 per household.

¹⁶ 1990 X-PERT Advanced Planning Document.

¹⁷ Based on estimated FNS funding allocation of 24.42 percent from the 1993 APDU.

Table 7.4 ABC Food Stamp Operational Cost per Case

Year	Monthly ABC Food Stamp Operational Costs	Average Monthly Caseload¹⁸	Food Stamp Cost Per Case (Household)¹⁹
1989	\$137,504	66,947	\$2.05
1990	\$173,528	68,539	\$2.53
1991	\$156,588	72,752	\$2.15
1992	\$186,473	77,327	\$2.41

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

Iowa defines operational costs as ADP charges and indirect costs of ABC support personnel. ADP charges are billed through the PACE billing system. The PACE system is operated by ISD which provides ADP support to DHS. Job numbers are assigned to each software program run. Each job number corresponds with a particular function and can be attributed to a specific DHS program (e.g., Food Stamp). There are six job numbers associated with ABC ADP operations. Each time a program is executed, PACE collects the processing costs associated with the program run. Each job number is assigned a State agency (SA) code. This code serves as a cost pool for ADP costs. Programmers and ADP operations personnel charge time to appropriate job codes.

Support (indirect) costs are collected in a residual cost pool. The TRAK system is used to track and identify DHS MIS staff time and the specific project or program to which this time is attributed.

7.3 Iowa Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the cost allocation methodology used by the Iowa DHS to allocate costs associated with the current food stamp support system (ABC) and the system currently being developed (X-PERT.) The cost allocation plan currently in use has been approved by FNS.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of X-PERT Development Cost Allocation Methodology

X-PERT system development costs are collected into direct and indirect cost pools. The direct cost pool includes the salaries and support of the staff working on the X-PERT system; equipment; and purchases and support of the Iowa Department of General

¹⁸ Caseload figures provided by Iowa for May of each year shown.

¹⁹ Monthly cost per case was calculated by dividing the monthly ABC Food Stamp operational costs by the May FSP caseload.

Services. These costs are allocated to the Medical Assistance, AFDC, Refugee Resettlement, State-only programs, and Food Stamp Program pools. Direct X-PERT costs are collected by time sheets and put into the X-PERT direct cost pool M01 and allocated on the basis of Income Maintenance Local Office Time Study or Random Moment Sample (RMS) results.

The X-PERT residual cost pool M05 consists solely of indirect costs related to the X-PERT system. Indirect costs are also allocated to the Food Stamp Program based on the Income Maintenance Random Moment Sample time study.

The food stamp funding share for the X-PERT development project is 24.94 percent.²⁰ This is an effective FNS funding rate of 12.47 percent (24.94 x 50 percent FFP) for the entire project. This allocation is based on recent field office RMS study results available at the time of the 1993 APDU. RMS program allocations during several recent quarters are shown in Table 7.5, Cost Allocation Trends by Program.

Table 7.5, Cost Allocation Trends by Program²¹

Quarter	Medicaid	AFDC	Refugee	Food Stamps
Jan-Mar 91	39.14%	33.55%	0.10%	18.90%
Jul-Sep 91	36.83%	33.02%	0.33%	28.54%
Apr-Jun 92	41.96%	32.87%	0.33%	24.42%
Oct-Dec 92	39.39%	34.79%	0.14%	25.17%

When the X-PERT system becomes operational, operational costs will be allocated using the same methods currently used for allocating ABC operating costs.

7.3.2 ABC Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

The Iowa Department of Human Services total Food Stamp Program costs are separated into the following cost categories:

- Central Office
- Community Service
- Local Administration
- X-PERT Project

²⁰ 1990 X-PERT Advanced Planning Document.

²¹ X-PERT APDU 1993.

Table 7.3 X-PERT Annual Operating Costs¹⁶

Category	Annual Projected Operating Costs FY 1994-98	FNS Share ¹⁷
General Services	\$164,000	\$40,032
DHS X-PERT Technical Maintenance Staff	\$104,678	\$25,551
Communication Lines	\$128,000	\$31,244
Policy Staff	\$146,092	\$35,638
Total	\$542,770	\$132,466

The policy staff will be required to change and modify the system with new rules and regulations which govern the decision making process of the system.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Table 7.4 shows that the operating cost per case per month ranged from \$2.05 to \$2.53 per household from 1989 to 1992. In 1992, the cost per case increased to \$2.41 per household.

