

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-4625



September 22, 1987

ALL-COUNTY LETTER NO. 87-131

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM (SAWS) CENTRAL DATA
BASE (CDB) COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT FOR THE STATE POST-
IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT (PIER)

REFERENCE: ACIN I-51-87, Dated June 19, 1987
Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP),
Section 28-130

The purpose of this All-County Letter (ACL) is to transmit the format and instructions for all counties to use in preparing their individual County Input Document for the State PIER. The Department is required to submit a statewide PIER which evaluates the system's performance to the State Office of Information Technology and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

Enclosed is a copy of the format and instructions to be used by all counties. The County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) SAWS Steering Committee reviewed and provided comments on the County Input Document format and instructions and we have made modifications based on their input. The County Input Document is due February 15, 1988.

If you have any questions regarding the County Input Document, please contact Sandi Russell, Statewide Systems Program Management Bureau, Program Requirements Section at (916) 323-6411.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Dennis J. Boyle".

DENNIS J. BOYLE
Deputy Director
Management Systems and
Evaluation Division

Enclosure

cc: CWDA

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM (SAWS)
CENTRAL DATA BASE (CDB)
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT (PIER)

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

Table of Contents

TITLE	PAGE
Introduction.	1
Instructions for Completing the County Input Document for the State CDB PIER.	2-5
Section I, Development/Implementation Costs	6-7
Section II, Ongoing Maintenance and Operations Costs.	8-9
Section III, Summary of Costs/Savings	10-12
Extra Comment Sheets.	13-14

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

As specified in the Manual of Policies and Procedures, Division 28 (County Public Assistance EDP System Funding), Section 130, a Post-Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER) is required at the completion of an EDP project such as the Central Data Base (CDB). The purpose of this PIER is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the CDB.

The State Department of Social Services (SDSS) is required to submit a CDB PIER to the Department of Finance, Office of Information Technology after statewide implementation. This statewide implementation was accomplished in April, 1987. The individual County Input Documents must be completed for the CDB PIER after a sufficient amount of experience and data can be accumulated to adequately judge system performance. Therefore, counties are required to submit their County Input Documents by February 15, 1988 which will reflect system performance data. Use the actual October through December, 1987 period ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) costs to project the annual ongoing M&O costs. If this period of time does not reflect a normal three-month operation of M&O costs, please identify and project costs based on the more representative three-month period.

The foundation for the County Input Document is the Cost Benefit analysis/Implementation Plan (CBA/IP) which was submitted by each county prior to development and implementation of the individual county CDB. The County Input Document must address the following considerations:

- Evaluation of system
- System performance
- Development costs
- Ongoing maintenance and operations costs
- Benefits, including the following: cost reduction, cost avoidance and other management benefits

The County Input Document must state reasons for any significant difference between actual results and those projected in the CBA/IP. Recommendations for improving the system should be provided.

The County Input Document should be prepared and returned by February 15, 1988 to:

Department of Social Services
Program Requirements Section
744 P Street, MS 19-53
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Ms. Sandi Russell

If there are any questions concerning the completion of this document, please contact Sandi Russell, Program Requirements Section, at (916) 323-6411.

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE CDB
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT FOR THE STATE PIER**

The following instructions and comments describe each major line of the County Input Document. Specific instructions for each line are provided to clarify the type of costs which should be included in each category. For those items which are not applicable for your county, please enter "N/A".

**DEVELOPMENT/IMPLEMENTATION COSTS (Section I) AND
ONGOING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION COSTS (Section II)**

The costs requested in these sections represent category totals rather than line-item detail as requested in the CBA/IP. Variances between the approved costs and the actual costs need to be documented. For Section I, include costs incurred by the county beginning with the first development/implementation activities through the month when the county converted to the CDB and began the daily update batch processing. For Section II, include approved costs from the CBA/IP and the projected annual costs based upon actual October 1, 1987 through December 31, 1987 costs. If this period does not reflect a normal three-month operation of M&O, please identify and project costs based on the more representative three-month period.

EDP STAFF RESOURCES (Section I & II)

a. Vendor/Outside Consultant Fees

Include fees for outside vendors such as Alpha Beta Associates (ABA) for the Welfare Case Data System counties or temporary clerical fees for data entry and conversion activities paid to an outside vendor.

b. County Central Data Processing Charges (non-CWD)

Include any charges that a county data processing center would bill to the County Welfare Department (CWD).

c. CWD-EDP Staff

Include staff costs for welfare staff who worked on the development and implementation of the CDB. Staff must meet the CWD-EDP requirements of All-County Letter 86-73, dated August 11, 1986, and Errata dated August 22, 1986. Staff costs include salary and benefit costs, but not the associated overhead or operating expenses.

