

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT JUNE 7-9, 1993

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE REPORT

JULY 20, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

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

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Administrative Costs	3
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	4
2.4.1 Staffing	5
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change	5
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	5
2.4.4 Claims Collection	5
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	6
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	6
3.1 System Functionality	6
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	9
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	9
3.4 Current Automation Issues	10
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	10
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	10
4.2 Justification for the New System	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	10
4.4 Conversion Approach	11
4.5 Project Management	11
4.6 FSP Participation	12
4.7 MIS Participation	12
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	12
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	12
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	13
6.1 System Profile	13
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	14
6.2.1 Operating Environment	14
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	15
6.2.3 Telecommunications	15
6.2.4 System Performance	16
6.2.5 System Response	16
6.2.6 System Downtime	16
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	16
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	17
7.1 ACCESS Development Costs and Federal Funding	17
7.1.1 ACCESS System Components	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major ACCESS Development Cost Components	18
7.1.2.1 Hardware	19
7.1.2.2 Contractor Costs	19
7.1.2.3 State Personnel Cost	19
7.1.2.4 Operations Support	19
7.2 ACCESS Operational Costs	19
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	20
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	20
7.3 South Dakota Cost Allocation Methodologies	20
7.3.1 Historical Overview of ACCESS Development Cost Allocation Methodology	20
7.3.2 ACCESS Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	21

APPENDICES

A State of South Dakota 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	5
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	6
7.1	ACCESS Major Cost Components	18
7.2	ACCESS Operating Costs	20

APPENDIX A - State of South Dakota Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of South Dakota Hardware Inventory	A-4

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE REPORT

Site Visit June 7 - 9, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: ACCESS

Start Date: 1984

Completion Date: 1986

Contractor: Independent

Transfer From: Vermont

Cost:

Actual: \$3,200,152

Projected: \$1,743,789

FSP Share: \$1,846,488

FSP %: 57.7%

Number of Users: 400 (estimated)

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: IBM 3090/200J

Workstations: 3270-type terminals

**Telecommunications
Network:** T3/T1 backbone SDLC network

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Child Support Enforcement (CSE), Medicaid

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The State of South Dakota's Department of Social Services (DSS) is divided into four major operating units. These units include Management Information, Program Management, Management Services, and Field Management. Each unit is headed by a deputy secretary. The program management area is responsible for administration of the Food Stamp Program.

FSP is operated through 66 local offices, one in each county. Some local offices are open for limited hours, and some are open only one day per week. Eleven local offices serve a food stamp caseload of less than 125 households.

South Dakota is primarily rural. Major population centers include Sioux Falls, Rapid City, and Aberdeen. State staff does not consider South Dakota to have unique geographical features that impact the operation of the Food Stamp Program, however, the remoteness and sparse population of areas of the State and the harsh winter season clearly impact transportation and communications.

Total State population was 699,999 as of the 1990 census. Approximately 7.1 percent of the population were food stamp recipients.

System liaison to the State data center is provided by the Computer Support Unit. Food Stamp Program contact with this unit is usually through the Automated Eligibility Program Unit. The Food Stamp Program has very little direct contact with the Department-level Management Information System (MIS) section or the State computer center.

The unemployment rate in South Dakota declined from 5.1 percent in 1985 to 3.4 percent in 1991. During this period, the unemployment rate decreased each year except in 1989, when it rose to 4.2 percent from the 1988 rate of 3.9 percent.

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

- South Dakota's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was in the 0.0 to 4.9 percent range; the national average was 2.4 percent.
- South Dakota did not reduce the 1992 State budget after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in South Dakota increased by 2.0 percent. This change differed in direction from the 0.6 percent national average decrease in State government employment.
- South Dakota did not implement any changes to increase or decrease revenues for FY 1993.
- The regional outlook indicated stronger economic performance in the Plains region than nationally. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 5.4 percent was lower than the

national average of 7.8 percent. The per capita personal income increase for the region (2.9 percent) was higher than the national average of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

South Dakota DSS is State-administered, contracting with county governments for the issuance of food stamp coupons.

Although FSP reports directly to the deputy director for Program Management, FSP staff closely coordinate activities with the district program managers and district managers who report to the deputy director for Field Management. In addition, the Food Stamp Program is supported by the Computer Support, Budget and Finance, Administrative Support Services, and Recoveries & Investigation Units of Management Services. System support for FSP is provided by the Automated Eligibility Program Unit of Program Management. FSP is supported by a program administrator, an assistant program administrator, three program specialists, and two clerical support staff.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

The number of FSP households in South Dakota increased by 15.6 percent from 1989 to 1992; however the corresponding increase in the number of individuals receiving food stamp benefits represented a smaller change of 9.4 percent. Changes in participation levels for FSP and other public assistance programs are shown in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC- cases	7,206	6,998	6,766	6,616	N/A
AFDC- individuals	20,138	19,774	19,140	18,823	N/A
FSP- households	19,677	18,244	17,242	17,023	N/A
FSP- individuals	55,499	52,504	49,832	50,274	N/A
Medicaid- individuals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
General Assistance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSE	25,020	22,851	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 9:4 in 1988 to 10:8 in 1992.

