

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting

August 14, 2002

CDSS Training Center
815 S Street Delta Room
Sacramento, California

1. Welcome – Richard Trujillo greeted everyone. He said that Joeana Carpenter would not be conducting today's meeting as she was attending the APHSA Conference in Dallas
2. Agenda Review – Richard went over the agenda items and asked for any additional items. Holly Hamilton asked that Southern Counties be added, and Bill Corder asked that the Inquiry Process be added as well.
3. Summary Review – Richard asked if there were any additions or changes to the summary. Gerry Greer indicated that the summary should reflect that the "monthly error rate report for all counties be distributed *in addition to the cumulative report*".
4. Reauthorization Update – Frank Andersen indicated that we would be operating under the current TANF bill for one more year. He said that there are two reauthorization bills, both of which substantially change the current TANF program, especially the Work Participate Rate (WPR). He said that currently the requirement is 50%, which we are not meeting. However, the Case Reduction Credit (CRC) which is 43.1% allows us to meet the goal. Some states, he stressed, don't even have a WPR because of the CRC. The single parent WPR is 50%, and the Two-Parent WPR is 90%. He went on to say that both new bills eliminate the Separate State Program-Maintenance of Effort (SSP-MOE). The house bill uses a new base year and does away with the CRS. Additionally, the hours change; it increases the hours for a single parent from 30 to 40 regardless if the parent has a child under the age of six. Twenty-four of the hours have to be in core activities.

He said the Senate bill caps the WPR at 70%, and does away with the Two-Parent requirement. However, it sets up a new requirement of 30 hours for a single parent. If the single parent has a child under six years of age, the required hours is twenty-four. He also said that a Leavers Credit is included in the senate bill. The credit is calculated using a convoluted process, which uses the average percentage subtracted from the WPR. Frank went on to describe the impact of not meeting the WPR. If the WPR is not met the counties share of TANF goes up 5% as well as the state's share. This amounts to \$187M for the state. This will have huge impact on county budgets. It is therefore critical, Frank emphasized, of analyzing the case data and obtaining and reporting the actual hours worked. Staff should be aggressively exploring all data maintained in the county to obtain the work hours so that we meet the WPR.

5. Food Stamps – Michael Bowman Jones indicated that the QC Refresher Training was held on June 12th at the CDSS Training Center. The evaluations of the participants showed that the training met the goals established from the onset of the session. He distributed the Q & A's and said that the household composition question was still pending further study. There was discussion on how to review to EBT issuances. Some supervisors were unclear as how to review participation.
Action Item: Michael to investigate and provide information on EBT.

6. Corrective Action – Richard Terwilliger distributed the Rolling Error Rate. He also described the organization of the Corrective Action Units. He indicated that it is not yet official. IRIS reviews are being resurrected and will begin in FFY 2003. The counties will be categorized into three groups: Large, with an IRIS review done every year; Medium, every other year; Small, every three years. In regards to the appeal process (FS Sanction), nothing has been settled. The letter sent to FNS asks for one-half the money for reinvestment possibilities. Hector Hernandez asked for a copy of the letter the state sent to FNS. Nancie Monson said that the Electronic CAP report is not user friendly and was difficult to work in. Gail Dershewitz asked about when would FNS audit reinvestment 2000.

7. Food Stamp Federal Differences – Hector Hernandez said that both Ron Morgan and Pete Flores are at another meeting, and when they arrive, they will provide the entire difference package. The list of difference cases was sent out via the users egroup.

8. CalWORKs – Warren Ghens talked about the Q5i Item T22C CalWORKs Number of Months, and Item T48 Work Participation Status. He distributed the definitions for each of the items and how the data items should be completed. Richard Trujillo talked about a report, which is still in draft, that compared the WTW hours contained in the Q5i and that contained in the WTW 30. He said that one important finding of this report is the information in the Q5i does not capture all the work participation hours. The report reveals that not all the CW-7's regarding a particular sample month were reviewed. For example, when the client reported work activity hours in a month on the CW-7, neither the previous or subsequent months CW-7 were reviewed to check for any spill over hours (client report hours for a month on a subsequent CW-7). Thus, not all the work activity hours for a particular sample month were captured on the Q5i. Richard stressed that the staff entering the data on the Q5i are not merely data gatherers. They are analysts.
They must analyze all the data. They must ensure, particularly in the area of work activity hours, that all the information is analyzed and correctly reported in the Q5i. Richard reiterated what Frank had emphasized and that is Work participation hours will have a profound negative fiscal impact to the state and counties in terms of sanctions. It is important therefore, the analyst

aggressively explore all data maintained in the county to obtain the work hours so that we meet the WPR.

9. Training On Data Entry/Edits – Warren Ghens distributed information regarding the federal TANF errors. One handout showed the distribution frequency for edits, and another showed the frequency by county. Edits 194, 196, 132, 109, 212, 221, 198, 209, and 193 were discussed. For each edit, the edit text, the definition, and examples were discussed. Warren stressed that the supervisors share this with their analyst.
10. Status of Enterprise – Donna Portee indicated that if any of the supervisors have issues about DTVU to call her directly; past issues have been taken care of. She said due to the Oracle debacle, the process for approving contracts has become cumbersome and at a result, the contracts have backed up. However, a vendor has been selected to conduct the Feasibility Study Report (FSR). The money is set aside to begin the study; however, we just need the ok. She said that Jason Moore sent out a questionnaire via the user egroup asking for information about the operating system in each county.
11. Future Meetings – It was suggested by Hector Hernandez that our next meeting date be changed. It was agreed that we meet on September 18th. Additionally, the frequency of the meetings was discussed. It was proposed that we meet every other month. Holly Hamilton indicated that since many of the southern region counties cannot now attend the meetings because of budget constraints, the counties meet in Riverside and hook up via conference call with PMC participants in Sacramento. Since we will be meeting every other month, it was suggested that we hold off until January on this proposal.
12. Regional Reports – Regional concerns were covered this meeting.
13. Other Items – Bill Corder indicated that the Inquiry Process recently established was not working as he had anticipated. The response times for the inquiries was not timely and the responses were not clear. Two other counties were experiencing issues with timely responses.
Action Item: Discuss particulars with FS Program and invite them to the next PMC meeting.
Tom Broderick stated that he will be retiring and that this will be the last meeting he will be attending. All of us expressed our best wishes to Tom on his retirement.
14. Next Meeting – Change of schedule to September 18th. The site will be sent along with the Agenda. Tentatively the site is the Sacramento County Office.