SITE PREPARATION (Section I only)

Include any environmental changes such as cable pulling, carpentry and electrical work needed for installation of terminals, CPU links and/or printers.

EDP SUPPLIES (Sections I & II)

Include those supply costs necessary for testing, development and/or implementation of the CDB, i.e., magnetic tapes, paper, etc.

OPERATING COSTS (Sections I & II)

Include any data processing operating costs related to testing, development and implementation activities, i.e., printing or CPU costs.

CWD non-EDP STAFF RESOURCES (Section II only)

Include the costs of CWD non-EDP staff (Eligibility Workers, Clerical and Administrative). All County Letter 86-130 provides clarification on EDP vs. non-EDP activities. These costs were not reported above as EDP staff resources.

NOTE: The CDB pilot counties reported these costs as "Redirected Staff" on the CBA/IP. Changes have occurred in reporting and claiming these costs so that they should be included in the total M&O costs.

OTHER COSTS (Sections I and II)

Include and describe in detail any other testing, development or implementation costs not mentioned in the previous categories.

COST VARIANCE EXPLANATION (Sections I & II)

Each part requests information about the variance of costs between the approved projected costs made in the CBA/IPs and the actual or projected annual costs (based on the October through December, 1987 period) for both development/implementation and ongoing maintenance and operations costs associated with this function.

SUMMARY OF COSTS/SAVINGS (Section III)

This section requests data that will be used to identify activities, evaluate administrative costs and identify potential savings associated with the operation of the CDB. Part B asks for projected annual savings based on the October through December period. Please identify the three-month period used to project annual savings, if other than October through December period, and explain fully why this period reflects the normal savings. Part C requests annual totals for three areas of name/birthdate matches.

Part A requests a detailed description of the system that the county used to identify potential duplicate participation in welfare programs (AFDC, Food Stamps and Medi-Cal) prior to and after the implementation of the CDB.

Part B requests costing information regarding assistance dollars saved due to implementation of the CDB (October-December, 1987 period) through the identification of potential duplicate participation of recipients. Please explain the methodology used for determining the number of duplicate matches for assistance dollars saved. This methodology should include (at a minimum) the actual number of matches. Data requested will be used to identify potential savings applicable to the AFDC, Food Stamp and/or Medi-Cal programs.

Part C requests annual name/birthdate match totals for: number of matches to be worked, number of matches worked (non-duplicate and duplicate), number of duplicate matches and benefit costs.

Part D asks for a detailed description of the program and/or current administrative benefits that county staff are deriving from the use of the CDB.

Part E asks for a detailed description of any recommended modifications or new applications for SDSS to consider in order to improve the system.

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

COUNTY

ADDRESS

PREPARED BY

TITLE

()

PHONE NUMBER

CONTACT PERSON

TITLE

()

PHONE NUMBER

Return four (4) copies of the completed County Input Document (pages 5 -12)
to:

Department of Social Services
Program Requirements Section
744 P Street, MS 19-53
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Ms. Sandi Russell

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
 CENTRAL DATA BASE
 COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
 FOR THE STATE
 POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

Section I

A. DEVELOPMENT/IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

All variances between approved costs from the CBA/IP and the actual cost must be explained in Section I.B.

	APPROVED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1. EDP Staff Resources		
a. Vendor/Outside Consultant Fee	\$ _____	\$ _____
b. County Central Data Processing Charges (non-CWD)	\$ _____	\$ _____
c. CWD-EDP Staff (ACL 86-73, 86-130)	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL STAFF RESOURCES	\$ _____	\$ _____
2. Site Preparation	\$ _____	\$ _____
3. EDP Supplies (One-Time Only)	\$ _____	\$ _____
4. Operating Costs	\$ _____	\$ _____
5. Other Costs (Specify)		
CWD non-EDP Staff	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL OTHER COSTS	\$ _____	\$ _____
 TOTAL DEVELOPMENT/IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	 \$ _____	 \$ _____

B. COST VARIANCE EXPLANATIONS-DEVELOPMENT/IMPLEMENTATION

1. Please explain fully the variance between approved and actual costs for EDP Staff Resources stated in Section I.A.

2. Please explain fully the variance between approved and actual costs for Site Preparation stated in Section I A.

3. Please explain fully the variance between approved and actual costs for EDP Supplies stated in Section I.A.

4. Please explain fully the variance between approved and actual costs for Operating Costs stated in Section I.A.

5. Please explain fully the variance between approved and actual costs for Other Costs and CWD non-EDP Staff stated in Section I.A.

