

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: SEPTEMBER 20 - 21, 1993

RHODE ISLAND STATE REPORT

NOVEMBER 9, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

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

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Administrative Costs	3
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	4
2.4.1 Staffing	4
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes	5
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	6
2.4.4 Claims Collection	6
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	7
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	7
3.1 System Functionality	7
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	11
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	11
3.4 Current Automation Issues	11
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	12
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	12
4.2 Justification for InRHODES	13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	13
4.4 Conversion Approach	14
4.5 Project Management	15
4.5.1 APD Process	15
4.5.2 Contractor	16
4.6 Food Stamp Program Participation	16
4.7 MIS Participation	17
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	17
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	17
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	19
6.1 System Profile	19
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	19
6.2.1 Operating Environment	20
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	21
6.2.3 Telecommunications	21
6.2.4 System Performance	22
6.2.5 System Response	22
6.2.6 System Downtime	22
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	23
7.1 InRHODES Development Costs and Federal Funding	23
7.1.1 InRHODES System Components	23
7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components	23
7.2 InRHODES Operational Costs	24
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	25
7.2.2 InRHODES Cost Control Measures and Practices	25
7.3 Cost Allocation Methodologies	25
7.3.1 Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology	26
7.3.2 InRHODES Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies	26
7.3.2.1 Data Entry Costs	26
7.3.2.2 InRHODES CPU Operations and Maintenance Cost ...	26
7.3.3.3 InRHODES Software Maintenance	27
7.3.3.4 Central Services Cost	27

APPENDICES

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

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	3
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	4
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	6
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	7
7.1	InRHODES Actual Development Costs	24
7.2	InRHODES Operational Cost	25

APPENDIX A - State of Rhode Island Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Rhode Island Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	InRHODES Development History	A-5

RHODE ISLAND STATE REPORT

Site Visit: September 20 - 22, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: InRHODES

Start Date: 1985

Completion Date: January 1990

Contractor: Network Systems, Inc.

Transfer From: Vermont

Cost:

Actual:	\$10,187,000
Projected:	\$3,688,758
FSP Share:	\$3,667,320
FSP %:	36%

Number of Users: Not available

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe:	Amdahl 5890-300E
Workstations:	Memorex-Telex, IBM 3270, Lee Data
Telecommunications Network:	56 KB lines, digital; 9600 baud lines

System Profile:

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

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Department of Human Services has five divisions: Management Services, which contains the Operations Management group responsible for on-going maintenance and operations of the InRHODES system; Economic Social Services; Medical Services; Veterans Affairs; and Community Services. The Division of Economic Social Services is responsible for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp, and Title IV-A Programs. The Food Stamp Program (FSP) is State-administered.

Field operations personnel report to their supervisors, who report to three regional directors and the Associate Administrator of Food Stamps.

Rhode Island is a highly unionized State and for this reason has difficulty implementing staffing reductions.

Unemployment in Rhode Island was highest in 1982, with a level of 10.2 percent, and has generally declined from that date to 1988, when it reached a low of 3.1 percent. Since 1988 the rate has increased, reaching 8.5 percent in 1991.

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

- Rhode Island's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was negative; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Rhode Island reduced the 1992 State budget by \$17 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Rhode Island decreased by 2.38 percent. This change was much larger than the national average 0.60 percent decrease in State government employment.
- Rhode Island implemented changes to increase revenues by \$60.6 million for FY 1993. These changes included increases in personal and corporate income taxes and other taxes.
- The regional outlook indicated that the New England region was hard hit by the recession. Unemployment rates are among the highest in the nation. Rhode Island's was the highest in the region at 9.7 percent, while population growth is the lowest in the region.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

There are 19 local welfare offices with separate offices for non-public assistance (NPA) Food Stamp cases. The Public Assistance (PA)/Food Stamp (FS) offices are under the direction of Field Operations within the Division of Economic and Social Services. Regional directors are responsible for staffing local offices. The non-public assistance

food stamp offices are under the direction of the Assistant Administrator of Assistance Payments, who is also responsible for all reconciliation and issuance of food stamps.

Although InRHODES is integrated and some workers handle multiple programs, there is a separation of assistance program management both in the central office and in the field.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Food Stamp Program participation, based on figures supplied by Rhode Island, increased by 153 percent for households and over 51 percent for individuals between 1988 and 1992, with the largest percentage increases occurring in the 1990-1991 period.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

	FY 92	FY 91	FY 90	FY 89	FY 88
AFDC					
Cases	20,944	18,687	16,077	14,953	15,230
Recipients	58,481	52,313	44,591	41,612	42,279
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA	*	*	*	*	*
Cases					
Recipients					
FSP					
Households	38,835	34,178	28,390	25,318	25,330
Participants	88,519	78,250	65,297	57,666	58,527
Medicaid	*	*	*	*	*

* Information requested from State, but not available.

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved dramatically from 6.2:1 in 1988 to 12.9:1 in 1992.

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

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

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$150.16	\$139.67	\$125.22	\$108.80	\$106.17

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Rhode Island's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.² While total costs have fluctuated over this period, the average cost per household has decreased.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$5,343,227	\$5,996,122	\$4,849,402	\$4,770,062	\$5,061,271
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$11.63	\$12.30	\$14.45	\$15.91	\$17.02

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Food stamp systems typically have an impact in several program performance areas. This section examines the system impact in the areas of staffing, responsiveness to regulatory changes, error rates, and claims collection.

2.4.1 Staffing

Rhode Island has 162 eligibility workers and 18 eligibility worker supervisors. There are 123 AFDC/FSP/Medical assistance workers and 39 FSP non-public assistance staff. The State indicated that total staffing has decreased over the past five years, however, no specific figures were provided to show the impact the automated system has had upon

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

staffing levels. During this same period, the average monthly caseload per worker increased and an increase in case backlog was noted.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

As shown in Appendix A, Exhibit A-2.1, Rhode Island implemented two of the fourteen provisions requiring States to make regulatory changes by the Federal implementation date. Each of the provisions not implemented by the date required are discussed below:

- Vendor Payments Exclusion (CFR 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)): Does not apply as Rhode Island GA does not make vendor payments.
- Clothing Allowance Exclusion (CFR 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)): Because Rhode Island did not provide clothing allowances until 11/92, the provision did not apply to Rhode Island until that time.
- AFDC/Supplemental Security Income Recipient Resource Exemption (CFR 273.8(e)(17)): State did not receive final clarification from FNS until 4/7/92 (see Regional Letter 92-41).
- Standard Estimate of Shelter for Homeless (CFR 273.9(d)(5)(i)): Implemented 10 months late. This provision had a low priority and was implemented along with other annual changes.
- Farm Property/Vehicle Exclusion (CFR 273.8(3)(5)): Not yet implemented since there are few farmers in Rhode Island on food stamps and this has a very low priority.
- Combined Initial Allotment (CFR 274.2(b)(2)): Implemented eight months late because a waiver from FNS to extend the validity period for authorization to participate documents issued after the 15th of the month for ongoing FSP households was needed.
- Combined Initial Allotment for Expedited (CFR 274.2(b)(3)): Implemented late. FNS issued a clarification in June 1993 expanding the interpretation of the original requirement. This clarified interpretation has not been implemented.
- Exclusion of Job Stream Migrant Vendor Payments (CFR 273.9(c)(1)(ii)): Low priority since there are few migrants in Rhode Island. Implemented 3/90.
- Exclusion of Advance Earned Income Tax Credit Payments (CFR 273.9(c)(14)): Rhode Island questioned effective date of 9/1/88. Believes effective date was 1/1/89. Implemented 3/90.
- Replacement Issuance Limitation (CFR 274.6(b)(2)): Implemented 10 months late due to staffing problems in Policy Office.

- Destruction of Unusable Coupons (CFR 274.7(f)): Relates to business office procedures which are not under the director of the policy unit.