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

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$181.69	\$177.95	\$168.01	\$153.69	\$151.30

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

South Dakota's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are shown in Table 2.3.² Both total cost and average cost per household indicate a slight upward trend over the period.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$3,875,993	\$3,628,551	\$3,432,292	\$3,411,441	\$3,293,016
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$16.76	\$16.77	\$16.59	\$16.76	\$16.10

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Food Stamp Program 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.

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

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

2.4.1 Staffing

Current full-time eligibility worker (EW) and supervisory staff number 212 (180 EWs and 32 supervisors). EWs are generic caseworkers. Other State staff include five part-time eligibility workers. There are approximately six full-time and 65 part-time issuance workers; these individuals are county employees who are contracted for issuance. Sixty-five county supervisors also have contact with the Food Stamp Program at the county level.

Caseworker staff has increased over the past five years, as have the monthly caseload per worker and the number of cases in backlog status. Exact figures on staff increases were not available, caseload and backlog were estimated to have increased by 10 percent.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes

As shown in Appendix A, Exhibit A-2.1, South Dakota met the timeframes for implementing all major legislative changes in the Food Stamp Program areas which they cited as applicable to their specific environment. Regulation codes 1.1 and 1.2, State or local GA payments and annual school clothing allowance respectively, are not applicable because the State does not make these payments or allowances. Regulation code 3.1, exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments, was not applicable because the State does not make these payments.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

As indicated in Table 2.4, South Dakota's official combined error rate increased from 1987 to 1989 and decreased in 1990 and 1991. Because of the age of the system, South Dakota personnel were unable to attribute specific changes in the error rate or savings to the system.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	4.52	4.00	4.85	4.96	3.45

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Total claims collections and claims collected as a percentage of claims established are shown in Table 2.5 for the past five years. The value of claims collections reached a peak in 1989 and decreased in 1990 and 1991, while the percent of claims collected increased each year from 1987 to 1990 before decreasing slightly in 1991.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$240,565	\$194,425	\$199,661	\$250,416	\$273,745
Total Claims Collected	\$136,987	\$148,912	\$167,088	\$200,672	\$182,930
As a % of Total Claims Established	56.9%	76.6%	83.7%	80.1%	66.8%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

South Dakota's ACCESS system has been fully operational for over seven years. It was Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified in October 1986 and has undergone a post-implementation review by FNS.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM

ACCESS is a system transfer of Vermont's FAMIS system. It supports the AFDC, Food Stamp, Medicaid, CSE and JOBS programs. A separate system (SS52) supports claims and collection activities. ACCESS is considered to be stable with no major enhancements planned in the near future. An Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) project is currently in the planning stage. South Dakota is conducting EBT planning in conjunction with North Dakota. Impact of this initiative on the ACCESS system is unknown at this time.

Separate systems support Medicaid claims and payments and Child Welfare.

3.1 System Functionality

The ACCESS system has been operational for over seven years. It is a mainframe-based, dumb terminal system which may be accessed by intelligent workstations, i.e, personal computers (PC), utilizing terminal emulation software.

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

- **Registration.** Clients complete printed applications which are entered into the system by clerical workers or EWs. When a client first applies for food stamps, a one-page form (Request for Food Stamps) is completed and entered into the system at time of registration. South Dakota maintains permanent records of individuals receiving benefits. Case data is maintained for three years after the case is closed. All FSP and other public assistance program recipients are registered in the Person Master Index (PMI), which is accessed during the search process.

Data is entered into the system by either an eligibility worker or a clerical support person, depending upon the size of the local office. Need for expedited service is determined by the intake/eligibility worker from information contained on the first page of the official application form. If the worker determines that the client meets the expedited criteria, an appointment is set with an eligibility worker for that day. The EW then reviews the remainder of the application for accuracy and correctness.

While client scheduling is a manual process with no system support available, the system has other capabilities applicable to registration. ACCESS has the ability to copy historical records into current case records, perform searches of outside data files, assign old case numbers if the client is a previous recipient, and assign a new number if necessary.

- **Eligibility Determination.** Relevant assistance units within households are determined by the eligibility worker, not by the system itself. Data entry screens must be specified by the EW from menus provided by the system. Immediate on-line data edits are provided at the screen level. Data entry screens follow the format and sequence of the hard copy application form. There are approximately 40 separate data entry screens within the ACCESS system.

The system performs background eligibility determination and benefit calculations. The eligibility worker has the ability to request higher than normal priority for specific case processing within the background processing system. The ACCESS system enforces mandatory verification reports via status fields completed by the eligibility worker during data entry.

- **Benefit Calculation.** Verification of gross nonexempt income, eligible alien status, utility expenses, medical expenses, and Social Security Number (SSN) are tracked. The system calculates monthly gross income, monthly net income, monthly utility expenses, and monthly medical expenses. Supervisory benefit authorization is not enforced by the system.
- **Benefit Issuance.** South Dakota contracts with county and tribal governments for coupon issuance. The State provides benefits through direct mail out of coupons, Authorization to Participate (ATP) cards issued to households, and ATPs provided directly to issuers. The ACCESS system generates both ATP cards and mailing

labels for issuance purposes. Expedited issuance is possible the same day the application is submitted.

