

Bulletin

April 5, 2006

Minnesota Department of Human Services □ P.O Box 64941 □ St. Paul, MN 55164-0941

OF INTEREST TO

- County Directors
- County Supervisors
- County Fiscal Supervisors
- County Financial Workers

ACTION/DUE DATE

Please read for information.

EXPIRATION DATE

This bulletin expires within two years or the issuance of a new FSME bulletin- whichever is earlier.

FFY 2005 Food Support Program Management Evaluation (ME) Results Reported; FFY 2006 Management Evaluation Review Process Announced**TOPIC**

The Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005 ME results, and FFY 2006 ME review process.

PURPOSE

To inform counties of the FFY 2005 Food Support ME review results, and FFY 2006 review priorities.

CONTACT

Kathy Bruen, Supervisor
Quality Enhancement Section
Minnesota Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Road N.
St. Paul, MN 55155-3845
Phone: (651) 215-6039
E-mail: Kathy.Bruen@state.mn.us
MAXIS E-mail: JSY

SIGNED

CHARLES E. JOHNSON
Assistant Commissioner
Children and Family Service

BACKGROUND

The two overarching goals of the Food Support Program (FSP) are to improve nutrition of children and low-income people, and to improve stewardship of federal funds through effective and efficient administration of the Food Support Program. States, counties, localities and community organizations all play a role in achieving these goals.

The Food Support Management Evaluation (FSME) is required by federal regulation and is conducted to ensure that the FS Program is being administered as efficiently and effectively as possible. The FSME process can be a tool to help both states and counties identify service delivery issues and improve the FS Program access and delivery system. Regulations require county site visits using a schedule based on county caseload size. Counties are required to develop and submit corrective action plans in review areas that do not meet or exceed performance standards.

Overall, review priorities from FFY 2004 to FFY 2005 remained the same and supported improved performance on the four federal performance measures, which in turn, support the primary goals of the Food Support Program as indicated above. Not all of the FSME review areas are directly tied to the performance measures outlined below:

- Participant Access Index (PAI) – Measures the state's success in promoting access, and minimizing or removing barriers to the FSP for families, children and individuals.
- Application Processing Timeliness Rate – Measures the state's ability to process applications within expedited and 30-day timeframes.
- Payment Accuracy Rate – Measures how accurately the state manages benefits on active cases to ensure accuracy for customers and help preserve public confidence in the program.
- Negative Error Rate – Measures the extent to which the state reduces, terminates or denies benefits appropriately.

SUMMARY

The Participant Access Index (PAI)

The access index is the number of FS participants as a percent of people below 125% of poverty and is determined by the Food and Nutrition Service using administrative data and Census Bureau data.

The eight states who received a bonus on this measure for FFY 2004 had an access index between 92.4 percent and 97.2 percent, and for the most improved, the improvement fell between 14.2 percent and 23.9 percent. The most recent DHS estimate shows Minnesota's average participation at 72 percent.

Excellent customer service can play an extremely important role in program access. The majority of counties did well on most of the customer service practices reviewed. However, three areas were cited most frequently as needing improvement; informing applicants about the importance of filing the first page of the Combined Application Form (CAF) (40%), not clearly posting

agency hours (22%), and monitoring customer complaints to determine if patterns exist that may contribute to lower access rates (15%).

Counties continue to struggle determining FS eligibility when MFIP is denied or terminated (79%). Twenty-one counties required corrective action on this measure. In contrast, counties reviewed did well determining FS when DWP was terminated (94%). Only one county required corrective action.

Application Processing Timeliness Rate – Using quality control data to measure, the rate for 30-day and expedited are combined for an overall timely processing rate.

The six states with the best combined application processing timeliness rate ranged from 96.81 percent to 98.67 percent. As of September 2005, Minnesota's timely processing rate was 87.2 percent. FSME results are similar with a combined processing rate of 86 percent. The FSME provides additional individualized data for counties to supplement quality control data. Two counties required corrective action on the 30-day processing measure and twenty-two counties on the expedited service component.

Payment Accuracy Rate – Based on quality control reviews of 1,017 cases across the state in FFY 2005, measures the accuracy of benefits issued.

The error rate for the seven states who received a bonus on this measure for FFY 2004 ranged from 1.97 percent to 4.15 percent. The three states who received a bonus for the most improved rate ranged between improvement of 4.47 percent and 6.92 percent. Minnesota's error rate as of September 2005 is 7.2 percent. The goal for FFY 2006 is to avoid sanction by decreasing the error rate to below 6 percent. The long term goal is to achieve an error rate in a competitive range for either the "best" or "most improved" categories.

The FSME does not target the four most error prone case types during the FSME (cases with earnings, complicated household composition, shelter and utility deductions). However, DHS quality control reviews over 1,000 cases per year and reports error findings monthly. Quality control accuracy reports can be found at: <http://www.dhs.state.mn>, then click on "County and tribal workers", and click on "county reports" on the menu to the left. In addition to using quality control data, DHS relies on counties to conduct second party case reviews to determine the type and nature of errors in their individual county, and devise corrective action strategies to improve their county error rate.