Rhode Island can make retroactive changes back to January 1, 1990, but not before. This is the date InRHODES was implemented. The major factor affecting implementation dates is staff size of the policy unit. This unit has one policy director and three policy analysts who handle all regulations for FSP, AFDC, Medicaid, Long Term Care, Vocational Rehabilitation, JOBS, IV-F, Veterans Homes, Child Support Enforcement, and General Assistance.

Rhode Island has an on-line policy manual which is updated at the time of a regulatory change. The on-going implementation of Medicaid, Long Term Care, and the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) also affects the ability of the State to respond to regulatory changes. Under the State's Administrative Procedures Act, 43 days are required to promulgate regulations. To begin this process, the State must have a copy of the law. As of the site visit, it still had not received a copy of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993 that has an effective date of October 1, 1993. Another factor contributing to the inability of the State to implement regulatory changes requiring programming is the limited operational automated data processing (ADP) budget.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rates

Rhode Island's error rates, as indicated in Table 2.4, have fluctuated over the past five years, but generally have been low.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	4.40	7.47	5.50	6.62	9.08

2.4.4 Claims Collection

The number of claims established has declined over the last five years. This decline seems to be impacted by the fact that there has been no training for eligibility staff on how to construct and electronically submit a claim report.

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of claims established and collected and the percentage of claims established that were collected. From 1988 to 1992, the dollar value of claim collections fluctuated.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$101,874	\$72,804	\$115,559	\$172,297	\$211,714
Total Claims Collected	\$100,000	\$73,555	\$62,228	\$82,019	\$95,529
As a % of Total Claims Established	98.1%	101.0%	53.8%	47.6%	45.1%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) conducted a post implementation review on June 11-15, 1990 and July 16-20, 1990. The review report was completed on October 24, 1990. The Agency for Children and Families (ACF) certified the system as of May 1, 1990.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

InRHODES handles AFDC, Food Stamps, Medicaid, JOBS, Child Care, Child Support Enforcement, and General Assistance. InRHODES programs were implemented in the following time sequence: AFDC, Food Stamps, and Medicaid on January 1, 1990. Child Support Enforcement on January 1, 1991; General Assistance on July 1, 1992; JOBS and Child Care on August 1992; and Medicaid for Categorically eligible and Medically Needy on December 1, 1993.

3.1 System Functionality

Major features of InRHODES functionality are discussed in this section. These features are:

- **Registration.** The applicant completes a two-page initial application form that is used to identify cases that require expedited processing. If it is an expedited case, the eligibility worker may enter the information; otherwise clerical personnel enter the data. Terminals are used to register the head of household on the system which checks the InRHODES database for both current and previous participation. The search is limited to the head of household. If there is an active or inactive case, a new case is not created. The case number is the Social Security Number

(SSN) of the head of household. A search can also be conducted on the name, date of birth, and other information if the SSN is not used.

The interview is scheduled by the caseworker, depending upon the office. When the application form is completed, the information from the 23-page form is entered into the system by the eligibility worker. No further matching is performed on the head of household or individual members until after the case has been made active (after eligibility determination).

- **Eligibility Determination.** The processing of eligibility is performed in "background" and on-line to the host computer. During this process a worker can be processing other cases. It takes from 15 minutes to a few hours to obtain the results, depending upon the processing occurring at the host. At the end of the demonstration, for instance, Medicaid eligibility was being piloted, and system response was very slow.

InRHODES presents the eligibility worker with a screen that contains the primary questions contained on the DHS-2 data collection document. Answering "yes" or "no" causes the electronic application screens presented to the worker to appear only if the worker answered "yes" to the question that governs the screen. The electronic application is tailored to the case situation presented. This eliminates the need for the worker to delete or deal with unnecessary screens.

The system determines the relevant household composition. The worker must enter all household members into the case. The system determines who is eligible.

The system requires that a number of codes be entered into the screens. The worker can obtain the code for a field by hitting the PF-10 key, which accesses the on-line policy manual. Although the on-line policy manual will provide the policy citation for a particular field, however, it does not always provide the needed code. The worker can then look up the code in a hard copy printout.

If the applicant does not provide all of the required verifications, the system does not automatically close the case after 30 days. The system does track the receipt and acceptance of the verifications by the worker and provides reminders to the worker that a verification has not been received. The worker has the discretion to close the case or not if the verification has not been received.

- **Benefit Calculation.** The income and resource information is entered into the system from the application form (DHS-2) and the system performs the calculations and monthly budgeting. The worker reviews the information and benefit calculation to verify the appropriateness of the result, not whether the system performed the calculations correctly. The worker can often determine at this review whether the correct and complete information has been entered into the system.

Supervisors are required to authorize benefits for all new workers. Otherwise, the eligibility worker authorizes benefits for all cases.

Mass changes are approved by the system unless the case was in a non-approved status at the time of mass adjustment or the latest version of eligibility was pending. The exceptions are provided to the worker on a report for their evaluation and approval.

- **Benefit Issuance.** Issuance is fully integrated in InRHODES. ATPs and notices are printed at the State's central computer facility in Johnston, Rhode Island. Nightly issuances are delivered each night to the Central Providence Post Office by a bonded courier service. If the eligibility determination is approved by the worker by the close of the business day, the ATP, AFDC check, and notices are mailed that evening by 8:30 p.m. and usually received by the client the next morning. The main monthly ATP printing is printed and enveloped at the computer center and transported to the State mail room in Providence for postage and delivery to the Postal Service.

ATPs are redeemed for coupons at financial institutions. The ATPs are returned to the central NPA office for data entry and reconciliation. A complete issuance history screen is available on-line. Workers can issue manual ATPs for expedited issuance if necessary, though the system has the capability to put an ATP into the mail the same night. The need for a replacement ATP can be entered into the system by the worker.

- **Notices.** InRHODES automatically generates all required notices to clients. No worker input is required for the automated notices that are mailed from the central office. All notices are maintained on line; no paper copies of notices are kept in the case file. For notices of required outstanding verifications, the worker must enter the notice information into the system; the notice is then sent from the central office. Notices for General Public Assistance are not yet on line.
- **Claims System.** InRHODES has a fully integrated claims collection system. The eligibility worker prepares a paper referral form or establishes an electronic record. If the referral form is prepared it is sent with the substantiating documentation to the Collections Unit. If an electronic record is created, the worker enters the name, address, SSN, issuance period of the claim, cause of claim, and type of claim that is being referred. The screen permits two lines of free text for entering the narrative information and, if more space is needed, the worker can use the Case Log narrative screen for a more detailed description. Regardless of method used, the worker must provide the backup documentation, such as an employer statement of the receipt of income or a paystub. The Collection Unit prepares a letter that is sent to the client. The client is given the opportunity for an interview and may either sign a collection agreement or request a meeting with an administrative hearing officer.

After 30 days, the system will send a letter to the client indicating that collection will begin, at which time automatic recoupment will occur. Because the initial letter is prepared and sent by the Collections Unit, the establishment of a claim and the recovery of any overpayments is not fully automated.

When InRHODES was implemented the existing claims for cases that were currently receiving benefits or were closed, but making cash payments to the State, were converted from the old system to the new system.

- **Computer Matching.** Matching is performed on all active cases in a batch mode. The results of the matching are presented to the worker on the daily case management logs. The case management log provides information for each of the worker's cases, such as whether eligibility is pending and whether there are matches to be resolved or notices to be sent. Once an issue has been resolved, the warning on the case management log disappears. In some situations, however, the warning will never disappear. For instance, if a SSN is missing (as would be the case for an undocumented alien), the SSN warning will continue to appear and the worker will not be able to eliminate it. The worker can also add narrative notes to the case management logs as reminders.

The daily case management report, although on-line, is cumbersome to use. The worker must scroll through all of the cases, there is no prioritization to the warnings, and the warnings appear for at least 30 days.