ACCESS provides an on-line display of the entire issuance history, checks zip code information against automated files, and will not issue benefits until all missing verifications have been received. Issuance files are created monthly for on-going cases and daily for new approvals and other special issuances.

- **Notices.** The system generates both automatic and worker-initiated notices to households. Worker input to notices is optional and may be performed on-line. Workers may also generate their own free-form notices through the system.
- **Claims System.** Claims are handled by a separate system that is linked to ACCESS. This system (CCS) is updated automatically during the background

- **Alerts.** Workers are informed of discrepancies via on-line alert messages. Workers must respond to all discrepancy alerts and resolve them before they may be removed from the system. Supervisors are responsible for insuring the proper and timely resolution of these alerts. A three year history of all alerts, even if resolved, is maintained before archival.
- **Monthly Reporting.** South Dakota issues a monthly reconciliation report. ACCESS supports this procedure by determining which cases are subject to the requirements, producing monthly report forms for mailing, directing the returned forms to the assigned worker, and automatically closing the case if the form is not received. The monthly reporting processes do not technically impact system performance.
- **Report Generation.** The system produces daily on-line reports of outstanding work requiring action by the EWs and also generates warning notices of incomplete reports (EWs manually prepare the notices to the client). The system also produces 5 standardized reports, 10 ad hoc reports, 10 on-line reports, 100 batch reports, and 20 DBMS reports.
- **Program Management and Administration.** ACCESS supports E-Mail for all levels of staff, on-line policy manuals, on-line organizational charts updated by district managers, case narratives, and on-line problem reporting and task management.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

The South Dakota ACCESS system integrates FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid eligibility. It has access to a common client index for searches within other public assistance systems such as Child Support Enforcement. The collection system is separate, but closely tied to ACCESS. ACCESS's support of the Food Stamp Program appears to be sufficient for South Dakota's perceived needs. Program staff are satisfied with the operational aspects of the system such as response time and availability as well as the ability of the system to determine eligibility, benefit levels and to reflect FNS regulatory changes. ACCESS is a fairly complex statewide, mainframe-based system, which is currently in a stable phase, having been installed over seven years ago.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

There are currently 212 eligibility workers and supervisors in South Dakota. Each EW has either a cathode ray terminal (CRT) or a PC (each of the 46 offices has at least one PC). Approximately 60 additional workstations are used by approximately 188 clerical support workers, supervisors, and administrative system users in the State.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

State staff indicated that there were not any outstanding issues related to the system. Besides the planned EBT project with North Dakota, there are no major enhancements planned for the ACCESS system. System support appears to be satisfactory from the users' perspective.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section provides an overview of the ACCESS system development process. Areas described include: the system that ACCESS 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 MIS involvement throughout the process.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

The ACCESS system has been installed for some time. The previous system was food stamp specific, and the change to an integrated system demanded a change to the basic operational structure of the eligibility determination process.

4.2 Justification for the New System

The original Advanced Planning Document (APD) for ACCESS was submitted in late 1984, with two amendments in 1985 and another in early 1986. South Dakota's desire to move to a generic caseworker approach -- utilizing the same eligibility workers for all program areas -- was a prime motivator for developing an integrated system.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

South Dakota made the initial decision to develop a new system in 1983. Several State systems were reviewed during 1983 and 1984, including Alaska's TECS, Vermont's ACCESS, North Dakota's TECS, and New Hampshire's system. The North Dakota and Vermont systems were considered feasible to transfer. The decision to select Vermont's ACCESS system was made in late 1984 after it was determined that the North Dakota system lacked the developer tools required.

Contractors were not used for the planning phase of the project or for any subsequent phases. The ACCESS transfer was accomplished by internal staff with heavy assistance from Vermont, which provided access to technical and program staff as needed. Advocacy groups were not a factor in the transfer decision or in subsequent design modifications.

The criteria used by South Dakota for selection of candidate systems included the presence of the following characteristics: --

- Similar hardware
- Comparable caseload size
- Similar State and FSP organizational structure
- Urban/rural environmental mix
- County versus State-administered
- Geographical size and characteristics
- Desirability of functions and capabilities offered
- FAMIS certification
- Similar software
- System not obsolete

State technical staff were also impressed with the technical efficiency of the NATURAL language used in the ACCESS system.

Although the Federal government did not require States implementing new systems to examine other States' systems as transfer candidates in 1983 and 1984, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) suggested the transfer approach. FNS input during the planning stage was extremely limited because the transfer of the FSP component of the system was not planned initially.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Field staff were trained as implementation progressed and then sent back to their offices for conversion activities. Manual conversion of open cases was selected. Automated lists of cases to be converted were produced from the old system. Automated conversion of a limited number of data items also was performed, mostly for demographic and identification items.

One county was chosen as the pilot site to test implementation and operations before statewide implementation. State staff indicated that an additional site that contained more Native American recipients should have been selected as well because there are specific Program areas that impact the Native American population.