Table 7.4 ABC Food Stamp Operational Cost per Case

Year	Monthly ABC FSP Operational Costs	Average Monthly Caseload ¹⁸	Food Stamp Cost Per Case (Household) ¹⁹
1989	\$137,504	66,947	\$2.05
1990	\$173,528	68,539	\$2.53
1991	\$156,588	72,752	\$2.15
1992	\$186,473	77,327	\$2.41

¹⁶ 1990 X-PERT Advanced Planning Document.

¹⁷ Based on estimated FNS funding allocation of 24.42 percent from the 1993 APDU.

¹⁸ Caseload figures provided by Iowa for May of each year shown.

¹⁹ Monthly cost per case was calculated by dividing the monthly ABC Food Stamp operational costs by the May FSP caseload.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

Iowa defines operational costs as ADP charges and indirect costs of ABC support personnel. ADP charges are billed through the PACE billing system. The PACE system is operated by ISD which provides ADP support to DHS. Job numbers are assigned to each software program run. Each job number corresponds with a particular function and can be attributed to a specific DHS program (e.g., Food Stamp). There are six job numbers associated with ABC ADP operations. Each time a program is executed, PACE collects the processing costs associated with the program run. Each job number is assigned a State agency (SA) code. This code serves as a cost pool for ADP costs. Programmers and ADP operations personnel charge time to appropriate job codes.

Support (indirect) costs are collected in a residual cost pool. The TRAK system is used to track and identify DHS MIS staff time and the specific project or program to which this time is attributed.

7.3 Iowa Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the cost allocation methodology used by the Iowa DHS to allocate costs associated with the current food stamp support system (ABC) and the system currently being developed (X-PERT.) The cost allocation plan currently in use has been approved by FNS.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of X-PERT Development Cost Allocation Methodology

X-PERT system development costs are collected into direct and indirect cost pools. The direct cost pool includes the salaries and support of the staff working on the X-PERT system; equipment; and purchases and support of the Iowa Department of General Services. These costs are allocated to the Medical Assistance, AFDC, Refugee Resettlement, State-only programs, and Food Stamp Program pools. Direct X-PERT costs are collected by time sheets and put into the X-PERT direct cost pool M01 and allocated on the basis of Income Maintenance Local Office Time Study or Random Moment Sample (RMS) results.

The X-PERT residual cost pool M05 consists solely of indirect costs related to the X-PERT system. Indirect costs are also allocated to the Food Stamp Program based on the Income Maintenance Random Moment Sample time study.

The food stamp funding share for the X-PERT development project is 24.94 percent.²⁰ This is an effective FNS funding rate of 12.47 percent (24.94 x 50 percent FFP) for the entire project. This allocation is based on recent field office RMS study results available at the time of the 1993 APDU. RMS program allocations during several recent quarters are shown in Table 7.5, Cost Allocation Trends by Program.

²⁰ 1990 X-PERT Advanced Planning Document.

Table 7.5, Cost Allocation Trends by Program²¹

Quarter	Medicaid	AFDC	Refugee	Food Stamps
Jan-Mar 91	39.14%	33.55%	0.10%	18.90%
Jul-Sep 91	36.83%	33.02%	0.33%	28.54%
Apr-Jun 92	41.96%	32.87%	0.33%	24.42%
Oct-Dec 92	39.39%	34.79%	0.14%	25.17%

When the X-PERT system becomes operational, operational costs will be allocated using the same methods currently used for allocating ABC operating costs.

7.3.2 ABC Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

The Iowa Department of Human Services total Food Stamp Program costs are separated into cost categories of central office, community service, local administration, and the X-PERT Project

The central office operates the ABC system. All costs associated with ABC operations fall under the Central Office. ABC operational costs are a combination of ADP charges and the indirect cost of staff involved in the operations.

ABC operational costs are collected in two residual cost pools. RP0200 is the direct costs pool for information management services. RP0600 is the indirect residual pool for income maintenance administrative support.

RP200 charges originate from ADP PACE billings for computer, hardware, software, and support services. Job numbers (job streams) are used to identify the software programs which are related to ABC operation. Each job number's cost is accumulated in an SA account. A job may relate to one or many SA accounts. State agency account costs are then collected in a residual cost pool. The relationship between specific PACE billing numbers, State agency numbers, and residual costs pools is shown in Table 7.6, ABC ADP Billing Cost Pool Relationships.

RP200F is the information management residual pool for FAMIS specific functions. ADP costs are allocated on the basis of income maintenance time study RMS for all 17 income maintenance programs supported by Iowa DHS. Table 7.7, Recent RMS Allocation for Major Income Maintenance Programs, shows the RMS allocation for the three major programs.

²¹ X-PERT APDU 1993.

