

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting

May 8, 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. It was asked that the conference be added to the agenda.
3. Summary Review – Joeana asked if there were any additions or changes to the summary. None was made.
4. Food Stamps – Michael Bowman Jones indicated that the QC Refresher Training will be held on June 12th at the CDSS Training Center. The topics to be covered are QC Case Documentation and Narration, Household Composition, and Wages and Salaries; the presenters for these topics will be Judy Baca, Marietta Jubert and Rosalie Roca respectively.
Michael indicated that the transmittals were sent out via the users group.
5. Corrective Action – Lisa Lacy distributed the Error Rates for the nineteen counties. She said that her office does not have a current organization chart. Richton Yee is not shown in the chart that she distributed because of redirection. Corrective Action increased from one to two units and she heads one of them. Gerry Greer requested that the monthly error rate report for all counties be distributed instead of the cumulative report. Lisa said she would provide that report. Gail Dershewitz shared that the APHSA web site has the error rates.

Lisa said that the Corrective Action unit is going to Sacramento County this month along with the Feds. Sixteen staff will be descending onto San Diego County in August and onto Los Angeles County in November. She also said that the Feds want the old type of IRIS reviews to be done; ME is now of great importance. As of now the sanction for California is 140M and after adjustments, it is around 115M. She indicated that the state statistician is finding inconsistencies with the method the Feds are using to calculate the sanction. He has provided the issues we have to the federal statistician. Gail Dershewitz asked to see the method that is used to calculate the error rate. It was suggested that questions of this sort (Regression formula) be sent to Jim Anderson. Lisa said that the Best Practices Forum for the Central Region will be held on May 22nd in Fresno.

6. State Program Inquiry Process – Varaniece Hall thanked those who have used the process. Based on what she has seen the process is working pretty well. It was the intent to prioritize QC related questions and ensure consistency of information. Those counties that have used the process indicated that they liked it.
7. Food Stamp Federal Differences – Hector Hernandez said that his bureau sent out the latest difference list electronically; there were six difference cases. Hector stated in answer to the counties’ request, Field Operations Bureau will provide a copy of the entire federal difference package for each of the six cases. The counties can then take each package and review them. If they have a question on similar types of cases, they should email questions to SMU, specifically Michael Bowman-Jones. Hector also mentioned that the state has twenty days to respond to federal differences, and the time frame is not negotiable. Pete Flores talked about the Fresno case. This case generated much discussion, and it was agreed that follow up action be taken.

Action Item: Varaniece Hall, Hector Hernandez and Michael Bowman-Jones will meet to discuss the Fresno Case. They will determine if the SSI definition has changed and discuss the differences in Excluded and Ineligible. The result of the meeting will be shared with the group.

8. SASA – Joeana Carpenter shared with the group information regarding the “State Agency Systems Assessment” which the Feds are considering undertaking here in California. The assessment is done by FNS and focuses on the Quality Control audit process. FNS will be looking at both the state cases as well as federal cases. The assessment is done in the county over several days. Joeana will share more specific information about SASA when she receives it.
9. CalWORKs – Warren Ghens clarified that the survey he sent out via the users group is for information gathered and entered into the Q5I and not the form WTW 30. He discussed the provision in the regulations regarding the calculation of the hours for work participation activities. The reporting requirement is to capture actual hours and not the scheduled hours of the work activities. He explained that the regulations provide three methods for calculating the average hours per month an individual is participating in work activities. The method selected by the state is the actual hours divided by 4.33. Frank Andersen stated that based on current information, the TANF reauthorization bill would eliminate SSP MOE and also eliminate the case reduction credit. It appears that the bill will be discussed in congress right up to October of this year and we won’t know the final requirement of the until then. The program may change substantially to include expanding the data reporting requirements. The feds may allow states to identify their own programs, develop performance measurements, setup systems to evaluate their performance, and then transmit this information to the Feds.

10. TANF Edits – Peggy Usrey distributed the breakdown of edits she has evaluated in the TANF program. She went over each of edits on the lists. She described how the TANF “logic edits” compare data to determine questionable data. She said that the next version of the Q5i would have edits built in so that field staff would compare and enter the correct data. The PMC supervisors indicated that they liked the way the information was presented and found it a useful training tool.
11. Q5i Version 1.4 – Marlene Fleming/Carlos Ocampo demonstrated the enhancements to the Q5i software. One particular tool that will benefit supervisors will be the “Assignment Screen”. This screen will facilitate the assignment of cases to staff. They also demonstrated some of the new edits built into the next version.
12. Status of Enterprise – Donna Portee shared some information on the situation of Enterprise. She went over some of the underlying areas of concern that have surfaced regarding the move into Enterprise. Uppermost was the area of security. Other areas of concern are training, equipment, reports, and staffing. A statement of work has been developed and the department is currently getting bids for the development of the FSR. Moving into Enterprise will allow the data collection to be more efficient and flexible. Donna said that counties can contact her for more information about the FSR.
13. Food Stamp Profile Enhancements – Richard Trujillo indicated that the Farm Bill reauthorizing Food Stamps will be affecting the Quality Control audit process. He indicated that the QC data reporting has changed and the changes were shared and discussed at the February PMC meeting. Now that changes are being made to the QC process, it would be appropriate to look at the Food Stamp Profile. The supervisors were asked to break up into groups and review specific class elements with the goal of enhancing the data collection. The supervisors were then asked to list their recommendations and share back with the rest of the group. Several recommendations for simplifying the data and enhancements were made. Michael Bowman-Jones will ensure that the recommendations are included in the version to be released in October.
14. Regional Reports – Regional concerns were covered this meeting.
15. Other Items – The conference was discussed. If one is held, it will be in the fall. Supervisors do want to have a conference, but more information is needed. It was suggested that a group be formed to discuss this in more detail in June or July.
16. Next Meeting – The Food Stamp QC Refresher training will be conducted in lieu of PMC meeting.