4.5 Project Management

The original project manager was from the MIS unit and had limited project management experience. Other, non-project related duties were reported to have taken as much as 80 percent of the project manager's available time, leaving only 20 percent of his time for the ACCESS project. The project manager's experience included three years of public assistance program experience, five years of MIS experience, and five years of project management experience on smaller projects.

User group representation during the planning phase of the project was limited to AFDC management, Department Administration, and MIS. MIS personnel were involved with the project from beginning to end.

During the development phase, FSP and AFDC EWs formed user groups for requirements, testing, and training purposes. AFDC and FSP management, administrators, and technical staff also participated on the project team. User groups were able to make recommendations and had authority for review and approval. User groups met monthly during the development phase and weekly during implementation.

The original schedule, which called for project completion in 12 months, was lengthened to 18 months due to the effects of the internal State political environment. No specific phase of the project was identified as especially problematic, and State staff were unable to identify a specific cause for the time slippage. State staff anecdotally indicated that staff burnout, as a result of staff working 60 hours per week, was identified as the factor that impacted project time frames more than any other single influence.

4.6 FSP Participation

Since the ACCESS project was not originally intended to include the Food Stamp Program, food stamp personnel became involved only after the transfer decision had been made and project staffing decisions had been made. Both food stamp policy personnel and eligibility workers were involved in the development and implementation phases of the ACCESS project. The project appears to have been driven primarily by MIS technical personnel with program staff, including FSP staff, playing an advisory role and assisting with testing and implementation duties.

4.7 MIS Participation

As described in Section 4.5, MIS provided the project manager and had significant involvement in the project during all of phases. While managerial input was provided by the programs during testing and implementation, the technical aspects of the transfer -- which were the domain of MIS staff -- were given highest priority.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

While no unusual problems were encountered during the planning phase, program staff cited the restriction on program functionality as one of the drawbacks of system transfer. This problem, however, may reflect factors outside of those imposed by the transfer process itself. The time slippage from 12 to 18 months for completion of the project was believed to reflect an overly ambitious project schedule, rather than indicating unexpected technical or program-related problems.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

As previously mentioned, the system chosen for transfer to South Dakota was the Vermont ACCESS system. This system was selected after considering the Alaska, North Dakota, and New Hampshire systems.

Approximately 70 percent of the code and features of the Vermont system was transferred and virtually 100 percent of the code transferred was modified. A number of changes were required in the transferred system to meet South Dakota's needs. Important changes made included:

- Addition of an interface to the claims collection system
- Improvements in response time
- Additional capacity for the existing hardware platform
- Modifications to user screens
- Modifications to output reports
- Changes in issuance from two month retrospective to one month retrospective
- Different AFDC policies
- Additional functionality
- Additional edits

In addition, the eligibility, reporting, and data element capture components were modified to conform to South Dakota laws and regulations.

The South Dakota ACCESS system was the base for the Minnesota system development effort. Future transfers of the South Dakota system are unlikely because there is a newer version of ACCESS available. The mainframe-based, dumb-terminal design of South Dakota's ACCESS system also contributes to its lack of appeal as a transfer candidate.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

6.1 System Profile

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090 - 200J
MVS/ESA, CICS, ADATABASE, RACF
- **Disk:** IBM 3380/3390
- **Tape:** IBM 3480 Cartridge
IBM 3420 Reel
- **Printers:** IBM 3835 Laser
IBM 6262 Impact
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** IBM 3270

- **Telecommunications:** T3/T1 SDLC backbone network with 9.6 KB circuits connecting 45 sites to each of six node locations throughout the State.

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

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

This section describes the operating environment in South Dakota. Areas addressed include: operations and maintenance, telecommunications, system performance, system response, and system downtime. Current activities in the systems area and future plans also are addressed.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

ACCESS system processing is performed at a centralized data center that operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The mainframe is an IBM 3090/200J with 128 megabytes of main memory, 128 megabytes of expanded storage, 64 channels, and a processing speed of 45 MIPS.

The 200J operating system is MVS/ESA. ACCESS runs under IBM's CICS, utilizes Software AG's ADATABASE and NATURAL, and uses IBM's RACF for access security.

The on-line schedule runs from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. to accommodate two time zones within the State. South Dakota uses 10 production regions and five test regions during the first shift and utilize IBM's PR/SM to isolate hardware resources. The batch cycle is processed from 6:00 p.m. until 6:30 a.m. daily.

South Dakota uses IBM 3380 and 3390 disk drives, totaling 130 gigabytes, to support all application files. They are gradually replacing the 3380s with 3390s as growth and software migrations permit. They have a single partial string of 3380s remaining. They also have completed a conversion to 3480 cartridge tapes for all but a handful of archived tapes. There are currently 12 tape transports (IBM 3480s) installed, with three IBM 3420s remaining for external users or restoration of archived tape files. The production library numbers approximately 25,000 cartridges.

Printed output is supported by one laser (3835) and two impact (6262) printers. The 6262s recently replaced three IBM 4245s. South Dakota also uses a Datagraphics II Computer Output Microfiche (COM) unit to process up to 2 million lines per month of output that duplicates printed output. The device saves the State money compared to the alternative of using a separate microfilming process for printed output.

