

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting
February 14, 2002
CDSS Training Center
815 S Street Sierra Room
Sacramento, California

1. Welcome – Joeana Carpenter greeted everyone.
2. Agenda Review – Joeana went over the agenda items and asked for any additional items.
3. Summary Review – Joeana asked if there were any additions or changes to the summary, and none was made.
4. Food Stamps – Michael Bowman-Jones shared a draft of the transmittal dealing with the “Treatment of Federally Ineligible Noncitizen Income”. The transmittal provides instructions on how to handle cases with federally ineligible noncitizen with earned income, and also includes an example. Michael asked the PMC supervisors to review the draft and provide him with any changes. Additionally, it was decided not to release the transmittal until food stamp policy releases an ACL regarding this issue. Since Michael has email, he will be sending draft transmittals via the users group. There was a question regarding FNS reviewing cases and Michael indicated that FNS uses manual 315.
Action Item: Michael will get information on FNS 315 to determine the review process used by federal reviewers.
5. Surveys – Richard Trujillo shared the preliminary raw data of both the Code 4 Drops and Food Stamp case rereview surveys. The total number of cases dropped for FFY 2001 was 263. The breakout by quarter was: 1st Qtr – 68 cases; 2nd Qtr – 72 cases; 3rd Qtr – 56 cases; 4th Qtr 67 cases. There did not appear to be an increasing trend of drops. There was some discussion as to the kind of code 4 drops that were reported by the county. All but two counties reported correctly. They will resubmit the correct information. It was suggested that the previous year’s total drops be looked at to determine if there is indeed an increasing trend.

The preliminary data for the food stamp case rereview survey indicates that of the seventeen counties responding, all have a rereview process in place. Eleven indicated that they rereview all of the cases, while six indicated that they do not. Two counties rereview only error cases while three counties have another rereview process in place. Fifteen counties indicated that the supervisor conducts the rereview, and six indicated that a lead analyst rereviews as well. All seventeen counties indicated that

they rereview cases upon receipt (flow basis) as opposed to waiting for all cases for a sample month to be submitted before rereviewing. This information will be shared with Lisa Kim from FNS at the next meeting. Richard thanked all the counties that completed both surveys.

Action Item: LA FOB and Contra Costa will forward new data regarding the dropped cases. Richard will ask for data on previous year's drops.

6. Food Stamp Federal Differences – Hector Hernandez distributed three handouts: Food Stamp Active Federal Difference Narrative 10/2000 – 9/2001, Incomplete Food Stamp Active Cases for FFY 2001 Preliminary Findings, and FS Active Drop Differences Preliminary Findings. Some of the case findings were discussed.
7. Corrective Action – Lisa Lacey indicated that because of staff resources her staff could only attend either the regional or the PMC meeting, and asked which of the two would be beneficial to the group. It was decided that since all counties are represented at the PMC meeting, CA should attend this meeting. Lisa indicated that Rich Terrilliger would be attending PMC on a regular basis. Giv handed out comparative charts (some counties charts were missing; Giv will email them). He clarified information that was presented at last month's regional meeting regarding cases dropped NSTR. First, he stated that consistent and accurate QC data is vital. Second, QC does not have a direct role with QA except for cases dropped NSTR. He explained that in these types of cases, QC either inform the EW, so when clients come into the welfare office they obtain the client's participation or QC send a notification to the client in order to complete the case. He said that the impact, however, on performing the above procedure has a very small impact on the error rate; it increases the denominator. Giv said that the information was intended as a sharing of information only and not as a recommendation to change the quality control process.
8. CalWORKs – Warren Ghens distributed a handout with five examples on coding TANF cases that have reached the 60-month time limit. He went over each of the examples and Carlos demonstrated where the items on Q5i the data are entered. There was a question regarding how to handle cases that timed out and are not in the appropriate aid code.
Action Item: Warren will issue instructions on dealing with cases timed out and not in the appropriate aid code.
9. TANF/Cardin Bill – Joeana indicated that the Democrats have put forward via the Cardin Bill their proposal for TANF reauthorization. The administration will be releasing their version very soon. Joeana will send the Cardin Bill (1/4/02) to everyone. She highlighted some of the provisions of the bill. The bill is for the 2003 through the 2007 period.

Frank Andersen went on to illustrate some of the concepts in the bill; he indicated that the reduction credits in this bill do not benefit us.

10. QC Refresher Training – Michael Bowman-Jones distributed an outline of topics for county supervisor review and comment. It was suggested that the data that is collected and published be available at the training. Tom Broderick suggested that the overall training goal and goals for each topic be part of the training as well as a summary of each. Michael indicated that there is a goal for each topic, but certainly will include a summary. Action Item: Michael will include a summary for each topic covered in the training.
11. Food Stamp Publication – Earl Davis from the Trend Analysis Unit presented the characteristics of the food stamp population in the state. The information is published and most of which is derived from data collected by PMC. The publication is available on the CDSS web site.
12. Regional Reports – Tom Broderick shared concerns that counties have especially during these times of looming federal sanctions. QC is now the focus of attention of county administrators and supervisors. QC supervisors are now actively educating all levels of management and administration on Quality Control processes, procedures and policy. Plunged into this new role of educator has required the QC supervisor to attend meetings where directors and/or supervisors show data which the QC supervisors have neither seen nor are aware of. This indeed has been challenging. Everyone agreed that times are very stressful in light of the sanctions, and especially for QC supervisors when pressure is being applied to ensure that any adjustments to error cases are indeed done. And finally the group agreed that the FNS 310 Handbook continues to be our official source, and when clarification is needed contact Michael. One request is that whatever data is released by the state is shared with QC supervisors.