InRHODES performs the required matches and provides a warning on the Daily Case Management Log for worker resolution. All hits are reported. When the worker views the detailed information and resolves the discrepancy, the worker is to enter into a Save Screen the amount of time required to resolve and the amount of savings resulting from any corrections made to the active case file information.

- **Alerts.** The system does not contain alerts.
- **Monthly Reporting.** All AFDC clients must report earned income over the last month. There is no monthly reporting for Food Stamp-only clients. The monthly report is computer generated and sent to clients. Upon receipt, the worker must enter receipt and changes into the case.

Food stamp only cases are required to report income changes of \$25 or more. These clients do not receive monthly reporting forms monthly, but do receive the forms at intake, recertification, changes, and when a case is transferred to an NPA office.

The system provides automated screens that indicate the status of monthly reporting to the worker. Every time there is a change resulting from monthly reporting, the worker must go into the eligibility screens for each program and recalculate/approve the case.

- **Report Generation.** InRHODES provides both on-line and batch reporting. Daily reports are available for cases needing a worker's attention. One report that is

Page

[Redacted]

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section provides an overview of the InRHODES system development process. Areas described include the system that InRHODES replaced, the reasons for developing the new system, the activities involved and problems encountered in development and implementation, the conversion approach used, project management, and State FSP and management information system involvement throughout the process.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

The previous Rhode Island system required that the client fill out the initial application and submit it to an EW. The EW reviewed it with the client, partially rewrote it, and added more information manually. The application was then typed by a clerk and transported to the Providence central office for re-keying into the computer. Data entry was then verified (i.e., another person re-keyed the data and the results were compared). The same information was transcribed five times on its way into the system.

In the old system, the benefit calculation and registration component were only run twice monthly. Therefore, the worker might not see the results of the entry for 5 to 20 days and the client might not receive benefits for 20 days or possibly 40 days. This fostered a number of sub-procedures outside the system which were very counterproductive and, in some cases, not auditable.

Case numbers were assigned centrally via telephone from the local worker to the Master File Unit. The "Master File" was kept in vast tubs of 3x5 index cards in Providence. These cards were indexed in alphabetic order and contained the recipient's social security number, name, and date of birth. A new number was not assigned until the application arrived from the local office to be keypunched.

Since there was no interrelationship between systems, duplicate issuance was a major problem. Each program had its own application, input forms, and database. This was extremely redundant and time-consuming for both the worker and the client. Each system, including Child Support Enforcement and Medicaid, had a different indexing and control system which increased the difficulty for matching.

Inquiry and update terminals were available for food stamp workers under the old system. These were not readily available to the worker and were not timely for new cases since the registration and benefit calculations were only run twice a month. All updates to a food stamp case could be done on-line using the old system, but terminal access was an issue and even updates were usually done on paper before they were entered in the system.

General Assistance was not on any computer. Therefore, there was no way to determine duplicate participation outside of a given city.

Maintenance under the previous system had deteriorated to the point where the focus of the MIS managers was dedicated to keeping the system functioning rather than achieving the best or most productive use of automation.

The previous system was never able to reconcile ATPs. ATP reconciliation is now on-line.

4.2 Justification for InRHODES

InRHODES was expected to improve performance in a number of areas:

- Decrease the manual efforts associated with intake processing
- Improve system responsiveness with on-line feedback to workers
- Improve client service and speed up benefit issuance
- Reduce duplicate participation and benefit issuance
- Improve system controls by reducing system fragmentation
- Improve data verification with computer matching
- Improve program management

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Rhode Island decided to develop an automated system in 1985. A team of two full time staff comprised the core project team. Another team of 15 staff members was formed for three weeks to review the system functionality. This team included a food stamp policy worker; two AFDC, Medicaid, and Child Support policy staff; several generic workers and a Manager from the Office of Information Processing (OIP). The Project Manager had 15 years of public assistance service and had several years of project management experience. He also possessed a high degree of familiarity with the State system and was able to involve all factions, including the unions, early in the process. The Project Manager reported to the Director which was also critical since it gave the project high-level exposure and leverage.

The Project Manager, the head of public assistance Field Operations, and a representative from OIP went to Vermont and South Dakota to view prospective systems. They felt most comfortable with the Vermont system because it had more functionality, specifically Child Support Enforcement and Medicaid eligibility components. The key ingredients, however, were that Vermont had a certified system, was close to Rhode Island, and offered support and on-line access to assist Rhode Island to prototype its new system.

The team brought all screens to Rhode Island in paper form and developed the specifications for the request for proposals (RFP). A contractor, Maximus, was employed to assist in RFP development.

Rhode Island used field staff extensively to develop system design changes and specifications, and to perform testing and training. This was critical since there were only two full time staff assigned to the project. A significant percentage of field staff were

rotated through the development project, including the conversion and training phases. This increased the acceptance of the system in the field. An on-line program policy manual was developed as part of the system as a State innovation.

Rhode Island implementation activities were in three stages:

- Data collection
- Eligibility determination/benefit calculation results
- Issuance and notices

Network Systems Incorporated (NSI) was the contracting transfer agent. NSI had done maintenance work for the Department prior to bidding on the system. In addition to this familiarity with the public assistance program, the State sent them to its "academy" to learn about public assistance policy and systems. NSI continued as the support contractor after system implementation.

4.4 Conversion Approach

DHS took a three-phase approach over 18 months for piloting, converting, and implementing InRHODES. Rhode Island used a combination of automated and manual processes for conversion. The screens for the new system provided input for the Common Application Form (CAF). This form was distributed to the offices 12 months prior to implementation of the system. Rhode Island changed to generic workers at this time. There were training classes on generic eligibility and the CAF. The worker was expected to collect all the information on the CAF at recertification time for each case.

During the first phase, the screens were implemented for data collection. Other than edits, no other processing took place at this time. A desk review and acceptance test were performed, changes were made as needed, and, once the screens were acceptable, the screens were implemented statewide. This provided workers an opportunity to learn how to use the screens in a risk-free environment as no benefits were issued as a result of the data input through the screens. DHS continued to maintain the old system from which benefits were issued for AFDC and FSP. The single application form (referred to as a statement of need form) had been expanded and was used during this first phase. These screens were used for one year statewide before InRHODES was fully implemented. During this time, workers learned electronic file maintenance.

During the second phase of the pilot, eligibility determination and benefit calculation results were processed. Again, a desk review and an acceptance test were conducted in the pilot area and, once the required changes had been made, the ED/BC results were processed. Benefits were still not issued at this time by InRHODES.

In the third and final phase of the implementation, benefit issuance and client notices were implemented utilizing the same process, at the end of which screens, results, and issuance were combined in a two-month pilot. Implementation began statewide on January 1, 1990, at which point the enhanced funding for InRHODES ended. All case information

was moved from the old system to the new system in January and by May 1 all cases had been converted.

4.5 Project Management

Until InRHODES was created, the Department did not have an ADP group per se. There were a few staff who developed ad hoc reports and this group expanded its responsibilities significantly to encompass InRHODES development, operations, and on-going maintenance. A senior program staff person with good communication and coordination skills was selected as the InRHODES Project Manager and moved to the Division of Management Services.

The Office of Information Processing designated a staff member to serve as liaison with DHS during the development effort so that the Data Center would have the requisite equipment and capabilities to support InRHODES during development and operations.

During the transfer, Rhode Island worked very closely with Vermont. A consultant who had provided assistance to Vermont during its system development effort came to Rhode Island to meet with program staff. He explained what the Vermont system would do, enabling the Rhode Island staff to identify the differences between Rhode Island and Vermont and incorporate those changes needed into the RFP.

Key project staff included the Assistant Director of Policy who had over 38 years with DHS and was familiar with all of the operational aspects of the programs.

The Project Manager reported to the Associate Director of Management Services and was 100 percent dedicated to the project. The Project Manager came from the program side of DHS and had managed the refugee assistance project.