An IBM 3745 supports the State's T3/T1 backbone network that supports voice, data, and video transmissions for all State agencies. They are in the process of converting all locations that can be converted economically or technically, from analog to digital service

during 1993. They are also working on disaster backup connections to the hot disaster recovery site in Florida.

The State has a uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system composed of 12 minutes of immediate battery backup, plus a diesel generator to provide total data center power in case of an extended outage.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

The Information Processing Services (IPS) Division provides the data center operators, telecommunications technicians, technical support staff, and workstation support personnel for all State agencies, including the Department of Social Services. A total of 62 personnel support the technical environment. The number of staff members in each area of technical support include: 20 in computer operations, 11 in systems programming, five in database administration, three in teleprocessing, three at the Help Desk, and 20 in PC support. A team of 10 analysts and programmers support the ACCESS application as part of the MIS staff of DSS.

South Dakota feels that the current staffing levels are more than sufficient to meet the demands of the ACCESS system. No problems were mentioned regarding the State's ability to attract and retain qualified staff and program management felt that they were extremely competitive with other industries in salary, benefits, and challenging project work.

System hardware and software maintenance is performed as required with no set schedule for implementation. Major upgrades or changes are made over weekends. Application changes are placed into test libraries and held until they are ready for production and can be fit into the overall schedule of software events. Only systems programming personnel can migrate changes into the production libraries after the change has been proven acceptable in the production environment.

Full disk backups of all files are performed daily between 3:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. There are four generations of backups maintained, three off site and one on site. Each application creates its own backups of application-critical files during their batch processing each night. Application backups are created in two copies, one remaining on site, while the other is transported off site with the system backups.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

South Dakota has a statewide telecommunications backbone network to support all telecommunications activities for the State. The backbone consists of T3 circuits connecting six nodes -- located in Brookings, Vermillion, Sioux Falls, Rapid City, Pierre, and Aberdeen -- that support counties and local State offices throughout the State. Nine additional locations are connected, separately, to one of the main nodes via T1 circuits. Voice, data, and video communications are carried on the backbone.

Each of the local offices is connected to one of the T1 or T3 nodes via a 9.6 KB SDLC, multi-dropped circuit. Based on throughput, the line can be boosted to 19.2 KB or higher, or some of the drops eliminated from a given circuit to provide acceptable performance. All circuits are connected to an IBM 3745 at the IPS data center in Pierre.

The multiplexing and switching equipment used at each node location is installed, owned, and controlled by the telephone carrier in the local area. No State-owned equipment is used for this function. Switching for disaster recovery support will occur in these telephone company central offices.

All State agencies share the use of the network. Institutions of higher education are the primary user of the video function to support closed-circuit telecast of college classes.

6.2.4 System Performance

The central processing unit (CPU) utilization level of the 3090/200J was not available from State personnel. There are no obvious performance or capacity bottlenecks, and reasonable space exists for equipment expansion when needed. Direct access storage device (DASD) and tape growth both are expected to be relatively low over the next two years.

6.2.5 System Response

South Dakota maintains terminal response time reports for all counties. Ninety percent of all response times are at or below four seconds. No issues were noted by either IPS or Social Services staff. IPS has intentions to lower response times to under one second for as many users as possible by improving the network although no specific network improvements had been identified at the time of the State visit. Local fiber circuits have been installed in the Pierre Capitol complex and provide excellent response time. Local office response times on the Pierre fiber network have been reduced to less than 1 second when no system bottlenecks, such as CPU busy or channel busy, are present.

6.2.6 System Downtime

No issues were reported by either IPS or DSS staff. Current availability is in the 99 percent plus range. Hardware outages are infrequent (neither IPS nor DSS personnel could recall the last time the hardware was down). Power fluctuations have been eliminated by the UPS system. Software and network problems are also infrequent.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

It is expected that the following changes will occur within the next two years:

- Upgrading the teleprocessing network to digital service for all areas where the upgrade is technically or economically feasible;

- Upgrading the 200J to a larger system;
- Implementing Systems Managed Storage (SMS); and
- Implementing Network Data Mover (NDM) for connection to the Social Security Administration for computer matching.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses ACCESS development costs and approved Federal funding, on-going ACCESS operating costs, and cost allocation methodologies for development and operational costs.

All ACCESS development information was collected from the November 1984 ACCESS Advanced Planning Document (APD) and its three amendments; written correspondence between FNS and the South Dakota State Department of Social Services; and the Cost Allocation Interview Guide and Survey completed by South Dakota personnel.

7.1 ACCESS Development Costs and Federal Funding

The ACCESS development cost was reported to be approximately \$3.2 million; the FSP share, at 57.7, percent was \$1.85 million. FSP reimbursement was made at the enhanced rate of 75 percent. A detailed review of the available ACCESS documentation showed that:

- The initial ACCESS APD was prepared in November 1984. The proposed system was to be operational statewide by December 31, 1985. The estimated cost for the transfer and implementation was \$1.74 million. The APD was approved by DHHS in April 1985. FNS granted contingent approval in February 1985.³
- APD Amendment One increased development costs to \$2.27 million to accommodate increases in the cost of equipment and State personnel salaries.⁴ The amendment also extended the ACCESS statewide operational date to April 1986. FNS granted approval to the amended APD in October 1985 agreeing to fund its share of the \$2.27 million at 57.7 percent, or \$1.31 million.⁵

³ Letter, 2/20/85.