The residual cost pool RP0600 collects charges from 2610 Data Systems Support Services and 2620 Data Systems and Programming.

Table 7.6 ABC Food Stamp ADP Billing Cost Pool Relationships

PACE Food Stamp Program Billing Job Number	Description	Corresponding State Agency Number	Residual Pool	Program Pool
470C	ABC Operations System C	SA0182	RP0200	25
470D	ABC Operations System D	SA0182	RP0200	25
470X	Income Eligibility Verification FAMIS	SA0362	RP0200	25
470Z	Terminals and Disks	SA0182	RP0200	25
479X	Recoupment of Overpayment FAMIS	SA0362	RP0200F	25
479Z	Terminals, Disks, and Misc	SA0182	RP0200	25

Table 7.7 Recent RMS Allocation for Major Income Maintenance Programs

Program	Program Pool Number	RMS Allocation for 1992²²
Food Stamps	PP0025	27.37
Medicaid	PP0003	40.61
AFDC	PP0012	21.94

Data systems provides computer operations, data entry, quality assurance, and personal computer support. PACE billing tracks charges for 2610 and the TRAK project time tool is used to track and bill time associated with 2620. RP0600 costs are allocated to AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP based on the RMS for those three programs.

²² Random Moment Sampling Trend Sheet, HHS Finance Division April 30, 1993.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF IOWA

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 HHS 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	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	N	N	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92*	N	Y	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	N	N
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y

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

Code	Regulation	Provision	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 Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	N	N	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	N	N	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	N	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	N	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	Y	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	N	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 Iowa
Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090-300J	IBM	Purchase	256 MB main storage 512 MB extended storage
DISK			
3380	IBM	Purchase	5 disk drives
8380	STK	Purchase	22 disk drives
TAPE			
Tape Drives	IBM	Purchase	22 cartridge tape drives
PRINTERS			
Laser - 3820	IBM	Purchase	1 page printer laser
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	2 printers
FRONT ENDS			
3745	IBM		1 FEP
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
3174	IBM	Purchase	1,000 terminals

Table A-7.1 X-PERT Estimated Project Costs

	Allocation	FFP	FFY92	FFY93	FFY94	FFY95	TOTAL
Federal Matches							
Food Stamp	24.41%	50%	\$7,616	\$139,586	\$270,971	\$16,492	\$434,665
AFDC	32.87%	50%	\$10,257	\$187,994	\$364,944	\$22,212	\$585,406
Medicaid	41.83%	50%	\$13,052	\$239,221	\$464,389	\$28,265	\$744,926
Refugee	.46%	100%	\$286	\$5,250	\$10,191	\$620	\$16,347
Total Federal			\$31,210	\$572,050	\$1,110,495	\$67,589	\$1,781,344
State Matches							
State Share			\$31,294	\$566,800	\$1,100,304	\$66,969	1,764,997
Total X-PERT Costs			\$62,400	\$1,143,723	\$2,220,257	\$135,134	\$3,561,514

Table A-7.2 ABC Operational Costs 1989-1990

Year	ADP Costs	Food Stamp Portion	%	Indirect Costs	Food Stamp Portion	%	Total Operating Costs	Food Stamp Portion	%
1989	\$899,976	\$225,800	25	\$750,081	\$192,952	26	\$1,650,057	\$418,752	25
1990	\$1,035,766	\$266,256	26	\$1,046,576	\$276,107	26	\$2,082,342	\$542,363	26
1991	\$1,066,148	\$245,230	23	\$812,919	\$198,354	24	\$1,879,067	\$443,584	24
1992	\$1,361,306	\$352,499	26	\$876,375	\$243,855	28	\$2,237,681	\$596,354	27
Total	\$4,363,196	\$1,089,785	25	\$3,485,951	\$911,268	26	\$7,849,147	\$2,001,053	25

APPENDIX B

STATE OF IOWA

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

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

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

Description of the Sample

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

Number of EWs in Iowa	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
671	63	10.7%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	35	55.5%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Iowa. The response rate of 56 percent is low, however, producing a sample whose responses may not be representative of eligibility workers in Iowa.

Summary of Findings

Most of the eligibility workers are satisfied with the computer system in Iowa. They generally find it responsive, accurate, and easy to learn. Two complaints are that response time is sometimes too slow and that the system is down too often. Most eligibility workers also think the computer system helps them do their jobs and usually makes them more efficient, although 43 percent feel the system adds stress to their jobs.

