Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: SEPTEMBER 29 - OCTOBER 1, 1993

PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPORT

October 25, 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

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

STATE PROFILE 1

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT 2

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS 3

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation 3

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs 4

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs 5

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance 5

2.4.1 Staffing 5

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes 6

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 12

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio 12

3.4 Current Automation Issues 12

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION 12

4.1 Overview of the Previous System 13

4.2 Justification for the New System 13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities 13

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 19

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS 20

6.1 System Profile 20

6.2 Description of Operating Environment 20

6.2.1 Operating Environment 21

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance 22

6.2.3 Telecommunications 22

6.2.4 System Performance 23

6.2.5 System Response 23

6.2.6 System Downtime 23

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans 24

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION 24

7.1 CIS Development Costs and Federal Funding 24

7.1.1 CIS System Components 25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components 25

7.2 CIS Operational Costs 27

7.2.1 Cost Per Case 28

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices 28

7.3 Pennsylvania Cost Allocation Methodologies 28

7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology 29

7.3.2 CIS Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics 29

7.3.2.1 Cost Allocation Mechanics 29

APPENDICES

A State of Pennsylvania Exhibits A-1

B Analysis of Managerial User Satisfaction B-1

C Analysis of Operator User Satisfaction C-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	4
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	5
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	7
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	8
7.1	CIS Development Costs	26
7.2	CIS Operational Costs	27
7.3	Development Cost Allocation	29

APPENDIX A - State of Pennsylvania Exhibits

Exhibit No.		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Pennsylvania Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	Development Cost Allocation	A-5

Table of Contents

PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPORT
Site Visit September 29 - October 1, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name:	Client Information System (CIS)
Start Date:	1979
Completion Date:	1993
Contractor:	Gentec, Touche Ross
Transfer From:	Ohio (design transfer of eligibility determination/benefit calculation function)
Cost:	
Actual:	$72,480,176
Projected:	$15,874,000
FSP Share:	$14,842,185
FSP %:	20.3%
Number of Users:	7,660 (est.)
Basic Architecture:	
Mainframe:	Unisys 2200/9944, 2200/644ES, 2200/644
Workstations:	Unisys terminals
Telecommunications Network:	Proprietary UNISCOPE T1 network to local LATTAs; 19.2 KB and 9.6 KB lines within local LATTA
System Profile:	
Programs:	Food Stamp, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, General Assistance

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare (DPW) is the designated State agency for the administration of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and other assistance programs in the State. The agency is comprised of the following divisions which report to the secretary of DPW:

- Administration
- Income Maintenance
- Medical Assistance Programs
- Mental Health
- Mental Retardation
- Children, Youth, and Families
- Social Programs
- Fraud and Abuse Investigation and Recovery

The Office of Income Maintenance (OIM) is responsible for administering the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, State General Assistance (GA), and Food Stamp Programs. Income Maintenance is under the direction of a deputy secretary who is a political appointee. Within the OIM, there are five bureaus:

- Operations, responsible for field operations

- Program Support, responsible for management, budget, automation planning and support, and statistical analysis

- Policy, which consists of four divisions: Cash Assistance (AFDC and GA), Food Stamps, Medical Assistance Eligibility (Medicaid), and Planning and Specialized Program Development

- Program Evaluation and Staff Development, responsible for staff development, corrective action, field assessment, and quality control

- Employment and Training Programs

The Bureau of Information Systems (BIS) within the DPW Office of Administration provides information support services for the Client Information System (CIS) that supports the State's Division of Income Maintenance program.

A large portion of the State is considered rural; however, the largest welfare population groups are in two large urban areas, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. Nationally, Pennsylvania ranks sixth in terms of the number of persons participating in FSP, and public assistance households account for 55 percent of the total.

Pennsylvania's population in 1990 was 11,924,710. Food stamp recipients comprised approximately 8.3 percent of the total State population.

The level of unemployment in Pennsylvania decreased each year between 1983 and 1989 and then increased in 1990 and 1991. The unemployment rate decreased by 62 percent between 1983 (11.8 percent unemployment) and 1989 (4.5 percent unemployment). The 1991 unemployment rate was 6.9 percent.

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

- Pennsylvania's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was 0 percent to 4.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Pennsylvania reduced the 1992 State budget by $258.1 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Pennsylvania increased by 0.24 percent. This change differed in direction from the national average decrease of 0.60 percent in state government employment.
- Pennsylvania's revenues for FY 1993 decreased by $450.0 million due to a decrease in personal income taxes.
- The regional outlook indicated the Mideast states have been strongly affected by the recession. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 8.4 percent was higher than the national average of 7.8 percent. The per capita regional personal income increase of 2.2 percent was less than the national average of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

FSP oversight responsibilities are divided between central office and field units. Within the State Bureau of Policy, there is a Director for the Division of Food Stamps. Seven program specialists report to the Food Stamp Division Director.

Oversight for the 105 local welfare offices responsible for FSP operations is provided through the Division of Field Management within the Bureau of Operations. There are seven area managers that report to the Field Management division director.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Changes in participation levels for FSP and other public assistance programs for the last five years are provided in Table 2.1. Between 1988 and 1992, the number of participating FSP households increased by 28.0 percent; during the same period, the number of individuals participating in FSP increased by 22.7 percent. All program areas experienced participation growth during the period, but the degree of change varied. The number of individuals receiving Medicaid assistance increased by 69.4 percent. At the other extreme, the number of individuals participating in the AFDC and GA Programs increased by 10.6 percent and 10.1 percent, respectively, over the same period. Between 1988 and 1992,

the participation increases for AFDC and GA cases were 12.0 percent and 17.8 percent, respectively.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	200,770	191,984	178,255	173,962	179,257
Individuals	594,649	567,967	520,574	521,070	537,490
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA					
Cases	148,711	147,964	133,982	123,079	126,219
Individuals	171,000	175,341	162,386	149,156	155,250
FSP					
Households	520,805	486,764	433,052	405,353	406,963
Individuals	1,186,057	1,096,232	994,666	941,026	966,506
Medicaid	536,935	462,713	397,094	347,570	316,934
Child Support	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 9.5:1 in 1988 to 11.1:1 in 1992.

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

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$154.28	$144.66	$134.22	$118.70	$115.21

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

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Pennsylvania's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.[2] Total administrative costs increased each year during the period, while average costs per household increased between 1988 and 1990 and decreased in 1991 and 1992.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$82,203,156	$78,007,741	$76,438,246	$64,103,452	$56,804,355
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$13.85	$14.25	$15.52	$13.74	$12.12

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

This section addresses potential system impacts on staffing, error rates, claims collections, and the implementation of regulatory changes.

2.4.1 Staffing

Pennsylvania utilizes a generic caseworker approach, but has separate eligibility workers (EWs) for intake and on-going cases. Currently, there are 1,180 eligibility workers who perform intake functions. There are 3,500 on-going caseworkers, who handle on-going cases. Other staff include: 780 eligibility worker supervisors, 500 district administrative and management staff, and 1,700 clerical staff. Clerical staff greet clients, schedule appointments, and perform application registration functions.

Staffing levels have not changed over the last five years; however, EW caseloads have increased to accommodate increased participation. Intake workers handle between three to five intake interviews each day. The average caseload for on-going EWs is 300 cases, although some workers handle as many as 500 cases. State staff believe that the implementation of CIS may be one of the reasons that workers have been able to handle growing caseloads.

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

Table of Contents

The vast majority of eligibility workers are generic caseworkers handling all program areas, although there are some caseworkers handling Medicaid eligibility for nursing home clients. Pennsylvania adopted the generic approach in 1977, prior to the implementation of CIS.

