

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting

March 10, 1999

Human Resources Building

1325 J Street

Room 1519

Sacramento, California

SUMMARY

1. Agenda review and welcome-Lois welcomed county representatives. The agenda was reviewed for additional topics.
2. Review of summary from previous meeting –no changes noted.
3. Federal list of allowable work activities- Barry Smith provided a handout on activities identified in federal and state regulations in the area of work activities. Lois discussed a memo that went out to State program managers recommending the discontinuance of QC reviews on CalWORKs cases. Evalyn Epps would like a prepared document on flexibility and definitions for workers. There were a couple ideas discussed pertaining to ‘hours’ and how to report them to maximize work participation; 1) Get employer statements of maximum number of work hours, 2) Recipient statement of average number of hours, and 3) Recipient statements of additional activities such as job search, community service, etc. Lois emphasized that the federal government has provided no further information on the meaning or definition of allowable work activities. Therefore, county reviewers should use the maximum flexibility in identifying hours for work activities. The current definitions in QCIS will be revised for the April release that will provide for the maximum flexibility. Richard discussed current definitions as they relate to Work Activities handout. Changes to definitions to make the definitions more flexible will be included in the April 1999 release. Donna Laird suggested that a color code distinction be placed on the QC5 to identify those items that are data collection items vs. quality control items.
4. Data Cleaning update- Hector thanked the county supervisors and their staff for their clean up effort and staff work to meet the deadlines. Gerry Greer identified an edit in 344 that had caused him some problems. Pam Neely stated that Marie Thomas had advised her to resubmit the case and the edit goes away. Hopie Rios asked whether the definitions and edits will be changed to reflect the findings of the data clean-up project. Richard Trujillo and Hector stated that all the findings and recommendations of the clean-up project will be incorporated in the near future.
5. San Luis Obispo conference—Daphne handed out a draft agenda for the conference. Daphne explained that the conference will be held at the Embassy Suites and begin with check-in on Wednesday May 19. All attendees must make room reservations directly with the Embassy Suites. The conference will begin on Thursday May 20 and conclude on May 21. The registration fee is \$ 35.00 per person and rooms have been reserved. Daphne wanted input from all county representatives and expects to finalize the agenda in the upcoming weeks.

6. Food Stamp Federal vs. State (CFAP) – Pete Flores discussed error rates and will bring the report on county specific error rates to the next meeting. The concern is ‘how’ to do CFAP. Hold harmless relates to actions where you convert someone from Federal to CFAP (see FNS 310). The breakdown between federal dollars and CFAP dollars is not always clear. Donna Laird referred to a transmittal/information that is on the computer that can be used for reference purposes to ensure the correct dollar amounts. The state needs to work with FNS in clearing this up because rates are going up. Sacramento County is at 18%, up from 6%. Do we drop CFAP-only cases? From Federal sample? YES, as addressed by Richard Wilmer. From state sample? – (Pete)Who’s the customer for CFAP information? – (Lois) Should this be included in county error rates? – (Lois) Where are CFAP errors reported? – (Joeana) Patty Kreider asked for something in writing pertaining to the ‘Hold Harmless’ issue, written questions to be submitted to Richard Trujillo. On the Rolling Error Rate reports, those won’t be distributed until the data is weighted and reflects the most accurate information that is available, Data Builders and state staff are working on this.
7. Work Participation Rates – Joeana Carpenter handed-out the Appeal Letter to Sharon Fujii on California’s \$ 6.9 million dollar penalty; it discusses California’s ‘Reasonable Cause Claim’ and Corrective Compliance Plan: Also discussed was the calculation of work participation rates. Discussion followed and the letter is still pending input from the CWDA.
8. Internet Update – Lois reported that the letter to All County Welfare Directors asking that all QC staff have access to the Internet was sent out on March 4, 1999. Contact Hector with any follow-up questions.
9. Data Builders ad hoc training – Presentation on class 10 and class 20 items pertaining to Food Stamps by using the ad hoc reports section.
10. Secondary Case Sampling- Jim Anderson responded to questions from Marietta Jubert on how to provide data to the state. Marietta said she talked to representatives from most of the PMC counties and they told her that they could provide the state with data tapes containing at least the new cases and maybe all cases. Marietta will provide to Lois the names of county contacts with whom she discusses this idea. Lois will talk with the CWDA members and the State Information Systems staff. This will be discussed at the next Performance Measurement Counties meeting on April 7th.
11. County Classes only - Patty Kreider discussed whether the counties wanted class specific options for their individual counties. She would like to modify and perhaps add data fields in order to compile county specific information. A couple of the other counties present expressed interest in this proposal. A discussion on separating ‘county only’ cases versus Q5 cases took place with the understanding that this is possible to program but that counties would provide the support and funding for these additions..
12. May meeting vs. conference- Due to the fact that the conference takes place in May a question was raised as to whether a May PMC meeting was needed. After discussing the pros and cons, it was decided that the May meeting will take place on May 12, 1999 as previously scheduled.
13. Earnings Reports – Lois reported that KPMG Consulting are reviewing our sampling plan and procedures as well as our data to see how we be more efficient. They are also reviewing the data we receive from ISAWS.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting
April 7, 1999
10:00 A.M.
DSS Training Center
1122 S Street
Delta Room
Sacramento, California
AGENDA

1. Agenda review and welcome
2. Summary review
3. Internet update
4. Quality Control update
5. Work Activities transmittal
6. County Tapes for TANF cases
7. San Luis Obispo Conference
8. County only Q5 classes
9. QCIS changes in April release
10. Data Operations update
11. Data Builders-ad hoc training-
12. CFAP
13. Data Cleanup update
14. Other