⁴ The amended APD was not dated; however, it was issued between November 1984 and November 1985.

⁵ Letter, 10/14/85.

- APD Amendment Two, issued in November 1985, was a request to purchase additional equipment with funds already approved. FNS granted approval in December, 1985.⁶
- APD Amendment Three, submitted in February 1986, showed that \$2.58 million had been expended on ACCESS. This amendment requested approval of a project extension to June 30, 1986, and additional funding for that period of \$314,000 that would increase the total cost of ACCESS development to \$3.2 million. FNS approved the increased amount.⁷ No additional amendments were submitted.

ACCESS was FAMIS certified in October 1986.

7.1.1 ACCESS System Components

The ACCESS system implemented in 1986 supported only AFDC and FSP.

7.1.2 Major ACCESS Development Cost Components

APD Amendment Three presented an ACCESS budget divided into seven components. Travel, supplies, and costs associated with transferring the Vermont system comprised \$225,000 of its cost. Four other components comprised more than 93 percent of total ACCESS costs. These costs are presented in Table 7.1, ACCESS Major Cost Components. The table presents the original estimate for each component, its actual recorded cost as of March 1986, and its estimated cost to completion as of February 1986.

Table 7.1 ACCESS Major Cost Components

ACCESS Component	ACCESS APD 11/84	Actual Costs as of 3/3/86	APD Amendment 3 (2/86)
Hardware	859,189	972,151	972,151
Contractor Support	75,000	100,633	122,743
State Personnel	354,600	699,296	933,921
Operations Support	300,000	586,337	946,337
Total Major Components	1,588,789	2,358,417	2,975,152
Travel, Supplies, Transfer	155,000	225,000	225,000
TOTAL ACCESS	1,743,789	2,583,417	3,200,152

A detailed account of each major component is provided in the following sections.

⁶ Letter, 12/20/85.

⁷ Per South Dakota personnel; there was no documentation to substantiate the approval.

7.1.2.1 Hardware

Hardware was the single most costly component of the ACCESS development and implementation effort. In November 1984 the cost of hardware was estimated to be \$859,000. This amount was increased to \$1.3 million in APD Amendment One. More than \$400,000 was expended for terminals; controllers and modems accounted for an additional \$380,000. The remaining equipment included printers, furniture, protocol converters, and other support devices. By February 1986, actual equipment costs of \$972,000 had been incurred, which was \$328,000 less than the revised estimate presented in APD Amendment One.

7.1.2.2 Contractor Costs

A sole source contract was awarded to support ACCESS transfer, development, and implementation activities. The contract acquired the services of one person knowledgeable in the design and functionality of the system to be transferred from Vermont. The award date was unavailable. The initial APD estimated the cost of services to be \$75,000. By February 1986, the cost of the contractor services was increased to \$123,000.

7.1.2.3 State Personnel Cost

The total State personnel costs for ACCESS development exceeded \$933,000. These costs were originally estimated to be \$354,600 in the November 1984 APD. By March 1986, actual costs incurred were almost \$700,000. APD Amendment Three requested an additional \$233,000 to support a three-month extension.

7.1.2.4 Operations Support

Table 7.2 ACCESS Operating Costs

Federal Fiscal Year	Total ACCESS Operating Costs	FSP Share of ACCESS Operating Costs	FSP Share
1991	\$949,037	\$585,550	62%
1992	\$887,885	\$552,807	62%
1993 (2 qtrs)	\$544,977	\$338,273	62%

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Annual ACCESS operating costs for 1992 were \$887,885, and the FSP share was \$552,807. On a monthly basis, the FSP share was \$46,067. The cost per case month -- based on monthly participation of 19,677 food stamp households -- was \$2.34.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The South Dakota Information Processing Services facility is the central computer processing organization that provides operational support to the ACCESS system as well as all automated systems maintained by DSS. All charges for ACCESS support are based on ACCESS job requests submitted to IPS. A job accounting system tracks the CPU time used to complete each transaction. DSS is then billed for all CPU and input/output (I/O) resources used during ACCESS processing based on negotiated rates.

Costs for IPS services other than CPU and I/O support are charged to the DSS based on the number of devices owned by DSS with a value exceeding \$630. These costs include, but are not limited to: Local Area Network costs, research costs, and repair center costs.

7.3 South Dakota Cost Allocation Methodologies

The methodology used to allocate ACCESS development costs to FNS and DHHS is documented in the 1984 APD. The methodology for allocating operating costs is documented in the Cost Allocation Plan effective January 1993.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of ACCESS Development Cost Allocation Methodology⁸

The approved allocation of ACCESS development costs to FNS was 57.7 percent; DHHS was allocated the remaining 42.3 percent. The basis for the allocation was the accumulated number of time-study minutes recorded by eligibility and clerical workers

⁸ An explanation of the methodology was taken from the ACCESS APD, November 1984. The Cost Allocation Plan in effect during the development period was not available.

while performing activities related to AFDC and Food Stamp Program eligibility during FY 1984.