Clerical workers are represented by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and eligibility workers are represented by the Pennsylvania Social Services Union (PSSU). Labor unions have impacted system operations in Pennsylvania. In 1991, when the State had implemented CIS in two counties and was preparing to implement the system statewide, the two unions sued the State regarding data entry responsibilities of the workers. The State halted further system implementation and over the next 12 months worked with the unions to identify the specific data elements that would be entered by each worker. Screens had to be redesigned to accommodate the changes in worker responsibilities. The lawsuit and subsequent redesign activities delayed statewide implementation of CIS for more than one year.

Workers have separate and distinct data entry responsibilities. Eligibility workers are not permitted to change data that has been entered by a clerical worker. EWs also are not allowed to enter certain data elements, such as address, for which clerical workers are

- Code 1.4: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act, which specifies the use of a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members (regulation 273.9(d)(5)(i))

- Code 2.1: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act, which extended the resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles (regulation 273.8(e)(5), etc.)

- Code 4.2: Issuance, which limited the number of replacement issuances (regulation 274.6(b)(2))

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Pennsylvania's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has fluctuated between 1988 and 1992. The error rate decreased in 1989, increased in 1990, decreased in 1991, and increased in 1992.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	8.13	6.24	6.83	6.37	8.67

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of claims established, the total value of claims collected, and the percentage of claims established that were collected. During the five year period, there was year-to-year variation in the value of claims established and claims collected; however, claims established decreased slightly between 1988 and 1992, while claims collected increased during the same period.

Pennsylvania's claims collected as a percentage of claims established fluctuated between 1988 and 1992. The percentage, however, increased over the five year period. 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 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$14,657,245	$19,261,044	$15,890,355	$17,554,921	$15,295,204
Total Claims Collected	$5,580,354	$5,421,285	$5,066,149	$2,772,687	$3,933,538
As a Percent of Total Claims Established	38.1%	28.1%	31.9%	15.8%	25.7%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

CIS received Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification from DHHS in April 1992.

The FNS post implementation review for CIS is scheduled for December 1993.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of CIS functionality, complexity, and level of integration. With the implementation of Phase XI in 1992, eligibility determination and benefit calculation functions were added to the system and interactive interviewing during intake was adopted.

3.1 System Functionality

CIS provides a high degree of automation and eliminates the need for many paper forms. Major features of CIS functionality addressed in this section include:

- ***Registration.*** The application registration function is performed by clerical workers on terminals. CIS performs a search for each household member to determine whether the individual is known to the CIS database. This search is performed on the name, address, date of birth, sex, and, if known, the social security number (SSN). Whenever there is a match in the existing participation files, the EW reviews the case to verify whether there really is a match and indicates whether the existing record is to be included. If there are not any matches, the system assigns an application number to the case. This number designates the case as a pending application. Once the case has been approved,

the application number is replaced by a case number. If the case was active within the last 18 months, the system can access case data, whether it is active or closed.

Eligibility workers screen applications to determine whether households are eligible for expedited food stamps.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Eligibility determination is fully automated for the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs and partially automated for Medicaid-only eligibility. For FSP and AFDC, the following four steps are involved in eligibility determination: non-financial, resources, income, and budget authorization or denial. Eligibility can be denied at the completion of each step, but all four steps are required for a household to be determined eligible for benefits. Resource and income calculations are performed manually by the worker to determine Medicaid eligibility.

  During the interview, the EW reviews the information provided by the applicant on the application form and enters resource and income information into the system. As the information is entered into the system, CIS performs edits. Data are only entered once for the AFDC and food stamp budgets. The worker performs two-month prospective budgeting. The system presents the necessary screens to the worker, and the worker can go back to a previous screen if the information was incorrectly entered. CIS screens emulate the format and sequence of the hard copy application form.

  CIS requires the worker to indicate that necessary verifications of information have been performed and will not complete the eligibility determination process without the necessary verifications. The exception is five-day expedited service.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** Benefit calculation is performed by the system in conjunction with eligibility determination. The EW reviews the results and authorizes benefits.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** Pennsylvania has three methods for benefit issuance. The majority of households receive authorization to participate (ATP) cards in the mail, or at specified financial institutions where the ATPs are stored. Clients receive food coupons by redeeming ATPs at financial institutions. Five zip code areas in Reading use on-line electronic benefit transfer (EBT) for benefit issuance. In Philadelphia, benefits are issued through electronic funds transfer (EFT) issuance. With EFT issuance, ATPs are replaced by an electronic record that is sent to the issuance location. The electronic record serves as the basis for the issuance of food coupons. For replacement ATPs, the worker reviews the situation, the client signs a form, clerical staff enters the data into CIS, and the system generates another ATP. Workers can review an entire issuance history on-line. Expedited issuance is possible within five days through the manual issuance of ATPs at the county assistance office (CAO).

- ***Notices.*** The system automatically generates all required notices in English or Spanish. The system was designed to provide workers the option of entering narrative comments into the notices, but this option is no longer available because of concerns about the quality of workers' input. All notices are maintained in an on-line history file for 90 days. After that, notices are archived on microfiche. Generally, paper copies of notices, for the worker, are not produced. However, on-line requests for notices can be made by the EW through the Client Notice Module.

- ***Claims System.*** The Referral Management System (RMS) is a separate system residing on a different Unisys mainframe that interfaces to the CIS DMS1100 database through a MAPPER COBOL interface. The claims system is operated by the Office of Fraud and Abuse, Investigations, and Recovery (OFAIR) and serves all DPW programs.

  The identification of an overpayment by a worker or through Quality Control initiates the claims process. First, the worker prepares an overpayment referral form indicating the potential cause of the overpayment and whether fraud is suspected. The worker also calculates the corrected benefit amount based on the CIS database history and enters this amount into the claim. As a result of the lawsuit by a client (Mendez), the worker is required to present detailed information, such as the month-by-month amount of overpayment, on an attachment to the claim. CAO clerical staff then log the referral into the MAPPER database. When the claim is received by OFAIR, it is entered into RMS by a data entry contractor.

  The outstanding claims data on MAPPER is run monthly against CIS via the COBOL interface to see if cases that had been closed have been reactivated in CIS. If the case is active, CIS passes the case information and updates back to RMS, where the claim is reactivated. Once this has occurred, RMS directs CIS to recoup the overpayment when CIS prints ATPs.

  RMS sends out notices for overpayments. If there is a recoupment, one notice is sent indicating that automated recoupment will begin if the client does not provide a response. For overpayments that are not recoupments, multiple notices will be sent. The number of notices sent depends on the dollar value of the claim.

  RMS tracks the claim status, subtracts the recoupment amount from the recipient's monthly benefit issuance, and updates CIS to reflect the revision.

  The claims process is paper intensive. Within the next two years, the State plans to automate the process at the worker level to eliminate the need for the paper claim submittal and the calculation of the overpayment amount.

- ***Computer Matching.*** Workers must log into a separate function area of the system that performs Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) matching.

The system checks each case separately to see if there are any matches. The system provides the worker a list of all the worker's cases for which there are matches. The worker has the discretion to prioritize his or her work on IEVS matches. The worker is required, however, to review the information and initiate appropriate action within the 45 day disposition period. Information that does not meet the established targeting criteria is posted to the history file of the exchange and must be reviewed by the worker at the next reapplication or sooner. The issuance of benefits is not dependent upon the performance of IEVS matches.

Six matches are performed for IEVS: State wages, State unemployment insurance, Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), the Earnings Reference File (ERF) obtained from the Social Security Administration (SSA) (the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) information), IRS unearned income information, and the State Data Exchange (SDX). Some of these matches require no further verification (such as the IRS interest income), and other matches always require further verification. The worker enters a disposition code and the worker ID number for each match and case. Targeting is used, according to the match type, and the system indicates which discrepancies have the greatest cost impact. The worker is required to respond to all discrepancies.

- ***Alerts.*** The use of alerts in CIS is limited to alerts regarding discrepancies reported through IEVS.