4.5.1 APD Process

The Advanced Planning Document (APD) process and associated regulations have been beneficial to the development and implementation of InRHODES. The Project Manager utilized the APDs as a communications tool by which directors were required to review and sign off on the system. Another value of the APD is the need to commit to setting forth a plan which helps to assure a total "buy-in" by the agency. The need for a timeline by which the State must meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA) or lose Federal financial participation (FFP) was also considered a useful incentive to obtain management commitment. This was especially helpful for the InRHODES team which had three department directors during the life of the project.

Although the Rhode Island InRHODES team has developed good working relationships with Federal review staff in all agencies, the Rhode Island staff indicated that they often could not ascertain what Federal staff were looking for in the APD. Their management

contractor was able to provide a person who had previously worked with APDs at the Federal level who was able to provide insight into the intricacies of APDs.

ACF views the APD as a working tool that is flexible and can be modified with justification. State personnel felt that the Federal agencies should more clearly identify the purpose of the APD. The State would also like to have access by telephone to unbiased technical expertise, i.e., not provided by contractors.

Generally, APDs were approved within 30 to 60 days. This was facilitated through ongoing communications with Federal staff keeping them updated with recent events and changes they could expect. Communications with both FNS and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) have been excellent.

Areas in which the system was expected to improve State operations included reduced errors in worker calculations through automated budget calculation, automated interfaces, and SSN verifications. The single integrated database that includes General Public Assistance, FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid is also considered to be a major advantage in reducing errors. The system has also helped workers manage their workloads, so that cases are handled in a timely fashion.

4.5.2 Contractor Assistance

Besides the management and monitoring contractor, Rhode Island contracted with NSI for the development of InRHODES. This was the first major eligibility determination system that NSI had transferred, though it had some prior state-level welfare program experience. The State is using NSI to implement the IV-D component (Family Support Act of 1988) and EDS for the MMIS development.

4.6 Food Stamp Program Participation

Extensive involvement of field and policy staff during the project development and implementation was emphasized to get the users to accept the new system. A number of field staff were involved over the duration of the project, but none were involved 100 percent for the entire time. Well informed and experienced staff from local offices were selected for participation.

Policy staff were heavily involved in preparing for an automated policy change management and control process. This was an effective way to increase the involvement of policy staff in the InRHODES development process.

4.7 MIS Participation

Historically, Rhode Island MIS resided in OIP for programming and analysis. DHS had around five staff members that had program and field experience (ad hoc reports using IBM's Easytrieve). OIP did not have the staff nor the experience to undertake a project the magnitude of an automated system development. Consequently, DHS contracted with Maximus for systems analysis, cost benefit preparation, alternatives analysis, and preliminary project planning.

DHS then selected NSI through a competitive bid to be its MIS department through development and the three subsequent years of support. The Project Manager and the program systems analysts came from the ad hoc report group of DHS. OIP assigned one MIS staff person to work with the team for coordination.

The NSI development team consisted of a project manager, 6 analysts, 22 program/analysts, a systems test analyst, a quality assurance manager, and a documentation specialist. The six systems analysts doubled as quality assurance/quality control analysts.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

Rhode Island encountered a variety of problems during implementation. One of the major problems that had to be overcome was the belief that a major new system could not be implemented. Rhode Island had made some previous attempts at system development efforts which had not met the needs of program personnel. This was overcome through strong project management leadership.

Over a period of three years and just before implementation of the system in July 1989, there was a turnover in senior staff caused by enticing retirement packages.

Midway through the development project Rhode Island had to change from a lease procurement to expensing their hardware.

Conversion and training for the claims collection portion of InRHODES was inadequate. Claims for cases that had been closed were not converted and so the Collections Unit operates two separate collections systems. InRHODES training focused on eligibility determination and benefit issuance, not claims collection. Workers need retraining for claims collections to provide the correct documentation and submit the electronic or the paper referrals to the Collections Unit. Because of the large caseloads, the focus is on benefit issuance, not on claims collections.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Rhode Island transferred the Vermont ACCESS system that had been developed by Consultec. ACCESS has also been transferred to Minnesota and South Dakota. At the time of the transfer,

only South Dakota and Vermont were using this system. The prime considerations for a transfer system were caseload size, similar state organization, certification, functionality and, most importantly, candidate State proximity and cooperation. The main reason for transferring as opposed to in-house development was to reduce risk.

Rhode Island transferred all of the ACCESS code, as well as the on-line policy manual function from South Dakota. Vermont had most of the components required by Rhode Island, but claims, notices, a reconciliation process for ATPs, and general assistance modules were added. Rhode Island made many enhancements and changes, but as part of the planned development. Approximately 75 percent of the Vermont modules were either modified or recoded.

Rhode Island added the following components to the Vermont System:

- Claims
- Recoupment, automatic underpayment and overpayment
- General Assistance
- IEVS
- Intra State identification matches
- Notice texts
- On-line Policy Manual
- On-line Management and Supervisory reporting
- Rhode Island management reports
- ATP reconciliation

The public assistance Medicaid eligibility component had been eliminated from the original system and not added until after initial implementation in 1990. Non-PA Medicaid is currently being implemented.

The NATURAL code was converted from version 1.2 to NATURAL 2.1, a much more efficient and usable release. This resolved much of the concern that Rhode Island had about response time. A change to the MVS operating system is expected to further alleviate the response time problems and allow the State to implement additional components that the system cannot currently handle. Rhode Island took the approach of getting a basic system in place with the code conversion and then added to it and cleaned it up after implementation. The system is now handling a 40 percent larger case load and additional programs (e.g., JOBS) with fewer EW staff.

Rhode Island has an exemplary on-line management reporting capability. Caseload statistics, worker productivity, backlog, approvals by application type, redetermination activity, and many other items are available by worker, office, and statewide for management and supervisors.

Rhode Island is very happy with the Vermont system, partly because of the development partnership and cooperation from Vermont. The system has worked well, functionally. Although many changes were made to ACCESS, Rhode Island feels that the process was the best approach it could have taken and that developing its own system would have led to the automation of its existing way of doing business, with disastrous results. Rhode Island was able

to travel to Vermont to talk to users and, as a result, was fully aware of problems and limitations in the ACCESS system before it was transferred.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

6.1 System Profile

- **Mainframe:** Amdahl 5890-300E
VM/VSE, CICS, ADABAS
- **Disk:** Amdahl 6380 double density
IBM 3380 double density
- **Tape:** IBM 3480 cartridge
- **Printers:** 30 - Memorex-Telex 1187
1 - Lee Data Prima
4 - IBM 3x7x impact
- **Front End:** Amdahl 4725
- **Workstations:** 352 Memorex-Telex 1091
43 IBM 3270
87 Lee Data
- **Telecommunications:** 6 56KB lines, digital
Direct 9600 lines, digital

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The DHS Management Services Division does not have sufficient staff with the range of technical skills required to maintain the system and provide on-going technical support. They have contracted with NSI to provide on-going support. The first contract is for one year with two one-year options. The first year of operations is budgeted at \$1.3 million and the second year at \$1.7 million, at a fixed price level of effort. Contractor support is on-site. Management Services staff indicated that the budget is inadequate to meet the needs of the program. There are many requests for system enhancements and changes that are not being handled.

Experienced technical staff are generally not available at the State salary ranges offered. The proximity of two high priced markets, Boston and Hartford, make it difficult to compete for skilled personnel.

DHS staff have personal computers in the central office with emulation boards and Telex and Lee terminals in local offices.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The main computer center for Rhode Island is located on Johnston Island, about 10 miles from Providence. The Rhode Island system runs seven days a week, 24 hours a day. The batch window extends from 4:00 p.m. to 7:30 a.m. The longest batch run is 17 hours. This 17 hour batch window is starting to negatively affect response time. Maintenance and revision enhancements are performed on weekends.