The time study accumulated a total of 2.95 million minutes of work. Analysis of time study results revealed that 958,000 minutes were attributed to AFDC activities, and 1.32 million minutes were recorded for food stamp activities. Of the 2.28 million minutes spent on AFDC and food stamp activities, 57.7 percent of the time was spent doing food stamp certifications, and 42.3 percent was spent doing AFDC certifications. The percentage allocations were approved by DHHS and FNS in April 1985 and February 1985 respectively. The system was implemented in 1986 so development cost allocation was not necessary after that date.

7.3.2 ACCESS Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

All costs incurred by the Department of Social Services are recorded on the State's central accounting system. Each charge entered into the system is assigned an identifier comprised of the fund, type of purchase, and the budgeted unit from which the expenditure is being made. The identifier is used by DSS to identify the specific cost center, Federal fund source, and State/Federal match rate applicable to each expenditure. Each charge is also assigned a unique five-digit code which identifies the expenditure and allows all such expenditures to be accumulated into identifiable cost accounts.

Five types of costs comprise the ACCESS operations cost:

- **ACCESS Direct.** Salaries, wages, and costs of systems development and operations personnel assigned to ACCESS are included as direct costs. Three separate units are included: systems administration, management analysis, and programmer/analyst. The direct costs allocated to the Food Stamp Program are based upon staff time expended by each separate unit for the Food Stamp Program activities as reflected in the time study.
- **ACCESS Indirect.** This category includes salaries and costs of development and operations support personnel whose work can not be tied directly to any program area or system. The share of indirect costs allocated to the Food Stamp Program is calculated based on the total salaries and wages of Food Stamp Program personnel within the DSS as a percentage of the total salaries and of program personnel in DSS.
- **Automated Eligibility System (AES) Administration Direct.** AES direct costs include salaries and benefits of program support staff. The allocation of these costs is based upon staff time associated with the two automated systems (ACCESS or Title IV-D) maintained for a program area. Staff time spent on each program is identified; costs are allocated accordingly to the systems. Costs identified as related to ACCESS are further distributed to the applicable fund sources (Title IV-A, Title XIX, and Food Stamp Program) based on the Eligibility Determination Caseworker RMS results.

- ***Automated Eligibility System Administration Indirect.*** This category includes salaries and costs of DDS personnel who indirectly support all programs managed within DDS. These people include personnel in units such as accounting and budgeting. Indirect costs are allocated to each benefitting program or fund source based upon its proportionate share of the total salaries and wages for all benefitting programs within the DSS.
- ***Vouchers Direct.*** This type of cost includes the billings for ACCESS processing services provided by State's IPS. Costs are charged to programs on the basis of actual program usage, as reflected on job requests. The resource billing procedure which measures computer time to complete each transaction has been adapted by IPS to bill each program for machine (CPU and input/output) time costs. Costs other than mainframe operations cost are charged to the Food Stamp Program based on the number of devices owned by DSS with a value exceeding \$630. These costs include, but are not limited to, Local Areas Network costs, research costs, and repair costs.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

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/A	N/A	N/A
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	Y (2/1/92)	Y	Y - Policy N - Legislation
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*	Y (2/1/92)	Y	Y - Policy N - Legislation
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	N	Y - Policy N - Legislation
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal timeframes. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	Y (1/16/90)	Y	Y - Policy N - Legislation
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service timeframes. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	Y (1/16/90)	Y	N - Policy N - Legislation

**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/A	N/A	N/A
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*	Y (1/1/89)	N	Y - Policy N - Legislation
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 - Policy N - Legislation
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y (7/1/89)	N	Y - Policy N - Legislation
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	N	N - Policy N - Legislation
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y (1/16/90)	N	Y - Policy N - Legislation
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	Y - Policy N - Legislation

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

**Exhibit A-6.1
State of South Dakota
Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090/200J	IBM	Purchase	64 channels, 128 MB main storage, 128 MB expanded storage, 45 MIPS
DISK			
3380/3390	IBM	Purchase	Controllers: 3990 (6) 3880 (2) Drives: 3390 (48) 3380 (16)
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives	IBM	Purchase	3420 (3)
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (12)
PRINTERS			
Laser	IBM	Purchase	3835 (1)
Impact	IBM	Purchase	6262 (2)
FRONT ENDS			
3745	IBM	Purchase	1
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
3270 Type	IBM	Purchase	400 (est.)

APPENDIX B

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

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

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in South Dakota. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in South Dakota. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about 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 South Dakota	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
160	63	39.4%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	43	68.3%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in South Dakota. The response rate of 68.3 percent is acceptable and produces a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals.

Summary of Findings

Respondents generally are quite satisfied with the computer system in South Dakota. Most EWs think that system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use are acceptable. Nevertheless, the responses indicate that significant numbers of workers have some problems with particular features of the system. Most EWs feel that the system generally has a positive impact on job satisfaction; almost 84 percent of the EWs think that the system is a great help in their jobs.