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** Monthly reporting has a separate MAPPER database that interfaces with CIS. All clients with earned income are required to report monthly. There are approximately 77,000 monthly reporting cases for the FSP. CIS determines cases that are subject to monthly reporting and passes data to MAPPER to produce and mail the monthly report form. The reports are returned to the county office. Clerical staff track the receipt of monthly reports. Workers must review the reports and enter any data that has changed. The system generates late/incomplete notices to clients indicating whether a monthly report is missing or incomplete. If a monthly report or late/incomplete notice is not submitted, CIS suspends the case and does not issue the benefits. The case is maintained, however, in a suspense file for the recertification period so that the information does not need to be reentered if the client reapplies.

- ***Report Generation.*** CIS creates an extract file monthly; the extract file then is used to create monthly reports.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** CIS supports a limited electronic mail (E-Mail) function that enables central office staff to send messages to workers. Workers do not have the capability to send E-mail messages to each other or back to the central office.

CIS supports several other features. Workers who have policy questions can receive answers from the central office through their supervisors. Supervisors can

enter questions into a personal computer that is "Sperry" linked to the central office, where the policy can be evaluated. CIS also supports an automated calendar system that may be used by clerical staff who schedule client interviews.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

Although CIS supports the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, and GA Programs, interfaces with other systems are utilized to enable CIS to provide all necessary functions. IEVS mandated computer matching functions are handled through a separate function area of the system to which workers have access. The claims system, RMS, and the monthly reporting system also are separate from CIS. In both cases, the worker must log out of CIS and access the MAPPER database through a MAPPER COBOL interface.

Pennsylvania's CIS demonstrates considerable complexity and innovation in its use of two types of transaction processes. The system uses foreground processing for edits and other work on the current case. Background processes are used for updates and database retrievals; both retrievals from the database and re-writes to the database require between five seconds and one minute, depending on what other background processes are being performed.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Eligibility workers who conduct intake interviews have their own terminals, and clerical workers responsible for data entry generally have dedicated terminals as well. There is one terminal for every two on-going caseworkers in some offices, and one terminal for every four on-going workers in other offices. EW supervisors also share terminals.

The total number of CIS terminals in the State is 6,420. These terminals support eligibility workers and supervisors, clerical staff, and other users in the State.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

The system currently does not determine eligibility for State Medical Programs in an automated manner. A pilot in Franklin County uses the State's "MA Advisor," a knowledge-based system developed with the Unisys expert system product KES II, to facilitate eligibility determination and support for State Medical Programs. The expert system enables users, when provided with some technical assistance, to make policy changes using rules that change the system.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section discusses the approaches used in Pennsylvania during the development and implementation of CIS.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

Prior to implementation of CIS, Pennsylvania had separate systems to support various assistance programs. The Medical Eligibility System, a batch system that was used to record eligible participants, did not interact with FSP or AFDC databases. This Medical database was used in the CIS conversion process.

The stand-alone food stamp system used prior to CIS implementation was more automated than other program's systems at that time. The food stamp system used turnaround documents for data entry, but eligibility workers had access to terminals and the capability to perform inquiries and make changes in the system. Under this system, food coupons were issued using an NCR minicomputer.

4.2 Justification for the New System

In justifying the need for a new system, Pennsylvania identified several tangible and intangible expected benefits. Intangible benefits identified by State staff included: the ability to handle an increased workload, higher worker productivity, improved functionality, improved management controls, and consistency in AFDC and FSP policy application.

Tangible benefits, with an expected cost savings to FNS of $33.2 million, also were identified. The State estimated the following expected benefits and associated savings:

- Error reduction: $27.9 million
- EW staffing reductions: $2.8 million
- Improved collections: $1.3 million
- Reduced administrative costs: $1.2 million

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Pennsylvania system development has been organized into two year phases that systematically implement various functional components. State staff indicated that this approach has worked well because more complex components (e.g., eligibility determination and data exchange) were scheduled later in the project. This provided more design transfer options for Pennsylvania.

Initial system planning, for a combined Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS)/CIS, began in the mid 1970s. In 1979, the combined development was split into two separate development efforts.

CIS project phases included:

- ***Phase I - Requirements Analysis.*** Requirements for each phase were identified separately. This phase initially was completed prior to July 1981.

- ***Phase II - Initial Database Load.*** The purpose of this phase was to generate an initial operational database that was related to a Medical eligibility file. This phase was completed in July 1981.

- ***Phase III - Initial Benefits Processing.*** This phase involved the production of Medical Assistance ID cards and was completed in January 1992.

- ***Phase IV - Common Application Processing and Budget Computation.*** The common application form development activities were completed in December 1984, and development efforts related to budget computation for cash programs were completed in March 1992. Common application processing involved the transition from centralized key entry of data provided on program specific forms to localized data entry based on a fully integrated application form.

- ***Phase V - Cash Monthly Reporting.*** This phase involved the integration of monthly eligibility reporting for AFDC cases and was completed in May 1983.

- ***Phase VI - On-line Cash and Food Stamps.*** The first part of this phase was completed in September 1982. The implementation of this phase provided the on-line capability to submit the PA 122 and PA 122SP transactions for AFDC and FSP respectively.

- ***Phase VII - Referral Management System (RMS)/RMN Interfaces.*** Four components of the RMS were completed between May 1983 and February 1987. Interfaces for collection systems, including AFDC and FSP recoupment, were completed in February 1987.

- ***Phase VIII - MAID/CASH On-line Inquiry.*** A change completed in July 1983 merged the Medical database with the Cash Assistance database. This phase also included Assistance Disbursement Integration (ADI), which provided on-line, real time inquiry and update capabilities for AFDC and Medical Programs. With the completion of this phase in November 1985, all components of cash benefit processing were fully implemented.

- ***Phase IX - Food Stamp Monthly Reporting and Integration.*** The monthly reporting component was completed in August 1984, and the integration portion was completed in February 1987. These changes made the system non-redundant for clients, reporting, and issuance.

- ***Phase X - Data Exchanges.*** This involved a total of 11 components. Data exchanges for State data (e.g. Employment and Unemployment Compensation) were completed between March 1983 and May 1985. Federal data exchange development to support Income and Eligibility Verification System requirements began in January 1983 and was completed in September 1987.

- ***Phase XI - Eligibility Determination/Benefit Calculation.*** Food stamp eligibility determination originally was not part of Phase XI, but it was added during development. The phase started in 1989 and was completed in May 1992. The phase included nine subsystems that represented logical groupings of income maintenance functions that had been automated. The implementation of this phase significantly increased both transaction volume and database size.

- ***Phase XII - FAMIS Certification.*** This phase provided history maintenance and a detailed mock certification process. The scheduled completion date for this activity was March 1992; however, the phase was not completed until February 1993.

- ***Phase XIII - Electronic Funds Transfer.*** This phase was completed in December 1988.

Each project phase included its own requirements analysis task. This had two effects: it allowed the State to incorporate the latest functionality for each component, but it also extended the timeframe for development, cost, and occasionally the Federal approval cycle, beyond initial estimates.

Pennsylvania has submitted a large number of Advanced Planning Documents (APDs) and APD Updates (APDUs) since 1982, and has experienced very few problems in obtaining Federal approval. Some APDUs needed additional clarification, and the Federal agencies offered advice and recommendations on additional interfaces, such as a two-way interface for child support enforcement rather than a one-way interface and inclusion of the employment and training aspects of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program. There have been additional questions relative to capacity, hardware choice, and conversion time frames. These have all been successfully resolved. The hardware APDU was questioned, and a Federal consulting group from Fort Collins, Kansas was used to monitor and assess the acquisition. State staff believe that Pennsylvania derived additional respect within the Federal arena as a result of the State's innovative approach that allowed the State to process large transaction volumes with lower priced processors by using the dual processor controller and the solid state device.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Pennsylvania's conversion approach was to base the new system's initial database on the Medical eligibility database. They planned to convert in three phases:

- Data purification
- Data conversion
- Database load

During data purification, all duplicate, invalid, or inconsistent data were eliminated or isolated for review. Items isolated for review were corrected before the data conversion phase.