Since Iowa's current system has been operational since 1984, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	1	2.9
Good	30	85.7
Excellent	4	11.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	12	34.3
Good	23	65.7

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	6	17.1
Sometimes	27	77.1
Often	2	5.7

The eligibility workers who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is usually good or excellent but a majority (83 percent) agree that response time is sometimes or often slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	2	5.7
Often	33	94.3

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	28.6
Sometimes	23	65.7
Often	2	5.7

~~A large majority (94 percent) of the eligibility workers who~~

responded think the system is often available although a smaller majority (71 percent) agrees that it is sometimes or often down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	3	8.6
Good	25	71.4
Excellent	7	20.0

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	74.3
Sometimes	9	25.7

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	71.4
Sometimes	9	25.7
Often	1	2.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	68.6
Sometimes	10	28.6
Often	1	2.9

A majority of the eligibility workers who responded feel that the operations of the system are accurate. A large majority (91 percent) of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	51.4
Sometimes	14	40.0
Often	3	8.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	54.3
Sometimes	13	37.1
Often	3	8.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	62.9
Sometimes	10	28.6
Often	3	8.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	82.9
Sometimes	6	17.1

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	74.3
Sometimes	7	20.0
Often	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	5	15.6
Often	3	9.4

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	88.6
Sometimes	3	8.6
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	82.9
Sometimes	4	11.4
Often	2	5.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	85.7
Sometimes	5	14.3

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	74.2
Sometimes	8	25.8

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

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

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	77.1
Sometimes	7	20.0
Often	1	2.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	55.0
Sometimes	6	30.0
Often	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	54.5
Sometimes	10	30.3
Often	5	15.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	85.7
Sometimes	4	11.4
Often	1	2.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	85.7
Sometimes	4	11.4
Often	1	2.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	51.4
Sometimes	12	34.3
Often	5	14.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	40.7
Sometimes	11	40.7
Often	5	18.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	50.0
Sometimes	9	30.0
Often	6	20.0

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	97.1
Sometimes	1	2.9

A majority of the eligibility workers responding do not have difficulty performing any of the system-specific tasks such as assigning new case numbers or generating adverse action notices. Exceptions are identifying error prone cases and identifying cases involving suspected fraud.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	2	5.7
Often	33	94.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	51.4
Sometimes	15	42.9
Often	2	5.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	82.9
Sometimes	4	11.4
Often	2	5.7

Most of the eligibility workers who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work although about 40 percent report that it adds stress to their jobs.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	85.7
Sometimes	3	8.6
Often	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	80.0
Sometimes	7	20.0

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

Client Service

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

Fraud and Errors

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

APPENDIX C

STATE OF IOWA

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

Description of the Sample

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

Number of Supervisors in Iowa	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
151	30	19.9
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	21	70.0%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in Iowa. The response rate of 70 percent is good, producing a sample whose responses should be representative of supervisors in Iowa.

Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and helps them in their jobs, although almost half feel that it adds stress to their work. Most of the respondents find the system easy to use but about half have some problems learning to use it. The supervisors also report rarely having difficulty performing their specific system-related tasks.

Since Iowa's current system has been operational since 1984, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	4.8
Good	18	85.7
Excellent	2	9.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	38.1
Good	12	57.1
Excellent	1	4.8

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	19.0
Sometimes	16	76.2
Often	1	4.8

The supervisors who responded almost all (95 percent) agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although an similar majority (81 percent) also feel that the system response time is sometimes too slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Often	21	100.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	38.1
Sometimes	12	57.1
Often	1	4.8

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

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	15	71.4
Excellent	6	28.6

All of the supervisors who responded think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	71.4
Sometimes	6	28.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	45.0
Sometimes	9	45.0
Often	2	10.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	70.0
Sometimes	6	30.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	17	85.0
Sometimes	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	18	90.0
Sometimes	2	10.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

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

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	17	85.0
Sometimes	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	71.4
Sometimes	6	28.6

Most of the supervisors responding have no difficulty obtaining information but over half have difficulty in learning the system. Those who responded generally do not have difficulty performing such specific tasks as generating adverse action notices or restoring benefits.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	4	19.0
Often	17	81.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	52.4
Sometimes	10	47.6

All of the supervisors who responded think that the system is sometimes or often a great help to them in their work but almost half feel that it contributes added stress.

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	9.5
Good	19	90.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	9.5
Good	15	71.4
Excellent	4	19.0

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

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

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	60.0
Sometimes	5	33.3
Often	1	6.7

The supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, although one third reported difficulty in making mass changes and meeting Federal reporting requirements. Most think the reports produced by the system are good and that the technical support provided by the technical staff is good or excellent.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Iowa's system was implemented more than five years

ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

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