The system is extremely slow at the beginning of the month when the batch run is "propagating" the next month's cases. This run also recalculates benefits for all cases that have a change that might affect benefits. The system is also slow around the 20th of the month as the next months issuance is pulled from the system or whenever a mass change is being applied to the cases. These runs do not affect the on-line system coming up, but they do affect response time. The batch and on-line systems can run together. Cases that have not been updated or propagated are not available for update by caseworkers at this time. Inquiry is available at all times. However, the inquiry may not reflect the latest information if the batch run has not reached that specific case yet.

Much of this response time issue will be resolved once the system is upgraded to MVS. This was slated for December 1993. However, the APD has not been approved by DHHS, so it will probably not happen until first or second quarter of 1994. FNS and the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) have approved the upgrade.

All of InRHODES on-line code is in Natural 2.1. This code was converted from 1.1 at the time of implementation. There are approximately 25 batch programs in COBOL.

Rhode Island uses IBM Easytrieve for ad hoc reports. These requests access a VSAM file that is refreshed weekly. After the MVS conversion, the State plans to educate its users in SuperNatural from Software AG. This should greatly alleviate the users frustration in not having access to their data.

The Rhode Island disaster recovery plan provides for transfer of tapes to local universities to print monthly issuances. There is no current provision for a "hot" site or to provide the on-line portion of the system to users in case of a disaster. The State is negotiating with IBM for the use of its hot site. There is no provision to keep on-line up. Changes and new issuances would be outside the system until a new system was in place. All accumulated data would then have to be input and incorrect issuances would have to be tracked down and recovered.

Security for InRHODES is provided through Software AG's Natural and ADABAS. There is an audit trail that tracks the user, terminal, and field updated for all transactions. The users are aware of this capability to track their transactions and activity.

Additionally, there is some functional application security built into the system. When Rhode Island converts to MVS it will use IBM's RACF security facility.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

InRHODES runs on an Amdahl 5890-300E mainframe that shares the data center with the rest of the State's IBM equipment. The Amdahl is driven by an IBM operating system DOS/VSE. OIP staffs the data center and does all system programming and network maintenance. Database administration is performed by NSI, along with software support, system performance monitoring, and the appropriate performance tuning.

As part of the upgrade process to MVS, all channels to direct access storage devices (DASD), tape, and all control units will be dual pathed for reliability and enhanced system response. Vermont has already converted to MVS and dual pathing. Rhode Island is using Vermont's expertise and advice.

The State has been under a hiring freeze for at least three years. There have been three separate "early retirement" initiatives that have stripped DHS of all its "corporate memory" and much of its technical and program expertise. OIP hires new technical staff from local colleges, but few stay beyond two years. Providence is 60 miles from Boston and 99 miles from Hartford, the insurance center. Consequently, good technical staff usually leave for better salaries, benefits, and promotional opportunities in these close by cities.

The State plans to transfer system support and maintenance activities from NSI to State staff. However, the combined effects of the hiring freeze, low salaries, and limited opportunity for promotions and advancement has made it difficult for the State to hire or train competent staff. Consequently, the State anticipates that NSI will be its MIS department for the foreseeable future.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

The Rhode Island system is based on 9600 baud digital telephone lines. The four major metropolitan areas are connected to the Johnson Island computer facility by digital 56KB

6.2.4 System Performance

Under normal circumstances the State uses 45 percent of the Amdahl system for InRHODES. The peak utilization is at 60 percent. However, when development is heavy and month end or mass change is in process, effective utilization is closer to 100 percent. This is due largely to the limitations of DOS/VSE, the operating system.

InRHODES runs under DOS/VSE, a restrictive operating system that cannot adapt to a heavy transaction processing load and does not have the flexibility to allow many different concurrent processes to share the resources. The MVS operating system will alleviate many of the current performance problems.

One of the innovative features of the Rhode Island system is the ability of the on-line and batch processes to run concurrently. However, this has negative consequences on the days when the batch cycle does not finish before the on-line starts. Response time and data access can be severely restricted.

6.2.5 System Response

Rhode Island has a target of a 5-second response time for 98 percent of its transactions. The users are accustomed to much faster response time and direct questions to network support when response time approaches 5 seconds. During the site visit demonstration, the system response was averaging closer to 8 to 10 seconds. The State was running a mass change along with month end, Medicaid system testing and Medicaid MMIS pilot. As noted above, the State is anticipating that the MVS conversion will alleviate its response time problems, plus allow it to significantly enhance the system with long awaited features.

Currently, the system averages 150,000 CICS transactions per day. Approximately 25,000 of these are attributable to the food stamp portion of the system. Based on the experience of the State, there are an average of 7.5 database transactions per CICS transaction.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Downtime is not an issue in Rhode Island. The State is small enough that telecommunications problems are at a minimum. In addition, one telecommunications company controls the entire network, adding to its reliability.

The Amdahl equipment has an excellent uptime ratio. System maintenance is done regularly on the weekends and, therefore, is not an issue.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

DHS does not believe that the State should be on the leading edge of technology and for this reason it did not take a file server approach for InRHODES. In the mid- eighties,

this technology was considered state-of-the-art. Today, it is a mainstream technology and the State will consider this approach for future enhancements to InRHODES.

The State is examining graphic user interfaces (GUI) and portable PCs capable of dialing up to the mainframe for use by workers in hospitals determining Medicaid eligibility and in community centers for intake.

An APD has been submitted for MVS conversion.

By the end of 1994, the State hopes to be totally generic.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

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

7.1 InRHODES Development Cost and Federal Funding

Rhode Island submitted the initial APD for the InRHODES system in 1986. At this time, total development cost was projected at \$3,688,758. However, the actual development cost was approximately \$10,187,000 due to several changes in scope and requirements of various contracts.³ The FSP share was 36 percent of the Federal share or \$3,667,320. The FNS share was \$2,399,401 and \$234,059 at 75 percent FFP and 50 percent FFP respectively.

7.1.1 InRHODES System Components

The InRHODES system supports the following programs:

- AFDC
- FSP
- General Assistance
- Medicaid (added after implementation)

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

The two most significant components of development cost were the system transfer contractor and hardware. Actual amounts for all components are presented in Table 7.1. The initial APD for InRHODES was submitted to FNS in June 1986 with total projected development costs of \$3,688,758 and ongoing operational costs at \$1,706,295 per year.

³ Source: June 1990 APDU.

This APD was approved by FNS in September 1987 with an FSP share of 36 percent or \$1,327,953 (at 75 percent FFP). A revised APD was submitted in April 1987 that increased development costs to \$7,392,420, mostly for the purchase, instead of lease, of the mainframe hardware. This APD was approved by FNS for \$4,494,480 at 75 percent FFP. After further APD revisions in December 1987, January 1988, July 1988, March 1989, December 1989, and June 1990, the 1990 APD was approved by FNS in October 1990. The total approved was \$9,635,000 with an FSP share of 36 percent, \$2,250,059 at 75 percent FFP and \$234,059 at 50 percent. See Table A-7.1 in Appendix A for more detail.

Table 7.1 InRHODES Actual Development Costs

COST COMPONENT	ACTUAL COST
Salaries and Wages	\$760,000
System Transfer Contractor (NSI)	3,466,000
MAXIMUS	612,000
Hardware	3,334,000*
Wiring Offices	70,000
Travel and Miscellaneous	75,000
Indirect Costs	552,000
Communications/Terminals	746,000
CPU Software	476,000
Policy Module Equipment	96,000
TOTAL	\$10,187,000

* Includes a \$2.1 million Amdahl CPU.