Table of Contents

directing the project to its conclusion. State staff indicated that this high level exposure and influence was necessary to bring the system to a successful conclusion.

Field staff became involved in the CIS project to provide assistance in specifying and testing the system and remained involved throughout project development. The Division of Automation Planning and Support (DAP), comprised of field program staff, was created. This group functions as a liaison between program and technical staff. Many DAP staff members currently are working on the new Child Support Enforcement project and the Child/Adult Abuse systems.

The State considers support from program areas a critical success factor for the project. Program user representatives supported CIS development by preparing specifications and screens and participating in testing to ensure that the system met their needs. This involvement reflected the State's belief in the importance of user and field staff involvement from the beginning of the project in a formal, focused role.

4.6 FSP Participation

Generic field staff and FSP policy staff participated throughout most of the CIS project. FSP staff were not involved at the very beginning of the project because, at that time, CIS was a simple system to create a client database to support the implementation of MMIS. CIS user staff at that time included only AFDC and Medicaid staff.

Beginning with the planning phase in the early 1980s, FSP policy staff and generic field staff representing FSP users assumed a role in CIS development activities. Field staff were responsible for providing input and assisting in document preparation during planning, development, and implementation. FSP policy staff were involved in a review and approval role throughout the project.

4.7 MIS Participation

MIS has been a critical player in CIS since the State took over development in 1982. Three members of the core project team were MIS personnel from BIS. The Pennsylvania project manager's philosophy entailed that State MIS personnel do design, coding, and unit and system testing and assume the lead role in system implementation.

Consistent with this philosophy, contractor staff were used by the State as backups for State staff on the development project or were managed by State MIS staff on the project. The types of activities that were considered suitable for contractor assistance included performing functional requirements, providing specialized MIS expertise for the project, and conducting user training in conjunction with State personnel. Pennsylvania staff indicated that the State used contractors in this manner to avoid post implementation problems that other states experienced in supporting systems that were developed by contract MIS staff.

Contractor involvement changed several times during the project. Touche Ross, which had not been involved in CIS since it was separated from MMIS, returned to the project to assist in the development of specifications and user requirements during Phase VIII. The contractor left again after the Phase IX user requirements were approved. Touche Ross returned for the Phase XI user requirements and remained involved in the project through the design and development phases in 1992.

At its peak in the middle 1980s, CIS development involved over 50 MIS staff including systems analysts, programmer/analysts, quality assurance analysts, and data analysts. This number included contract staff under the direction of State MIS personnel.

Currently, there are 36 MIS staff assigned to CIS. Approximately eight are assigned to support the food stamp portion of the system.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

Early issues related to CIS included determination of project scope, timeframes and costs, and project management. The initial problem was the scope of an integrated system. Initially, the new system was planned to support all PA programs; however, after initial requirements were completed, the State decided to separate MMIS and CIS development efforts. The initial completion time and cost estimates for the CIS project -- a two year implementation time frame at a cost of $15.874 million dollars -- were overly optimistic. The State attempted to delegate CIS project management to a contractor, Gentec, during the initial stages of the project, but this approach proved unworkable. The State also experienced problems when the CIS project team reported to lower management levels within DPW.

In Phase XI, eligibility determination/benefit calculation, the project manger did not maintain control over the requirements and they were developed beyond the intended scope. Users thought that they were developing specifications for a personal computer (PC) platform that would utilize function keys, local help screens, and navigation paths. The increased complexity caused problems and the requirements analysis had to be redone to obtain a viable development schedule.

System transaction volume has been a constant source of concern. Through the innovative use of technology and software tuning, the State has been able to keep up with new populations added with each phase as well as growing Federal program requirements. The solid state disk has made response time tolerable by enabling the State to bring the most used tables and indices into that fast solid state device. Further response time improvements are expected with the implementation of a project now under development that will bring current cases in process into random access memory (RAM) or the solid state disk to further improve response time. This alleviates input/output demand with the main database, which is the most time consuming portion of each transaction.

During the course of the project, the system workload became too unwieldy for a single processor to handle. The use of the Unisys extended transaction controller (XTC), which

had not been developed at the beginning of the project, enabled the system to function effectively. This hardware adaptor and the solid state disk enabled the State to keep the processor size at the least expensive level for the transaction volume it handled.

State staff indicated that there were several areas that could have benefitted from additional time, including planning for the eligibility determination/benefit calculation phase, definition of scope for each phase, and requirements definitions for most phases. Throughout the project, completion dates dictated by the Federal entities or State management resulted in 60 hour work weeks and rushed implementation.
Conversion for the eligibility determination/benefit calculation phase was behind schedule due to unresolved training issues and the tremendous volume of data to be input. The delay associated with the labor unions' lawsuit enabled the State to catch up and implement the phase in an orderly manner.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Pennsylvania did not have many State systems to consider for a transfer. As the development progressed, Pennsylvania looked at other states' systems, either at conferences or through visits, to assess the feasibility of either a system design or code transfer. The State was limited in the latter because of its Unisys hardware. Over the years, the State has consulted with and exchanged ideas and code with New York State and Texas, states that also use Unisys hardware.

The ED/BC component was essentially a design transfer from Ohio. Touche Ross, the implementation contractor for Ohio, was the requirements contractor for that phase of the Pennsylvania system. Touche Ross provided staff from the Ohio project to assist in configuring the system for Pennsylvania. The State went through the Ohio system screen by screen and modified screens for Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania technical staff then performed the appropriate technical conversion of the code and database.

Pennsylvania looked at Connecticut, Illinois, and Virginia for candidate systems for various components. State staff believed that the Agency for Children and Families (ACF) transfer conferences were valuable for sharing ideas and discussing transfer candidates. The State also conducted a 12 state telephone survey about FAMIS systems and functionality.

The State identified the following major advantages of a system transfer:

- Cost savings
- Time savings, particularly in limiting design discussions
- Reduced risk
- Ensured FAMIS certification if a certified system is selected

State staff also identified concerns with and disadvantages of system transfers. First, a significant amount of customization is required, particularly if the hardware and the database management system (DBMS) are different. Customization also can create some problems. For instance,

Pennsylvania issues benefits twice a month for cash assistance. Some functionality may be lost in transferring from one DBMS to another. A major concern with all transfer candidates is response time because of Pennsylvania's transaction volumes and hardware.

There have not been any development efforts in other states that used CIS as the transfer system.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting CIS are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** Unisys 2200/9444; 2200/644ES; Unisys 2200/644
- **Disk:** Unisys M9720 and 8490-99 fixed head
Amphir 9242-30 solid state
Unisys 9200-30 cache
- **Tape:** Cartridge - Unisys model 40
9-track - Unisys model 36
- **Printers:** Impact
Laser - Xerox 3700, Xerox 9700, Xerox 9790
- **Front Ends:** Tandem TXP
- **Workstations:** Unisys terminals with some LANs attached to Unisys 6000 servers
- **Telecommunications:** Proprietary UNISCOPE T1 network to local LATTAs; 19.2 KB and 9.6 KB within local LATTA

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

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

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

telecommunications, performance, response time, system downtime, and plans for future hardware and software enhancements.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

CIS operates seven days a week, 24 hours a day. The system is available on-line from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The length of the batch cycle was reduced significantly when the state implemented cartridge tape drives because the use of cartridge tape drives resulted in a reduction of several hours in required backup time.

The State has a Unisys extended transaction controller controlling four processors in the main on-line Unisys 2200/9444 and four additional processors on the 2200/644ES. Four I/O processors are associated with the four CPUs. The XTC controls 16 shared database subsystems and record locking processors.