While not in the top error category, counties continue to struggle identifying non-citizen status and coding MAXIS accurately (77%). MAXIS is programmed to determine eligibility correctly if the correct status is identified and entered on the IMIG panel. Seventeen of thirty-three counties required corrective action in this area. The benchmark for performance on this measure is 90%.

Negative Error Rate – Based on quality control reviews, measures the extent to which counties reduce, terminate or deny benefits appropriately.

For FFY 2005, there were no FSME components directly tied to the negative actions measure. However, two review components have been added to the FFY 2006 ME related to negative actions.

Minnesota is currently ranked number one in the nation for accuracy on this measure for FFY 2005.

Detailed information on the FS performance bonus structure can be found at:

<http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov> Click on drop down bar and select "Title 7 Agriculture", click Go. Click on sections 210-299 Food and Nutrition Service. Click on [275.1 to 275.24](#), PERFORMANCE REPORTING SYSTEM. Scroll down to Subpart G, program performance and click on 275.24. See also Attachment "B".

Other Review Components - The FSME review includes components that target requirements to comply with various parts of FS regulations, civil rights laws, data and EBT security requirements, as well as compliance with the Income Eligibility Verification System (IEVS). Finally, FSME reviews focus on promoting customer service practices that help to identify and minimize barriers to program access, and support the overall goals of the Food Support Program.

- **Civil Rights Review** - During the FSME review, a sample of minority and non-minority cases were reviewed to determine if significant differences existed in case results in the following processing areas: thirty-day, expedited, and determination of FS on MFIP denials. Overall, review results found no evidence of disparate treatment in case processing practices. The results were similar to results across the state.
- **IEVS processing** - Counties continue to make progress in processing IEVS matches timely. Data from the most recent IEVS timeliness report (Infopac FN750301) indicates the state is resolving matches timely approximately 83% of the time. This is tremendous improvement since DHS began focusing attention on this area three years ago. Minnesota must continue its efforts to keep IEVS matches resolved timely 80% of the time to avoid the potential for fiscal sanction.
- **IRS Data Security** - Overall, very good results were achieved in protecting sensitive material by ensuring that computer terminals are locked when workers leave their desks, and passwords were not reportedly being shared. Thirty-two agencies passed the IRS security review, and one agency was cited having left MAXIS up when the worker was away from his/her desk.

Pages five through fourteen contain detailed results from the FFY 2005 FSME and identify areas to be targeted for FFY 2006. Areas to be reviewed in FFY 2006 are indicated at the end of each section in bold.

DETAILED FINDINGS FROM FFY 2005 FSME AND REVIEW PLAN FOR FFY 2006:

The following 33 counties, were reviewed in FFY 2005:

Anoka, Beltrami, Cottonwood, Dakota, Douglas, Faribault, Fillmore, Goodhue, Hennepin, Kanabec, Kandiyohi, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, Meeker, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Murray, Norman, Pennington, Pipestone, Pope, Ramsey, Renville, Rock, Roseau, St. Louis, Scott, Sherburne, Waseca, Washington, Watonwan, Winona.

The following 30 counties, and one tribe are scheduled for review in FFY 2006:

Aitkin, Becker, Benton, Blue Earth, Cass, Crow Wing, Hennepin, Houston, Jackson, Kittson, Lake of the Woods, Le Sueur, Marshall, Mower, Mahnomen, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe, Nicollet, Nobles, Olmsted, Polk, Ramsey, Rice, Steele, Stearns, Swift, Todd, Wabasha, Wadena, Wright, Yellow Medicine.

Program Access

Local Office FS Participation Analysis

In 2001, Minnesota implemented a Food Support Outreach Initiative to accomplish the following goals; educating the community about the purpose and use of the FSP; dispelling the myths currently associated with the FSP; increasing access to information and applications of the FSP through county and community involvement; and finally increasing participation in the FSP, especially among the working poor and elderly.

Minnesota's average participation in the FS Program as of June 2005 was 72%, an increase from 70% during the same period of CY 2004. Statewide, as of the same period, 15 counties had an average of 72% or more individuals participating, and 72 counties were below 72%. The highest participating county was at 102% (Anoka), and the lowest level of average participation was 23% (Cook).

The FSME provides an opportunity for the DHS to review and provide feedback on agency policies and practices that may enhance or detract from access to the FS Program. During the FFY 2005 reviews, quality enhancement reviewers conducted interviews with agency staff and customers, observed agency operations and application procedures, reviewed case files for timely and accurate application processing, expedited service, and MFIP denials and terminations.

Specifically, reviewers observed whether agency hours were clearly displayed, if posters displaying FS processing standards and notification of the right to apply the same day of agency contact were visible, and determined if phone, internet and access to agency staff was adequate.