7.2 InRHODES Operational Cost

In the June 1990 APDU, InRHODES operational costs were projected at \$708,783 per year. Of this amount, \$84,000 was for ongoing equipment costs and \$624,783 for IPD personnel costs. InRHODES costs directly charged and allocated to FSP were as follows:

Table 7.2 InRHODES Operational Cost

Fiscal Year	InRHODES Operational Cost Allocated to FSP	FNS Share at 50% FFP
1990	\$266,881	\$133,440
1991	\$689,328	\$344,664
1992	\$805,701	\$402,850
1993 (3 quarters)	\$598,044	\$299,022

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on the FNS share of InRHODES operating costs for 1992, \$805,701, the monthly FNS share of costs was calculated to be \$67,141. The cost per case per month -- based on monthly participation of 38,835 food stamp households -- was \$1.72.

7.2.2 InRHODES Cost Control Measures and Practices

All DHS expenditures are entered into an on-line Statewide Appropriation Accounting System (SAAS) by the State Controller's Office and are tracked by appropriation account and budget object code. Any adjustments to expenditures must also be made by this office via an A40-D document.

However, DHS does control its own costs through the cost accounting and allocation subsystem (a subsystem of the State's accounting system.) In this subsystem, costs can be tracked by cost center. Prior to the quarterly cost allocation process, errors are corrected on a monthly basis using an error listing report from the subsystem. This report identifies errors with a '999' code. After the three months' costs in the cost accounting subsystem are correct, the totals in the DHS Cost Allocation Summary are reconciled to subsidiary ledgers for Salary/Fringes and Travel. The Cost Allocation Summary identifies each program's share of a cost center if applicable. This summary is used to prepare the SF-269.

7.3 Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the methodology used to determine the share of InRHODES development costs that were allocated to each income maintenance program supported by InRHODES. It also describes the methodology currently used to allocate InRHODES operating costs to the Food Stamp Program.

7.3.1 Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology

Throughout the development effort, DHS allocated InRHODES' cost using percentages developed in 1986 and introduced in the initial APD. The percentages for both programs were calculated based on an average of five other percentages:

- Percentage based on programs' unduplicated case counts
- Percentage based on number of individuals served
- Percentage based on number of personnel devoted to the program and/or supporting program
- Percentage based on costs associated with maintaining personnel devoted to a program and/or supporting the program (i.e., salaries, fringes, etc.)
- Percentage based on programs' share of current system costs

The resulting allocation percentages were 64 percent for AFDC and 36 percent for FSP.

7.3.2 InRHODES Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies

The following sections describe the cost allocation methodology used for each of the four InRHODES operational cost components.

7.3.2.1 Data Entry Costs

Data entry costs are direct charges to FSP and are accumulated in cost center 107 on the Cost Allocation Summary.

7.3.2.2 InRHODES CPU Operations and Maintenance Cost

InRHODES operational costs consist of monthly computer charges reported by the Office of Information Processing on cost allocation printouts 87 and 98. The following types of costs are included in this category:

- Central Computer Maintenance
- Communication Lines
- Terminals and Remote Printers
- Systems Software and Teleprocessing Monitor
- Database Management System
- Personnel
- ADP Supplies

All costs related to InRHODES operations are accumulated in cost center 151 and are allocated based on data base size and data base activity statistics. An ADAREP utility is used to accumulate these statistics.

7.3.3.3 InRHODES Software Maintenance

InRHODES software maintenance costs are extracted from the Network Solutions, Inc. invoices and tracked in cost center 55. Total NSI cost is composed of several work orders. Use of a work order or program code identifies whether the work benefits one, a combination, or all programs. Total hours devoted to a work order are then multiplied by a rate and the total cost per program code is determined. These totals should reconcile with NSI's invoice.

The cost accumulated under program code, "ALL PROGRAMS," is allocated using Amdahl database statistics. All other work order costs on the invoice are allocated according to proportionate share. For example, if a work order benefits three programs, each program will share 1/3 of the cost.

7.3.3.4 Central Services Cost

Indirect costs allocated to the InRHODES system include personal services, machine use and printing as administered by the Central Services division. These costs are accumulated in budget object code 438 and are allocated to the programs using database statistics. The FSP share is obtained by extracting the amount from Statement B, account 125650100.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

EXHIBITS

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

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

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

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	N	N	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	N	N	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	N	Y	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Rhode Island
Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
5890-300E	Amdahl	Purchase	64 MB
DISK			
6880-G2/6100-100	Amdahl	Purchase	Controllers (2/1)
6380-Axx/6380-Bxx	Amdahl	Purchase	22.68 GB/30.24 GB
3880	IBM	Purchase	Controller (1)
3380-Axx/3380-Bxx	IBM	Purchase	5.04 GB/10.08 GB
TAPE			
3380-A22	IBM	Purchase	Controller (1)
3480-B22	IBM	Purchase	Drives (4)
PRINTERS			
1187	Memorex Telex	Purchase	(30)
PRMA-Cx	Lee Data	Purchase	(1)
3x7x	IBM	Purchase	(4)
FRONT ENDS			
4725	Amdahl	Purchase	2 MB
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations			
1091c	Memorex Telex	Purchase	(352)
3x7x	IBM	Purchase	(43)
IIS-372	Lee Data	Purchase	(87)

TABLE A-7.1 InRHODES DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

DATE/FY	EVENT	AMOUNT
6/6/86	Initial APD for InRHODES	Total development costs projected at \$3,688,758 and total ongoing operational costs per year at \$1,706,295.
9/17/86	FNS conditionally approved initial APD.	Total development cost approved at \$3,688,758. FSP share (36%) approved at \$1,327,953 and FNS share at 75% approved at \$995,965.
4/87	APD revised. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Installment/purchase of mainframe hardware rather than simple lease. - Use of Maximus to write hardware APD. - Proposed enhancement of South Dakota's automation policy manual. - Travel and Miscellaneous cost requirements. 	Total development costs now projected to be \$7,392,420 and total ongoing operational costs per year at \$2,640,783. FSP share was 36% or \$2,661,480.
6/9/87	Letter from FNS questioning drastic increase in equipment rentals.	Net increase of \$1,810,782
6/24/87	Letter from FNS re: InRHODES meeting; reason for equipment cost increases is due to prices amended are for installment purchase plan and not for rentals.	--
9/24/87	Approval letter from FNS	Total approved was \$4,494,480 which covered FY 87-89 and total FSP and FNS shares approved were \$1,618,142 and \$1,213,607 at 75% FFP respectively.
10/15/87	FNS approved RFP for computer terminals, printers, controllers, modems, and personal computer clusters.	No funding approval necessary.
10/28/87	FNS approved use of Maximus for RFP contractor (i.e. for hardware and software transfer RFP's.)	No funding approval necessary.
12/87	APD Revised <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase rather than lease/purchase of mainframe and related hardware. - Increased cost of software transfer. - APD changes to reflect approved terminal RFP equipment list. 	Total development costs now projected at \$10,269,500 and total ongoing operational costs per year at \$2,784,783. FSP share was 36% or \$3,697,200.