The solid state disk currently is shared among all processors for the system tables, file and database tables, and indices. The use of this device is being expanded to include the data for cases in process if the case does not fit in RAM. The State wrote system level programs to implement this hardware device.

The production system is replicated in a development machine with four processors in a machine located in a different site. This second system is used for development and some batch processing. It also is the "hot" backup site for the State's disaster recovery plan.

All hardware components are shared within a computer site. Tape drives and printers are not only shared within a data center but between data centers, e.g., the 15 Xerox 3700 laser printers are available to all 14 CPUs on the four machines in the two data centers.

A Tandem system with four redundant processors and mirrored disk drives is utilized for on-line EBT. This system will be greatly expanded as EBT goes statewide.

The State uses the proprietary Unisys operating system and database manager (DMS 1100). This is a hierarchical database manager. The database is reorganized three times per year. It takes three days to accomplish this task; therefore, the State reorganizes its database during holiday weekends. Individual subsystems may be reorganized every month or two. The database is mapped over 49 gigabytes locally and another 200 gigabytes of shared storage.

All local offices have at least one Unisys PW/2 microcomputer workstation. Most offices utilize AT&T UB2 1224 microcomputers with UNIX terminals within the office. Approximately 220 Unisys 6000 microcomputers with UTS UNIX emulation control over 6,200 terminals statewide. There are currently three LANs without UNIX.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

CIS is supported by the Bureau of Information Systems. BIS staff of 24 analysts and 12 programmers provide systems support. Additional device managers and telecommunications staff are assigned as needed to support CIS. Data center support staff consists of six teams of four operators and one shift supervisor for each data center. In addition, staff in the scheduling section include 30 data analysts and computer operators, seven supervisors, and four managers.

The State also uses contractors for some system support functions. There are currently 300 outstanding requests for system fixes or enhancements and six contractors are employed to assist BIS with this back log. The State also uses contractor staff to expose incumbent staff to new technologies. Currently, a contractor knowledgeable about Expert Systems is working with State staff developing the MA Advisor pilot project.

The State has some difficulty hiring and retaining qualified staff. CIS is written almost entirely in COBOL and local colleges provide candidates with Unisys COBOL and database experience. Nevertheless, several factors -- reduced benefits for entry level staff, requirements for programmers to join unions, and higher qualifications for the job -- have contributed to fewer graduates applying for State positions.

Maintenance is performed on Tuesday night or Saturday. Daily backups, which are performed during the batch cycle, secure both the dynamic and static files.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Pennsylvania uses a proprietary Unisys protocol, UNISCOPE, to run the WPA network. T1 lines operate through the Bell network to local LATTAs. All CIS circuits are point to point with some logical tail circuits in the local offices. The local lines transmit mostly at 19.2 baud with some smaller circuits at 9600 baud. There are 215 to 220 circuits to local offices.

Harrisburg is on fiber optic cable utilizing FDDI. This provides excellent response time, uptime, and performance. It also facilitates communications between the two State mainframe sites in Harrisburg.

A Network System Corporation (NSC) Hyperchannel connects the four Unisys systems through a T1 carrier with a transfer speed of 1.54 million bits per second.

Pennsylvania's direction is toward POSNET, a frame relay network with an Ethernet wide area network (WAN). This provides a more open system, with an industry- standard architecture. The State has initiated a competitive bidding process to implement ETHERNET 1500 microcomputers with UNISTATION emulation throughout the State.

6.2.4 System Performance

The Unisys 9444 is at 100 percent capacity during peak on-line time. The system is designed with a "staging" area or queue for transactions that impact the database significantly. This feature slightly reduces the impact of an increased caseload on the system because it provides background processing capabilities. The State has explored making more transactions into background processes, but this alternative has not been viable to users so far. The State also is considering additional RAM, additional solid state disk resources, or a combination of the two to increase capacity.

The CIS batch cycle requires four to five hours under normal conditions, but there are circumstances that cause it to run far longer. Occasionally, there are problems that cause the batch cycle to extend into the on-line hours. The monthly process, run at month end rollover, results in the batch cycle running into the on-line window one Monday each month.

The system handles over 1.3 million transactions daily on the main production machine and another 1.3 million on the batch processing and development machine. Approximately 99 percent of these transactions access the database. The State tries to limit an on-line transaction to less than 20 I/Os per transaction. Batch transactions may require as many as 140 I/Os. In the TIPP environment, the number of transactions related to one screen depends on the number of processes that the screen triggers.

6.2.5 System Response

Food Stamp Program staff indicated that the system is supposed to provide five second end to end response time for on-line interactive transactions and 15 second responses for eligibility determination. Actual response time varies according to function. A name search takes about five seconds, an SSN search requires one second, an on-line response to an inquiry takes three seconds, and eligibility determination takes 13 seconds. At peak periods, the response times may triple for each category. The time of day, rather than the type of transaction, has the most impact on response times. State staff believe that CIS response time has improved greatly since a new host was installed in spring 1993.

MIS data indicated that CIS internal response time is now 0.3 to 0.8 seconds. Prior to the installation of the new equipment in the spring, internal response times peaked at 0.5 seconds to 20 minutes.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Downtime is not an issue in Pennsylvania because of the extensive redundancy in the State's hardware and XTC. The system gets slow, but seldom is down. On some Monday mornings, batch processing runs into the on-line window, and as a result, the system is not available to workers. The unavailability may last until noon on Mondays. Since this delay is anticipated, it usually is not perceived as a problem.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Pennsylvania's current activities and future plans for system projects and equipment changes are focused in two areas: enhancements to the mainframe environment and implementation of hardware, software, and new technologies at the local and State level. With respect to the mainframe environment, State staff indicated that there are plans to increase RAM and/or solid state disk in an attempt to improve system performance and response time. The State currently is using "autotester," a programming language that enables 1,000 keystrokes to be sent to test the system through a single screen. Application processing, application entry/case management, eligibility determination/benefit calculation, and caseload management are system areas targeted for redesign efforts between 1994 and 1996. The State also plans to replace its existing UNIX telecommunications system with 56KB lines to all county offices.

The general direction of the State is towards LANs and a statewide WAN. New technologies and approaches considered by the State include expert systems, CASE technologies, relational databases, and graphic user interfaces (GUI). These technologies will reduce dependence on the mainframe computer for timely on-line responses and the technical staff for producing reports and making policy changes. One specific initiative is the MA Advisor pilot in Franklin County. The knowledge-based expert system is used to support Medical eligibility. If it is successful, State staff believe the system could be expanded to include the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs. A potential benefit involves reducing the mainframe load by placing a great deal of the eligibility determination logic on a microcomputer.

The State also is adding 3,500 PCs to the network to replace existing dumb terminals and provide a CIS terminal for all workers, clerical staff, and management personnel. This includes workers in hospitals, clinics, and other service providers that support the State's outreach program. The State plans to install Windows and WordPerfect on the PCs to increase worker productivity, facilitate development in visual BASIC, and support application downsizing.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the following areas CIS development costs and level of Federal funding, CIS operational costs, and methodologies used to allocate CIS development and operational costs.

7.1 CIS Development Costs and Federal Funding

Pennsylvania submitted the initial APD for CIS in 1982. At this time, total development cost was projected at $15,874,000. The FSP share was $2,136,000 with funding provided at 75 percent FNS Federal financial participation (FFP) rate, with a cap of $1,155,000.

The total actual development cost of CIS was $72,480,176 due to several changes in scope and significant expansion of the system's functionality. The FSP share of total development costs was $14,482,185. FNS' total FFP for development was $9,786,927. Total FFP consisted of $7,637,502 at the 75 percent FFP rate and $2,149,425 at the 50 percent FFP rate.

7.1.1 CIS System Components

CIS currently supports the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, and General Assistance Program.

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

As detailed in Section 4.2, CIS development was accomplished in phases. Six of the 13 phases did not involve FSP functions, so costs were not allocated to FSP. Available information concerning costs and cost allocation percentages for the remaining seven phases are presented below.

