STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

July 22, 1988

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE NO. I-68-88

TO: ALL-COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: ANNOUNCEMENT OF SPECIAL AWARD RECIPIENTS FOR OUTSTANDING CORRECTIVE ACTION PERFORMANCE IN THE AFDC AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS

REFERENCE: ACIN I-61-87

I am pleased to announce the recipients of my annual special awards for outstanding corrective action performance in the AFDC and Food Stamp programs for the period October 1986 through September 1987. The special awards are part of a State corrective action plan designed to raise awareness about the importance of County error reduction efforts.

As detailed in ACIN I-61-87, the criteria for receiving the special award are: excellent error rate performance; substantive and timely corrective action plans; participation in corrective action activities (e.g., workshops and conferences); and commitment to corrective action by management staff. The special awards are engraved plaques commemorating the County's achievement. We are in the process of scheduling a date with each County for the presentation of their award.

Counties were grouped in four categories: large, medium, small Quality Control (QC) Counties and non-QC Counties (see attachment). Due to the commendable performance of more than one County in each category, I want to recognize the performance of the "runner-up" Counties through honorable mention in this letter.

Large QC Counties

San Joaquin County received my special award for large QC Counties. The County's error rates during this period were low; that is particularly true in the Food Stamp program (0.4 percent and 0.5 percent*). The County has an aggressive home call policy (to which they have committed extra County dollars), there is a definite commitment to corrective action at all levels of staff and the County has actively participated in corrective action workshops and conferences.

* All AFDC error rates are from State QC performed by the County; Food Stamp error rates are from the Federal and expanded sample reviews performed by State QC. The first error rate shown is for the period October 1986 through March 1987; the second error rate is for April through September 1987.

Large QC Counties (cont.)

I would like to give honorable mention to **Sacramento County.** This County's error rates have also been excellent and they are very active in their corrective action activities. Sacramento County has developed an intensive training program on interviewing techniques to help reduce errors from client nonreporting. There is a demonstrated commitment to excellence throughout the organization.

Medium QC Counties

Kern County received my special award for medium-size QC Counties. The County's AFDC error rates during this period were exceptionally low (0.8 and 0.4 percent). Kern County has a history of excellent performance in Food Stamps as well, although the sample size is too small to be statistically significant. Kern County staff actively participate in corrective action conferences and workshops. Director O. C. Sills was recently the recipient of the Governor's Commendation for his excellent administration of welfare programs.

I would like to give honorable mention to **Merced County.** The County's error rates for this period were also very low. They have developed and implemented some innovative corrective actions (e.g., the C.A.R.E.S. case error data gathering system) and have worked with the Corrective Action Bureau to pilot the QC/Corrective Action Awareness training module. Director John Cullen has made presentations at the Food Stamp Conferences and their corrective action liaison Gary Chisum was a planning committee member for the Central Valley Counties three-day workshop and is helping to plan the 1988 corrective action conference.

Small QC Counties

Mendocino County was the recipient of my special award for small Counties. Mendocino County has a history of excellent error rates (since 1979 its error rate has been zero percent three times and nine times the County has had AFDC error rates below one percent), and participates in corrective action workshops and conferences. The County uses training programs designed to fix error problems and supervisory case reviews to look for error trends and evaluate corrective actions.

I would like to give **Placer County** honorable mention for its corrective action performance. Over the last seven QC periods, the County has maintained an average error rate under one percent

in AFDC. The County has been very strong in its participation in both Mother Lode Corrective Action meetings and in annual corrective action conferences. There is departmentwide commitment to corrective action exhibited by line staff participation in corrective action workshops and by the director's participation in the State Corrective Action Committee.

Non-QC Counties

Mono County received my special award for non-QC Counties based upon their active involvement in corrective action and error reduction. The County's error data indicates performance well above average. They have participated in Mother Lode workshops and corrective action meetings although they have to travel a great distance to attend.

Both **Trinity County** and **Tuolumne County** merit honorable mention for their corrective action activities and commitment. They also go to great lengths to participate in corrective action meetings and are always looking for ways in which they can improve their performance.

I applaud the performance of the Counties mentioned in this letter. I hope they will share the secrets of their success with other Counties seeking to improve their performance. As I have often said in talking with my own as well as County staff, corrective action is not a magic solution to be applied externally to "fix" performance problems. It is an emphasis or mind set that we can control the quality of our work, despite the obstacles which get in the way. The Counties mentioned in this letter exemplify commitment to excellence, and I congratulate them for their success.

If you have any questions about this letter, please contact your Corrective Action Consultant at (916) 445-4458.

LINDA S. McMAHON
Director

Attachment

Attachment

County QC Categories
(determined by AFDC caseload size)

Large QC Counties (>15,000)

Alameda
Fresno
Los Angeles
Orange
Riverside
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Joaquin
Santa Clara

Medium QC Counties (4,001-15,000)

Butte
Contra Costa
Kern
Merced
Monterey
San Francisco
Shasta
Solano
Sonoma
Stanislaus
Tulare
Ventura

Small QC Counties (1,400-4,000)

El Dorado
Humboldt
Imperial
Kings
Madera
Mendocino
Placer
San Luis Obispo
San Mateo
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz
Sutter
Yolo
Yuba

Non-QC Counties (<1,400)

Alpine
Amador
Calaveras
Colusa
Del Norte
Glenn
Inyo
Lake
Lassen
Marin
Mariposa
Modoc
Mono
Napa
Nevada
Plumas
San Benito
Sierra
Siskiyou
Tehama
Trinity
Tuolumne