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
 CENTRAL DATA BASE
 COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
 FOR THE STATE
 POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

Section II

A. ONGOING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS COSTS

All variances between approved costs from the CBA/IP and the projected annual costs must be explained in Section II.B. The basis for the projected annual costs is the actual October 1, 1987 through December 31, 1987 period. If this period does not reflect a normal three-month operation of M&O, please identify and project costs on the more representative three-month period and explain (See A.6).

	APPROVED COSTS	PROJECTED ANNUAL COSTS
1. EDP Staff Resources		
a. Vendor/Outside Consultant Fees	\$ _____	\$ _____
b. County Central Data Processing Charges (non-CWD)	\$ _____	\$ _____
c. CWD-EDP Staff (ACL 86-73, 86-130)	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL STAFF RESOURCE	\$ _____	\$ _____
2. EDP Supplies (One-Time Only)	\$ _____	\$ _____
3. Operating Costs	\$ _____	\$ _____
4. CWD non-EDP Staff	\$ _____	\$ _____
5. Other Costs (Specify)		
Terminals (CPU - Non-Dedicated)	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL OTHER COSTS	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL ONGOING COSTS	\$ _____	\$ _____

6. Please identify the three-month period, if other than October through December period, and explain fully why this period reflects a more representative three-month operation of M&O.

B. COST VARIANCE EXPLANATIONS-ONGOING MAINTENANCE and OPERATIONS

1. Please explain fully the variance between approved and annual projected costs for EDP Staff Resources stated in Section II.A.

2. Please explain fully the variance between approved and projected annual costs for EDP Supplies stated in Section II.A.

3. Please explain fully the variance between approved and projected annual costs for Operating Costs stated in Section II.A.

4. Please explain fully the variance between approved and projected annual costs for CWD non-EDP Staff stated in Section II.A.

5. Please explain fully the variance between approved and projected annual costs for Other Costs stated in Section II.A.

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

Section III

SUMMARY OF COSTS/SAVINGS

PART A - SYSTEM USED TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL DUPLICATE PARTICIPATION PRIOR TO AND AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CDB

Describe the system used by the county before and after the implementation of the CDB to identify potential duplicate participation by persons receiving welfare benefits (AFDC, Food Stamps and Medi-Cal). Attach additional pages as needed.

PART B - ASSISTANCE DOLLARS SAVED DUE TO CDB

		Projected Annual Savings Based on October Through December
1.	AFDC	\$ _____
	Food Stamps	\$ _____
	Medi-Cal	\$ _____
	TOTAL SAVINGS	\$ _____

Please explain the methodology used for determining assistance dollars saved due to the identification of duplicate participation of recipients. This methodology should include, at a minimum, the actual number of matches.

2. Please identify the three-month period used to project annual savings, if other than October through December period, and explain fully why this period reflects a more representative savings.

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

PART C - ANNUAL NAME/BIRTHDATE MATCH

1. Number of Matches To Be Worked (Total from county listing)

AFDC	_____
Food Stamps	_____
Medi-Cal	_____

2. Number of Matches Worked

a. Number of Non-Duplicate Matches (Matches which do not receive duplicate benefits).

	Annual Total
AFDC	_____
Food Stamps	_____
Medi-Cal	_____

b. Number of Duplicate Matches (Matches which did erroneously receive duplicate benefits)

	Annual Total
AFDC	_____
Food Stamps	_____
Medi-Cal	_____

3. Benefit Costs (Benefits paid in error due to duplicate aid being provided to recipient)

	Annual Total
AFDC	\$ _____
Food Stamps	\$ _____
Medi-Cal	\$ _____

STATEWIDE AUTOMATED WELFARE SYSTEM
CENTRAL DATA BASE
COUNTY INPUT DOCUMENT
FOR THE STATE
POST-IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

PART D. BENEFITS AS A RESULT OF CDB SYSTEM DESIGN

The CDB was implemented to readily identify recipients who may be receiving duplicate issuance of welfare benefits. Please list and describe in detail any other benefits the CDB has provided the CWD.

PART E. RECOMMENDATIONS

Please list and fully detail the recommendations for modifications and/or new applications which would help to improve the CDB. An example is the FX 11 transaction code which would link Food Stamp records. Use additional pages as needed.