Phases for which FNS provided funding included: IV-A - Common Application Processing, VI - On-line Cash and Food Stamps, VII-D - RMN Interfaces, IX - Food Stamp Monthly Reporting and Integration, X-K - IEVS Data Exchanges, XI - Eligibility Determination/Benefit Calculation, and XIII - Electronic Funds Transfer. The budgeted FSP share of total costs for Phases IV, VI, and VII were 11 percent, 12 percent, and 9 percent, respectively. Since Phase IX was specific to FSP, all costs were expected to be charged to FSP. Approximately 37 percent of IEVS costs (Phase X) and 36.3 percent of Phase XI costs were allocated to FSP in the original budget. The budgeted FNS share for Phase XIII was 50 percent.

Table 7.1, CIS Development Costs, presents actual development costs for each phase of the project.

Table of Contents

Table 7.1 CIS Development Costs

Phase	FSP Share $ (before FFP)	FNS Share $ at 75% FFP	FNS Share $ at 50% FFP	Total FNS Share $ (with FFP)	Total Phase Cost
FSP ED/BC	1,475,693	0.00	737,846.50	737,846.50	1,475,693
II	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	747,747
III	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,345,565
IV-A	171,181	128,385.75	0.00	128,385.75	1,556,188
IV-B	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	642,656
V	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	894,568
VI	285,807	214,355.25	0.00	214,355.25	2,544,933
VII, VII-E	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	754,533
VII-D	386,422	289,816.50	0.00	289,816.50	3,812,203
VIII	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	16,827,269
IX	7,056,113	5,292,084.75	0.00	5,292,084.75	7,239,561
X (excl. K)	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,487,233
X-K	289,352	217,014.00	0.00	217,014.00	1,109,575
XI	2,823,156	0.00	1,411,578.00	1,411,578.00	23,975,033
XII	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	716,675
XIII	1,994,461	1,495,845.75	0.00	1,495,845.75	4,350,744
Total	14,482,185	7,637,502.00	2,149,424.50	9,786,926.50	72,480,176

Documentation for some development costs was provided through correspondence between the State and FNS or DHHS. Based on the initial APD, total development costs of $15,874,000 -- with an FNS share of $2,136,000 -- were approved by FNS.[3] The Supplemental Planning Document (SPD) was approved by FNS in June 1986. It modified original cost estimates in several areas including an increase of $413,000 for Phase IX.[4]

[3] Letter, 10/22/84

[4] Letter, 6/26/86

In December 1986, FNS approved CIS' IEVS component at a total development cost of $2,182,000 and an FSP share of $807,000, with an FNS FFP of $605,505.[5] At the same time, FNS approved the Datronics Management, Inc. contract for CIS supplemental technical staff support.

With respect to Phase XIII costs, FNS approved a $261,000 FNS share in April 1989. FNS indicated that the FFP rate would be 50 percent because the project was considered operational rather than developmental.[6]

Phase XI funding was requested in March 1991 and approved in July 1991. The Phase XI FNS share was $1,663,400 and the FNS FFP was $1,114,600.[7]

The State was unable to provide any information about development costs by component, such as hardware or State personnel costs.

7.2 CIS Operational Costs

In the November 1982 CIS APD, operational costs were projected to be $14,480,000 in 1985, the year following full implementation according to the originally project plan. CIS was not fully operational, however, until 1992. Table 7.2, CIS Operational Costs, presents actual CIS operational costs and the amount allocated to FSP for Fiscal Years 1990 through 1993 to date.

Table 7.2 CIS Operational Costs

FY	TOTAL CIS OPERATIONAL COST	CIS OPERATIONAL COST ALLOCATED TO FSP	FNS SHARE AT 50% FFP
1990	$27,876,646	$9,509,998	$4,754,999
1991	24,024,381	8,551,933	4,275,967
1992	27,666,156	10,191,415	5,095,708
1993 (3 qrtrs)	24,071,589	7,042,976	3,521,488

[5] Letter, 12/29/86

[6] Letter, 4/24/89

[7] Letter, 7/5/91

Table of Contents

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on the 1992 monthly Food Stamp caseload of 520,805 and the average monthly food stamp portion of CIS operational costs of $849,284, the cost per case for FY 1992 was $1.63.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

All costs related to FSP are entered into the statewide Integrated Computer System (ICS). The Grant Accounting Subsystem, a subsystem of ICS, tracks State and Federal share for

Table 7.3 Development Cost Allocation

Phase		Cost Allocation Basis
IV	Common Application Form	Analysis of the proposed common application form data fields
VI	On-line Cash and Food Stamps	Estimated historical staffing allocation between Federal agency activities
VII-D	RMN Interfaces	Analysis of staff resources required for various subsystems of Phase VII-D design
IX	Food Stamp Monthly Reporting and Integration	Allocated completely to FSP
X-K	IEVS Data Exchange	Average monthly number of eligible cases; costs shared equally among each benefitting program where applicable
XI	Eligibility Determination/ Benefit Calculation	Proportion of FSP recipients to total recipients of AFDC and FSP
XIII	Electronic Funds Transfer	Estimated split between check and ATP workload

7.3.2 CIS Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

State employees' costs directly related to CIS operations are tracked using an automated time system. Personnel costs are allocated according to the number of hours worked per project. A job accounting code identifies what programs benefit for that particular project. Currently, there is one job code for CIS.

Most other direct and indirect CIS costs are allocated to the programs using percentages compiled on the Monthly Utilization Report (MUR) by the Bureau of Financial Operations (BFO). These percentages are based on unduplicated recipient counts.

Cost functions are currently used to accumulate CIS operational costs. Exhibit A-7.1 in Appendix A lists and describes the cost functions used to accumulate CIS operational costs.

7.3.2.1 Cost Allocation Mechanics

This section summarizes the steps required to allocate costs for the BIS 159 appropriation and prepare the SF-269.

- ***Cost Allocation - BIS 159 Appropriation.*** The following six steps are performed:

  1. Using the FMS 50C report from ICS, extract amounts and enter in a spreadsheet.

  2. Remove postage costs (object code 330) and other costs to be allocated differently.

  3. Distribute the amount from "00000" down to divisions 1732, 1734, and 1736.

  4. Distribute divisions' costs to staff sections below them. (A number of step down allocations are performed to arrive at the total to be allocated to the programs.)

  5. Apply MUR percentages accordingly.

  6. Combine direct and indirect costs summarized on *Cost Allocation Basic Worksheets* to arrive at the total CIS operational cost to the program.

- ***SF-269 Preparation.*** The following four steps are required to prepare the SF-269 report:

  1. Use the *Cost Allocation Basic Worksheets*, which are organized by appropriation, to further process the costs.

  2. Copy costs from these worksheets into another spreadsheet so that the State and Federal shares can be segregated by appropriation.

  3. Make adjustments to the appropriation in ICS to account for the Federal share. The updated amounts will then appear on the *Monthly Grant Transaction Update*. This report is used to complete the SF-269.