Since South Dakota's current system has been operational since 1986, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	3	7.1
Good	31	73.8
Excellent	8	19.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	16	37.2
Good	27	62.8

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	11.6
Sometimes	33	76.7
Often	5	11.6

Eligibility workers in South Dakota generally are satisfied with system response time. Almost 93 percent of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, and the majority thinks response time during peak periods is good.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	5	11.6
Often	38	88.4

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	23.3
Sometimes	29	67.4
Often	4	9.3

More than 88 percent of the eligibility workers believe that the system often is available when they need to use it, but most also think the system sometimes or often is down. The system downtime, however, does not seem to be intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	3	7.0
Good	32	74.4
Excellent	8	18.6

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	85.4
Sometimes	6	14.6

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	40	95.2
Sometimes	2	4.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	69.8
Sometimes	13	30.2

Most eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are very accurate. The quality of the information in the system is perceived as good or excellent by 93 percent of the EWs. Large majorities also believe that problems related to cases terminated in error, incorrect eligibility determination, and obsolete data are rare.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	55.8
Sometimes	19	44.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	59.5
Sometimes	15	35.7
Often	2	4.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	36	85.7
Sometimes	6	14.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	39	90.7
Sometimes	3	7.0
Often	1	2.3

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	37	86.0
Sometimes	6	14.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	76.2
Sometimes	9	21.4
Often	1	2.4

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	81.4
Sometimes	8	18.6

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	65.9
Sometimes	13	31.7
Often	1	2.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	74.4
Sometimes	11	25.6

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

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

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	37	86.0
Sometimes	6	14.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	79.1
Sometimes	9	20.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	54.1
Sometimes	12	32.4
Often	5	13.5

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	54.8
Sometimes	18	42.9
Often	1	2.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	73.8
Sometimes	8	19.0
Often	3	7.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	65.0
Sometimes	11	27.5
Often	3	7.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	71.4
Sometimes	12	28.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	47.5
Sometimes	18	45.0
Often	3	7.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	45.0
Sometimes	17	42.5
Often	5	12.5

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	37	86.0
Sometimes	3	7.0
Often	3	7.0

Eligibility workers generally believe that the system is easy to use. For most functions, a large majority reports rarely having difficulty. The areas in which the largest proportion of EWs report sometimes or often having problems include: obtaining necessary information from the system, learning to use the system, monitoring the status of hearings, tracking outstanding verifications, and identifying error prone and suspected fraud cases.

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	2	4.7
Sometimes	5	11.6
Often	36	83.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	39.5
Sometimes	21	48.8
Often	5	11.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	36	83.7
Sometimes	6	14.0
Often	1	2.3

EWs generally think that the system positively influences job satisfaction. Almost 84 percent of eligibility workers feel that the system is a great help to them in their jobs; however, a majority also believes that the system sometimes or often contributes to job-related stress. Nevertheless, nearly 84 percent believe that the system usually is more helpful than problematic.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	37	86.0
Sometimes	6	14.0

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	38	88.4
Sometimes	5	11.6

A vast majority of EWs feels that there are few problems associated with providing expedited service to clients.

Fraud and Errors

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

APPENDIX C

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	18	69.2
Excellent	8	30.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	10	38.5
Good	13	50.0
Excellent	3	11.5

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	15.4
Sometimes	21	80.8
Often	1	3.8

EW supervisors in South Dakota generally are satisfied with system response time. All of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, and the majority feels that response time remains good or excellent during peak processing periods. More than 85 percent of the supervisors, however, think that response time sometimes or often is too slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	1	3.8
Often	25	96.2

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	36.0
Sometimes	16	64.0

More than 96 percent of EW supervisors report that the system often is available when they need to use it; however, most supervisors think that the system sometimes is down. This downtime, however, apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	12	46.2
Excellent	14	53.8

EW supervisors perceive the quality of the system's data to be acceptable. All the responding supervisors feel that the information in the system is good or excellent.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	16	61.5
Sometimes	10	38.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	76.9
Sometimes	6	23.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	26	100.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	23	88.5
Sometimes	3	11.5

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	24	92.3
Sometimes	2	7.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	23	92.0
Sometimes	2	8.0

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	25	96.2
Sometimes	1	3.8

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

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

EW supervisors feel that the system is quite easy to use. For almost every function discussed, a large majority (between 77 and 100 percent) report rarely having difficulties in these areas. Obtaining necessary information from the system is the only area in

which a significant minority (39 percent) reports sometimes having problems.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	3	11.5
Often	23	88.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	53.8
Sometimes	11	42.3
Often	1	3.8

EW supervisors feel that the system contributes to job satisfaction. Almost 89 percent of responding supervisors feel that the system often is a great help, and a narrow majority thinks it rarely creates added stress in their jobs.

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	18	69.2
Excellent	8	30.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	9	36.0
Excellent	16	64.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	17	77.3
Sometimes	5	22.7

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

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

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

Client Service

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

Fraud and Errors

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