TABLE A-7.1 InRHODES DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

DATE/FY	EVENT	AMOUNT
1/88	<p>APD Revised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development period revised from 11/1/86 - 1/31/89 to 11/1/86 through 8/31/89. Reason due to delay in RFP process for a mainframe vendor. 	<p>Total projected development cost decreased to \$7,973,500 and total ongoing operational costs reduced to \$744,783 per year.</p>
4/12/88	<p>FNS approves extension of developmental time frame.</p>	<p>Approved total development costs for FY 87-89 was \$6,477,286 and FSP and FNS at 75% FFP shares were \$2,331,823 and \$1,748,867 respectively.</p> <p>Also approved expensing of mainframe in 1988 which had a total cost of \$1,300,327 with FSP and FNS shares (at 50% FFP) at \$468,118 and \$234,059 respectively.</p> <p>Total approved was therefore \$7,777,613 with FSP and FNS shares at \$2,799,941 and \$1,982,926 respectively.</p> <p>Approved mainframe contractor-Amdahl and software transfer contractor-NSI.</p>
7/8/88	<p>APD Revisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Activity schedule slipped by 5 months. - CPU software lease costs increased by \$5K per mo. - Included 22 IBM PRO XL terminal printers included in update. 	<p>Total development costs are now projected at \$8,139,000 and annual ongoing operational costs at \$708,783. FSP (36%) and FNS shares (at 75% FFP) were 42,930,040 and \$2,197,530 respectively.</p>
8/2/88	<p>FNS approved July 1988 APDU.</p>	<p>Approved total development cost of \$8,139,000.</p> <p>Approved FSP share (36%) at \$2,930,040. Approved FNS share at 75% FFP at \$1,846,442 and FNS share at 50% FFP at \$234,059.</p>

TABLE A-7.1 InRHODES DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

DATE/FY	EVENT	AMOUNT
3/13/89	<p>APD Revisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Activity Schedule updated to reflect DHS's phased in development approach: Phase I: Data Collection and Validation Phase II: Eligibility Validation Phase II: Implementation and Benefit Disbursement - DHS decided to seek Maximus support in the conversion of policy onto the on-line policy system. 	<p>Maximus contract amendment was \$96,000.</p> <p>Total development costs are now projected at \$8,235,000.</p> <p>FSP share (36%) was \$2,964,000 and FNS share was \$2,223,450 at 75% FFP.</p>
4/5/89	FNS approved 3/13/89 APDU.	<p>Approved total project cost of \$8,235,000.</p> <p>Approved FSP share at 36% at \$2,964,600. Approved FNS share at 75% at \$1,872,362 and FNS share at 50% at \$234,059.</p>
6/15/89	FNS approves RFP for purchase of an electronic mail handling and inserter equipment for InRHODES for proper printing and dissemination of client notices.	<p>Equipment cost approved for \$130,000.</p> <p>Approved total project cost of \$8,365,000. Approved</p> <p>FSP share at 36% for \$3,011,400. FNS share at 75% was \$1,907,462. FNS share at 50% was \$234,059.</p>
8/9/89	FNS approves contract b/w DHS and Pitney Bowes for an electronic mail inserter.	Equipment cost approved at \$109,545.
12/5/89	<p>APD Revision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated to reflect the impact of an early retirement program. Caused InRHODES development effort extension of an additional four months due to a loss of experienced staff. - Increased maintenance costs due phased in approach (NSI must maintain system much longer) 	<p>Total development costs are now projected at \$8,660,000.</p> <p>FSP share (36%) was \$3,117,600. FNS share at 75% FFP was \$2,338,200.</p>
2/8/90	FNS approves 12/89 APD.	FNS approved total at \$8,660,000. Approved FSP share at \$3,117,600. Approved FNS share at 75% FFP at \$1,987,112 and FNS share at 50% FFP at \$2,221,171.

TABLE A-7.1 InRHODES DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

DATE/FY	EVENT	AMOUNT
5/30/90	InRHODES has been operational for 30 days.	--
6/6/90	<p>APD Revision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase of software. - Amendments to Maximus contract. - Increase of indirect charges. - Increase of NSI's contract cost. 	<p>Increase of \$306,000 in miscellaneous Software AG products.</p> <p>Increase of \$170,000 for Maximus.</p> <p>Indirect charges increased by \$552,000.</p> <p>Increase of software transfer contractor cost of \$261,000.</p> <p>Increase of \$238,000 for lease of software and OIP technical support.</p> <p>Total increase in development cost is now \$1,527,000 for a total of \$10,187,000.</p> <p>FSP share (36%) is \$3,667,320. FNS share at 75% is \$2,399,401 and FNS share at 50% is \$234,460.</p>
6/7/90	FNS approves APD to procure vendor to maintain InRHODES.	<p>Total cost is \$1,301,661.</p> <p>FSP share at 36% is \$468,598. FNS share at 50% FFP is \$234,299</p>
6/11/90 - 6/15/90 7/16/90 - 7/20/90	FNS conducts post-implementation review.	--
10/15/90	FNS approves 1990 APDU except indirect costs of \$552,000.	<p>Total FNS approval is \$9,635,000.</p> <p>Total FSP share approved at 36% was \$3,468,600.</p> <p>Total FNS share approved at 75% FFP was \$2,250,059. Total FNS share approved at 50% FFP was \$234,059.</p>
10/24/90	FNS completed and submitted review report.	--

APPENDIX B

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all 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 Rhode Island. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Rhode Island. 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 Rhode Island	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
189	63	33.3%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	24	38.1%

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

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the computer system in Rhode Island. EWs generally find system availability, accuracy, and ease of use to be acceptable; however, a significant number of EWs are dissatisfied with system response time. Overall, 54 percent of EWs feel that the system is a great help to them.

Compared to the previous system, a slim majority of eligibility workers prefers the current system. Most workers think that the current system is easier to use. Most workers feel that there is little difference between the current and previous systems with respect to the level of client service provided. EWs' perceptions also indicate a lack of consensus in comparing the current and previous systems in two areas: job satisfaction and fraud and errors.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	10	41.7
Good	13	54.2
Excellent	1	4.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	22	91.7
Good	2	8.3

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	8	33.3
Often	16	66.7

Respondents generally are somewhat dissatisfied with system response time. Although a majority thinks that overall system response time is excellent or good, two thirds feel that response time often is too slow, and nearly 92 percent believe that response time is poor during peak processing periods.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	3	12.5
Sometimes	4	16.7
Often	17	70.8

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	3	12.5
Sometimes	13	54.2
Often	8	33.3

Nearly 71 percent of the EWs think that the system often is available when they need to use it, but more than half also report that the system is sometimes or often down. Apparently the system downtime is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system is generally available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	4	16.7
Good	16	66.7
Excellent	4	16.7

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of	Percentage of
--	-----------	---------------

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

or excellent, and at least half believe that cases terminated in error, incorrect eligibility determination, and out-of-date data in the system are rare. Compared to the previous system, 56 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	7	29.2
Sometimes	16	66.7
Often	1	4.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	47.8
Sometimes	10	43.5
Often	2	8.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	88.9
Sometimes	1	5.6
Often	1	5.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	81.0
Sometimes	3	14.3
Often	1	4.8

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	60.0
Sometimes	7	35.0
Often	1	5.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	83.3
Sometimes	2	11.1
Often	1	5.6

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	85.7
Sometimes	2	9.5
Often	1	4.8

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

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

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	65.2
Sometimes	8	34.8

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	14	70.0
Sometimes	6	30.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	73.9
Sometimes	5	21.7
Often	1	4.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	82.6
Sometimes	4	17.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	6	40.0
Sometimes	3	20.0
Often	6	40.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	8	42.1
Sometimes	8	42.1
Often	3	15.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	77.3
Sometimes	4	18.2
Often	1	4.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	72.7
Sometimes	5	22.7
Often	1	4.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	14	63.6
Sometimes	6	27.3
Often	2	9.1

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	47.6
Sometimes	7	33.3
Often	4	19.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	26.3
Sometimes	8	42.1
Often	6	31.6

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	76.2
Sometimes	5	23.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	12.5
About the same	6	37.5
Easier	8	50.0

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	2	20.0
Easier	8	80.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	7.1
About the same	3	21.4
Easier	10	71.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	7.7
About the same	2	15.4
Easier	10	76.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	3	25.0
Easier	9	75.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	6.7
About the same	4	26.7
Easier	10	66.7

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system is easy to use for most of the functions discussed; however, there are several exceptions. More than 70 percent of responding EWs report sometimes or often having difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system, and a majority sometimes or often has difficulty learning to use the system. Large numbers of EWs also report problems monitoring the status of hearings, tracking outstanding verifications, and identifying error prone and suspected fraud cases.