  4. Make any other quarterly adjustments before spreadsheet macros automatically input the appropriate amounts on a blank SF-269 report.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

EXHIBITS

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to DHHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	N	Y	Y - State policy
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	Y	Y - State policy
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)	2/01/92*	Y	Y	Y - State policy
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 - State policy
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	N	Y	Y - State policy
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	Y	Y	Y - State policy
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	Y	Y	Y - State policy

Table of Contents

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	Y	Y	Y - State policy
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	Y	Y - State policy
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	N	Y - State policy
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	Y	Y - State policy
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	N	Y - State policy
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	N	N	Y - State policy
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

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

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Pennsylvania Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
2200/9944	Unisys	Purchase	256 MB main memory (1)
2200/644ES	Unisys	Purchase	16 MB main memory (1)
2200/644	Unisys	Purchase	16 MB main memory (2)
DISK			
Fixed Head	Unisys Unisys	Purchase Purchase	M9720 drives (508 HDAs) controllers (90) 8490-99 drives (96 HDAs) controllers (12)
Solid State	Amphir	Purchase	9242-30 drives (36 HDAs) controllers (12)
Cache	Unisys	Purchase	9200-30 drives (154 HDAs) controllers (22)
TAPE			
9-track Drives	Unisys	Purchase	Uniservo 36 (28) controllers (4)
Cartridge Drives	Unisys	Purchase	Uniservo 40 (84) controllers (14)
PRINTERS			
Impact	N/A	Purchase	(2)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	3700 (15)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	9700 (3)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	9790 (1)
FRONT ENDS			
TXP system	Tandem	Purchase	(2)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations	Unisys	Purchase	Terminals (6,200) Model 6200 (220)

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-7.1
CIS Cost Functions

DIVISION	COST FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION
1730-BUREAU OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS	00503	Food Stamps: dedicated 100% to FSP activities, e.g., preparation of ATPs and other related costs.
1732-DIVISION OF SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	00535	Fraud Abuse Investigation and Recovery Section: relates to the design and development of a Recovery Management Network. Involves systems for claim settlement, medical assistance, and income maintenance collections made by the Department.
1732	00536	Eligibility Systems Section: relates to provision of system definition, design, development, and maintenance of DPW eligibility systems.
1732	00540	Systems Application Support: relates to staff time and staff related support costs that are distributed based on time reporting.
1734-DIVISION OF COMPUTER OPERATIONS	00560	Operations Computer Equipment (Mainframe and Peripherals): supports and is responsible for all computer hardware located at the two data centers.
1734	00561	Scheduling Section: relates to all output, distribution, scheduling, executing, and coordinating application workload at both computer facilities.
1734	00563	Operations Staff: provides support for the operation of all computer hardware located at the two data centers.
1734	00564	Burroughs/OCR Equipment: relates to the reconciliation of ATPs.
1734	00568	Disk Equipment: pertains to all disk drives, disk storage devices, and peripheral equipment.

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-7.1
CIS Cost Functions

DIVISION	COST FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION
1734	00569	Tape Equipment: pertains to computer tape, tape drives, tape storage devices, and peripheral equipment.
1734	00570	Tandem EDP: pertains to operation of Tandem hardware and peripheral equipment that is attached to or supports the Tandem mainframe.
1734	00571	Tape Supplies: pertains to the acquisition of "short life" and "long life" supplies that support the operation of computer tape drives and magnetic tape storage.
1736-DIVISION OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	00510	Data Base Administration: relates to database support through design of application systems, database schemas, and structures.
1736	00511	Systems Support Section: relates to the responsibility of evaluating, modifying, coordinating, and implementing all systems software and utilities for DPW's mainframe computer systems.
1736	00512	Distributed Systems Section: relates to support for Data Network Management, Telephone (voice) Telecommunication Systems, and Distributed Micro and Mini Computer Systems.
1736	00513	Electronic Printing Equipment: relates to the preparation of FSP ATP cards and all output and ad hoc reports.
1736	00514	Data Base Design Unit: relates to the provision of database support.

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-7.1
CIS Cost Functions

DIVISION	COST FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION
1736	00517	Distributed Systems Equipment: relates to telecommunication services acquisition and maintenance for Data Network Management, Telephone (voice) Telecommunication Systems, and Distributed Micro and Mini Computer Systems.
1736	00518	Electronic Printing Staff Supplies: relates to the provision of staff and supplies for FSP ATPs.
1736	00519	Data Tandem Network: relates to the telecommunications network services provided by the Data Tandem Network.
1736	00525	Technical Support Services: relates to consulting services provided for the operation of computer hardware and software.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW

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

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Pennsylvania. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
4,804	63	1.3%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	59	93.7%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Pennsylvania. The response rate of 93.7 percent is excellent and produces a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals.

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the computer system in Pennsylvania. EWs generally find overall system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use to be acceptable. Nevertheless, there are some areas in which workers experience difficulty with the system. Overall, 71 percent of EWs feel that the system is a great help to them.

Compared to the previous system, a large majority of eligibility workers believes the current system is better. For most functions, workers think that the current system is easier to use. Compared to the previous system, EWs generally think that the current system has a positive impact or little effect in the following areas: job satisfaction, client service, and fraud and errors.

Table of Contents

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	13	22.0
Good	41	69.5
Excellent	5	8.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	34	58.6
Good	23	39.7
Excellent	1	1.7

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	8.5
Sometimes	32	54.2
Often	22	37.3

Respondents in Pennsylvania are somewhat satisfied with system response time. While 78 percent of the eligibility workers think that overall system response time is excellent or good, a majority believes that response time is poor during peak processing periods. More than 37 percent of EWs also feel that response time often is too slow.

Table of Contents

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	27	46.6
Often	31	53.4

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	15.3
Sometimes	39	66.1
Often	11	18.6

More than half (53 percent) of the EWs think that the system often is available when they need to use it, but nearly 85 percent report that the system is sometimes or often down. For some workers, the system downtime apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	2	3.4
Good	48	81.4
Excellent	9	15.3

Table of Contents

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	42	71.2
Sometimes	16	27.1
Often	1	1.7

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	38	64.4
Sometimes	19	32.2
Often	2	3.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	47	79.7
Sometimes	12	20.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	3.5
About the same	11	19.3
Easier	44	77.2

The eligibility workers generally think the system's data and computations are accurate and timely. More than 96 percent of EWs feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or

Table of Contents

excellent, and significant majorities report that cases terminated in error, incorrect eligibility determination, and out-of-date data in the system are rare. Compared to the previous system, more than 77 percent of eligibility workers think that the new system makes accurate benefit calculation easier.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	40.7
Sometimes	29	49.2
Often	6	10.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	37	63.8
Sometimes	17	29.3
Often	4	6.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	42	76.4
Sometimes	10	18.2
Often	3	5.5

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	41	73.2
Sometimes	12	21.4
Often	3	5.4

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	40	67.8
Sometimes	16	27.1
Often	3	5.1

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	67.3
Sometimes	13	25.0
Often	4	7.7

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	44	77.2
Sometimes	11	19.3
Often	2	3.5

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	42	72.4
Sometimes	16	27.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	48	81.4
Sometimes	10	16.9
Often	1	1.7

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	45	78.9
Sometimes	10	17.5
Often	2	3.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	48	82.8
Sometimes	10	17.2

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	52	91.2
Sometimes	4	7.0
Often	1	1.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	25	67.6
Sometimes	8	21.6
Often	4	10.8

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	38	66.7
Sometimes	15	26.3
Often	4	7.0

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	54.4
Sometimes	24	42.1
Often	2	3.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	43	79.6
Sometimes	9	16.7
Often	2	3.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	66.7
Sometimes	16	31.4
Often	1	2.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	47.7
Sometimes	19	43.2
Often	4	9.1

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	47.9
Sometimes	19	39.6
Often	6	12.5

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	41	91.1
Sometimes	3	6.7
Often	1	2.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	21	36.8
Easier	36	63.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	3	5.7
About the same	35	66.0
Easier	15	28.3

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	20	35.7
Easier	36	64.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	4	8.3
About the same	19	39.6
Easier	25	52.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	4	7.0
About the same	32	56.1
Easier	21	36.8

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

	Number of	Percentage of

Table of Contents

The majority of eligibility workers feels that the system is easy to use for most of the functions discussed; however, there are some exceptions. Over 59 percent of the EWs feel that it is sometimes or often difficult to obtain necessary information from the system, and more than half perceive some difficulty in identifying error prone cases or suspected fraud cases.

In comparing the difficulty of performing specific functions using the current and previous systems, most workers feel that the current system is easier to use for the following functions: determining eligibility, automatically terminating benefits for failure to file, and generating warning notices. For other functions, however, most workers feel that the same level of difficulty applies to performing the function with the current and previous systems.

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	17	28.8
Often	42	71.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	13	22.0
Sometimes	31	52.5
Often	15	25.4

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	42.4
Sometimes	32	54.2
Often	2	3.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	7	12.3
About the same	35	61.4
More	15	26.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	7	12.3
About the same	37	64.9
More	13	22.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	8	14.0
About the same	25	43.9
More	24	42.1

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	6	10.5
About the same	27	47.4
More	24	42.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	3	5.3
About the same	32	56.1
More	22	38.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Worse	2	3.7
About the same	13	24.1
Better	39	72.2

The eligibility workers in Pennsylvania are somewhat satisfied with the current system. While a significant majority (71 percent) feels that the system often is a great help to them, a large majority also believes that the system sometimes or often is a source of stress.

Compared to the previous system, over 72 percent of EWs feel that the current system is better; however, in more specific questions related to worker satisfaction, large proportions (between 44 and 65 percent of the workers) feel that the current and previous systems provide similar levels of satisfaction.

Table of Contents

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	42	71.2
Sometimes	17	28.8

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	47	81.0
Sometimes	11	19.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	13	22.8
About the same	26	45.6
Easier	18	31.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	43	75.4
Fewer	14	24.6

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	5	8.8
About the same	42	73.7
Less	10	17.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	10	17.5
About the same	37	64.9
Less	10	17.5

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has little impact on client service. Most workers think that expedited service is relatively easy to achieve with the current system. Compared to the previous system, the vast majority also believes that the number of trips required to obtain benefits, the amount of time clients spend waiting in the office, and the amount of paperwork required from clients are reduced under the current system. EWs report mixed perceptions regarding the comparative degree of difficulty associated with interviewing clients in a timely manner with the current and previous systems.

Fraud and Errors

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	4.7
About the same	39	90.7
Easier	2	4.7

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	8	14.8
About the same	21	38.9
Fewer	25	46.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	2	3.8
About the same	37	69.8
Fewer	14	26.4

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has a positive impact or little effect on fraud and errors. The majority thinks that the number of undetected fraud cases and the level of difficulty associated with collecting overpayments are the same with either system. A plurality believes that the number of errors made are reduced with the current system.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX C

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW

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

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

Description of the Sample

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

Number of EW Supervisors in Pennsylvania	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
859	30	3.5%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	29	96.7%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Pennsylvania. The response rate of 96.7 percent is excellent and produces a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals.

Summary of Findings

EW supervisors in Pennsylvania generally are satisfied with the system. The majority reports that overall system response time, availability, and accuracy are acceptable. EW supervisors' feelings about system ease of use are divided. While most supervisors find the system easy to use for many functions, there are several areas where many supervisors report difficulties. Supervisors feel that the system exerts both positive and negative impacts on job satisfaction and generally supports management needs.

In comparison to the previous system, the vast majority of responding EW supervisors prefers the current system. In general, EW supervisors find the current and previous systems equally easy

Table of Contents

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	27.6
Good	21	72.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	18	62.1
Good	11	37.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

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

EW supervisors in Pennsylvania are somewhat satisfied with system response time. More than 72 percent of the respondents think that overall response time is good or excellent. But, the majority feels that response time during peak processing periods is poor.

Table of Contents

to use. Most supervisors think the current system offers improvements in management support and client service functions, but the majority believes the system has little impact on the prevalence of fraud and errors.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	27.6
Good	21	72.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	18	62.1
Good	11	37.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

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

EW supervisors in Pennsylvania are somewhat satisfied with system response time. More than 72 percent of the respondents think that overall response time is good or excellent. But, the majority feels that response time during peak processing periods is poor.

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	70.4
Sometimes	8	29.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	67.9
Sometimes	8	28.6
Often	1	3.6

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	39.3
Sometimes	14	50.0
Often	3	10.7

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	50.0
Sometimes	9	40.9
Often	2	9.1

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	65.5
Sometimes	9	31.0
Often	1	3.4

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	71.4
Sometimes	7	25.0
Often	1	3.6

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	3.7
About the same	9	33.3
Easier	17	63.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	19	70.4
Easier	8	29.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	3.7
About the same	14	51.9
Easier	12	44.4

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	3	13.0
About the same	11	47.8
Easier	9	39.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	3.7
About the same	15	55.6
Easier	11	40.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	4	14.3
About the same	14	50.0
Easier	10	35.7

EW supervisors have mixed feelings about system ease of use. For several of the functions addressed (determining and tracking monthly reporting status, terminating benefits for failure to file, and restoring benefits) a majority of the responding EW supervisors reports rarely having difficulty. For other functions, at least half of the supervisors experience difficulty sometimes or often. In most comparisons between the current and previous systems, a plurality thinks that the same level of difficulty is involved in

Table of Contents

performing these functions with either the previous or current systems.

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
Rarely	1	3.6
Sometimes	7	25.0
Often	20	71.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	34.5
Sometimes	12	41.4
Often	7	24.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	10.7
About the same	15	53.6
More	10	35.7

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	5	17.9
About the same	16	57.1
More	7	25.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	9	32.1
About the same	7	25.0
More	12	42.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	2	7.1
About the same	15	53.6
More	11	39.3

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	10.7
About the same	13	46.4
More	12	42.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	3	11.1
About the same	5	18.5
Better	19	70.4

EW supervisors' perceptions concerning the impact of the system on job satisfaction are ambivalent. Over 71 percent of EW supervisors think the system often is a great help, but the majority also believes that it sometimes or often causes additional stress.

In comparison to the previous system, a similar pattern exists. More than 70 percent of supervisors feel that the current system is better overall than the previous system. Majorities feel that their work is equally satisfying and pleasant with the current and previous systems. More than half of the EW supervisors also believe that their productivity is the same with the previous and current systems, and nearly 43 percent of the supervisors find their work more stressful with the current system.

Table of Contents

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	11.1
Good	22	81.5
Excellent	2	7.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	7	25.0
Good	16	57.1
Excellent	5	17.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	63.2
Sometimes	7	36.8

Table of Contents

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	16	72.7
Sometimes	6	27.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	5	18.5
About the same	7	25.9
More	15	55.6

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

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

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	4	16.7
About the same	7	29.2
Easier	13	54.2

EW supervisors generally feel that the system supports management needs. Large majorities think that the quality of both technical support and reports produced by the system is good or excellent. Most EW supervisors also report rarely having problems making mass changes or meeting Federal reporting requirements.

In comparison to the previous system, supervisors view the current system as meeting their management needs better. Three quarters of EW supervisors feel that the current system facilitates making mass changes. In addition, more than half think that the current system makes it easier to evaluate local office efficiency, and almost 56 percent of the supervisors feel that the personnel they supervise are more efficient with the current system.

Client Service

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	6	21.4
About the same	16	57.1
Easier	6	21.4

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	1	3.6
About the same	11	39.3
Better	16	57.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	1	3.7
About the same	7	25.9
Better	19	70.4

Most EW supervisors believe that client service is improved with the current system, but 57 percent of the EW supervisors also feel that the system does not have an impact on their ability to interview clients in a timely manner.

Fraud and Errors

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	3	13.0
About the same	18	78.3
Easier	2	8.7

Table of Contents

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	7	25.0
About the same	9	32.1
Less	12	42.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fewer	2	7.4
About the same	17	63.0
More	8	29.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	3	10.7
About the same	17	60.7
Fewer	8	28.6

EW supervisors feel that compared to the previous system, the current system generally has little impact on the prevalence of fraud and errors. Majorities (between 61 and 78 percent) of respondents think that the ease of collecting overpayments and the number of false claims and instances of fraud that are caught with the current system are the same as with the previous system. With respect to reducing errors, a plurality believes that less errors are made with the current system.