In comparison to the previous system, most workers feel that the current system is easier to use. For each specific function except eligibility determination, at least two thirds of the EWs feel that it is easier to perform the task with the current system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	4	16.7
Sometimes	7	29.2
Often	13	54.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	20.8
Sometimes	8	33.3
Often	11	45.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	45.8
Sometimes	9	37.5
Often	4	16.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	5	31.3
About the same	6	37.5
More	5	31.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	5	31.3
About the same	6	37.5
More	5	31.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	4	25.0
About the same	4	25.0
More	8	50.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	6	37.5
About the same	3	18.8
More	7	43.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	5	31.3
About the same	5	31.3
More	6	37.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Worse	5	31.3
About the same	2	12.5
Better	9	56.3

The eligibility workers are somewhat satisfied with the system, and 54 percent of EWs feel that the system often is a great help to them. A large majority feels, however, that the system sometimes or often is a source of stress.

Compared to the previous system, a small majority (56 percent) prefers the current system, but workers have mixed opinions regarding other facets of the current system. Half find their work to be more stressful now. Workers' diverging opinions provide little consensus about the system's impact on efficiency and productivity or whether the system makes the EWs' work more satisfying and pleasant.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	62.5
Sometimes	4	16.7
Often	5	20.8

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	73.9
Sometimes	5	21.7
Often	1	4.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	7.7
About the same	10	76.9
Easier	2	15.4

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 (%)
More	2	12.5
About the same	11	68.8
Fewer	3	18.8

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	3	18.8
About the same	11	68.8
Less	2	12.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	2	12.5
About the same	12	75.0
Less	2	12.5

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has a positive impact or no effect on client service. Most workers think that expedited service is relatively easy to achieve. Compared to the previous system, the vast majority also believes that the degree of difficulty associated with interviewing clients in a timely manner, 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 the same under both 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	4	28.6
About the same	4	28.6
Easier	6	42.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	4	25.0
About the same	4	25.0
Fewer	8	50.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	3	18.8
About the same	6	37.5
Fewer	7	43.8

Eligibility workers have somewhat divided opinions regarding the system's impact on fraud and errors. Half think that fewer errors are made with the current system. The largest segments (43 and 44 percent, respectively) believe that it is easier to calculate overpayments, and less fraud goes undetected with the current system. In each case, however, significant minorities feel the system has no impact or a negative impact on fraud and errors.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

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

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Rhode Island. 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 Rhode Island	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
44	30	68.2%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	13	43.3%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Rhode Island. The total number of respondents, however, is low. The low response rate produces a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

Most EW supervisors believe that the system often helps them in their jobs; however, there are several areas in which supervisors generally are not satisfied with the system including system response time and ease of use for certain functions. Most EW supervisors report that system availability and accuracy are acceptable. EW supervisors have mixed opinions regarding the system's impact on job satisfaction and its ability to support management needs.

In comparison to the previous system, a plurality of responding EW supervisors report a preference for the current system. EW supervisors think that it is easier or similar to use the current system. EW supervisors generally think that the current and previous systems provide a similar level of support for management

needs. Supervisors have divided perceptions when comparing the current and previous systems in the areas of job satisfaction and fraud and errors. Supervisors also feel client service is the same or worse with the current system.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	10	76.9
Good	3	23.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	11	84.6
Good	2	15.4

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	4	30.8
Often	9	69.2

EW supervisors in Rhode Island are not satisfied with system response time. Nearly 77 percent of the respondents think that overall response time is poor, and almost 85 percent believe that response time is poor during peak processing periods.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	4	30.8
Often	9	69.2

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	15.4
Sometimes	7	53.8
Often	4	30.8

Most EW supervisors think that system availability generally is acceptable. Over 69 percent of the respondents believe that the system often is available when needed. Although nearly 54 percent think that the system is sometimes down, this downtime apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability for most supervisors. Nevertheless, a significant minority (31 percent) thinks the system often is down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	7.7
Good	9	69.2
Excellent	3	23.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	11.1
About the same	2	22.2
Easier	6	66.7

EW supervisors perceive the quality of the system's data and the accuracy of its calculations to be very good. More than 92 percent of the supervisors feel that the information in the system is good or excellent. In comparison to the previous system, two thirds of the EW supervisors think that it is easier to calculate benefit levels accurately with the current system.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	30.8
Sometimes	6	46.2
Often	3	23.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	30.8
Sometimes	7	53.8
Often	2	15.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	77.8
Sometimes	2	22.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	90.9
Sometimes	1	9.1

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	69.2
Sometimes	3	23.1
Often	1	7.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	63.6
Sometimes	4	36.4

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

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

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	30.8
Sometimes	6	46.2
Often	3	23.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	22.2
About the same	1	11.1
Easier	6	66.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	3	60.0
Easier	2	40.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	33.3
Easier	4	66.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	3	60.0
Easier	2	40.0

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	16.7
About the same	3	50.0
Easier	2	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	22.2
About the same	4	44.4
Easier	3	33.3

EW supervisors feel that the system is easy to use for some, but not all, functions. Majorities feel that it is sometimes or often difficult to perform the following functions: obtaining necessary information from the system, learning to use the system, determining monthly reporting status, and restoring benefits.

Compared to the previous system, EW supervisors feel the current system is easier to use for some functions and comparable to the previous system for other functions. Two thirds of the supervisors think it is easier to determine eligibility and automatically terminate benefits for failure to file with the current system, and 60 percent believe that it is easier to generate warning notices than it was with the previous system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	7.7
Sometimes	3	23.1
Often	9	69.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	6	46.2
Often	7	53.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	37.5
About the same	4	50.0
More	1	12.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	5	55.6
About the same	3	33.3
More	1	11.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	11.1
About the same	2	22.2
More	6	66.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	11.1
About the same	4	44.4
More	4	44.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	33.3
About the same	4	44.4
More	2	22.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	3	33.3
About the same	2	22.2
Better	4	44.4

EW supervisors have mixed feelings about the system's impact on job

system often is a great help, but the majority also believes that it often causes additional stress.

Compared to the previous system, EW supervisors' opinions also are divided. While a plurality (44 percent) feels that the current system is better overall than the previous system, one third thinks it is worse. Majorities also find their work less pleasant and more stressful now. Most EW supervisors feel that their productivity and efficiency have stayed the same or improved under the current system.

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	7	53.8
Good	5	38.5
Excellent	1	7.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	37.5
Sometimes	1	12.5
Often	4	50.0

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	57.1
Sometimes	2	28.6
Often	1	14.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	2	22.2
About the same	4	44.4
More	3	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	25.0
About the same	2	50.0
Easier	1	25.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	11.1
About the same	5	55.6
Easier	3	33.3

EW supervisors' perceptions about the system's ability to support management needs are divided. While the majority feels that the quality of reports produced by the system is good or excellent and it is rarely difficult to meet Federal reporting requirements, half report often having problems making mass changes to the system, and the majority feels that the quality of technical support is poor. Supervisors generally view the current and previous systems as providing similar capabilities to meet their management needs.

Client Service

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	14.3
About the same	6	85.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	4	44.4
About the same	2	22.2
Better	3	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Worse	4	44.4
About the same	2	22.2
Better	3	33.3

Most EW supervisors believe that client service is the same or worse with the current system. Nearly 86 percent of the EW supervisors feel that it is easier to interview a client in a timely manner with the current system than it was with the previous system, but over 44 percent feel that client service is worse than it was with the previous system. Only one third of the supervisors believe client service is better now.

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	42.9
About the same	3	42.9
Easier	1	14.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	3	33.3
About the same	3	33.3
Less	3	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fewer	1	12.5
About the same	2	25.0
More	5	62.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	1	14.3
About the same	3	42.9
Fewer	3	42.9

EW supervisors' responses do not provide any consensus in the area of fraud and errors. Compared to the previous system, nearly 43 percent of respondents think that it is more difficult to collect overpayments with the current system, but the majority believes that more false claims are caught with the current system. Nearly 43 percent of the supervisors feel that less fraud cases go undetected with the current system. With respect to comparing the number of errors made under the current and previous systems, EW supervisors are evenly divided among the three possible alternatives.