Reviewers identified agency procedures related to; availability of FS applications, whether individuals requesting assistance were encouraged to file an application the same day, timeliness of interviews, verification process, screening for expedited service, use of same day interview, face-to-face interviews, whether a single interview was conducted for all programs, notification to customers who missed interviews of their responsibility to reschedule within 30 days, and customer complaint tracking and resolution.

Finally, reviewers observed if staff was available throughout the business day to take applications, if the agency offered extended hours, the general helpfulness of agency staff, and whether the availability of other programs and resources were communicated to applicants.

Results:

Nine of 32 counties reviewed adhered to the customer service practices identified above. The remaining 23 required improvement in one or more customer service practices. Counties reviewed in FFY 2004 showed similar results.

- The most prevalent practice not evident was informing applicants about the importance of filing the first page of the Combined Application Form which can cause service delays— 13 counties (40%).
- The second most common service deficiency was a lack of clearly posted hours. To support the large number of FS recipients working, it is important that applicants and recipients know when the office is open for service – 5 counties (22%).
- The third most common missing practice is maintenance of a customer complaint file. Reviewers heard consistently that complaints were addressed, however, it was not clear how many agencies were able to identify customer service trends in their agency that may detract from program access – five counties (15%).
- Three counties (9%) were not providing applications when requested and application packets contained outdated materials.
- Three counties needed improvement on their phone service – one phone system did not allow a caller to speak with a live person, and in the other instance calls were not returned timely (within 24 hours).
- The following customer service issues were identified in one or two counties. These counties did not: explain eligibility for expedited service, inform applicants how long the process may take, enter the CAF page one on the day received, secure EBT cards at the end of the day, contact applicants who dropped off applications of their follow-up responsibilities, inform applicant of other potential helping resources, have staff available during all open office hours, and display FS information in an easy to see location.

FFY 2006 FSME: Attachment C is a checklist of fourteen specific customer service practices that if not found will require corrective action. In addition, reviewers will gather practices that appear to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency in administering the FS Program as well as make recommendations for change. Counties will be required to respond to recommendations. The checklist also includes these items.

MFIP Denials and Terminations

Case files are reviewed to determine if stand-alone FS eligibility, including categorical eligibility is determined at time of denial or termination. Case notes must be written when determinations are made.

Results:

MFIP Denials – Four hundred sixty MFIP denials were reviewed to determine if Food Support was considered; including a review for categorical eligibility. Seventy-eight percent of cases reviewed were correct. The most improved subset of cases was those with FS determinations, but no consideration of categorical eligibility.

The following chart shows a breakdown of case review results for MFIP denials. Results are rounded up.

MFIP Denials

| | FFY 2005 Cases Reviewed = 460 | FFY 2004 Cases Reviewed = 462 | FFY 2003 Cases Reviewed = 518 |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Correct | 78% 358 cases | 70% 324 cases | 19% 100 cases |
| Incorrect – FS eligibility was not determined | 3% 13 cases | 4% 20 cases | 12% 59 cases |
| Incorrect – FS determined, but categorical eligibility was not considered | 19% 89 cases | 25% 118 cases | 69% 359 cases |

MFIP Terminations – Five hundred twenty-seven MFIP terminations were reviewed. Eighty percent of the cases were correct for determining FS, including categorical eligibility upon termination of MFIP.

The following chart provides more information on review findings. Results are rounded up.

MFIP Terminations

| | FFY 2005 Cases Reviewed = 527 | FFY 2004 Cases Reviewed = 475 | FFY 2003 Cases Reviewed = 466 |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Correct | 80% 419 cases | 78% 372 cases | 8% 39 cases |
| Incorrect – FS eligibility was not determined | 11% 60 cases | 12% 56 cases | 59% 274 cases |
| Incorrect – FS determined, but categorical eligibility was not considered | 9% 48 cases | 10% 47 cases | 33% 153 cases |

Results for MFIP denials and terminations were averaged together, and results indicated in the chart above are similar to results from 2004. Twenty-one agencies required corrective action in FFY 2005, compared to 28 agencies in 2004.

FFY 2006 FSME: The review component for denials and terminations has been expanded to include the following:

Denials:

- MFIP cases only – Was stand alone FS considered?
- MFIP and FS cases – Did denial occur within 30 days? Did agency allow 10 days to provide verifications? Was categorical eligibility considered?
- FS cases only – Was pending notice sent on 30th day? Was denial reason valid?

Terminations:

- MFIP cases only – Was stand alone FS considered? Were members added to FS at time of MFIP termination if required?
- MFIP and FS cases – was 10 days allowed to provide verifications? Was categorical eligibility considered? Was appropriate adverse action notice given?
- FS only cases – Was termination reason valid?

DWP Terminations – Two hundred ninety-two DWP terminations were reviewed to determine if eligibility for Food Support, including categorical eligibility, was determined. Ninety-seven percent of the cases reviewed were correct. Only one county required corrective action. This area was not reviewed in FFY 2004.

The following chart provides details of review findings. Results are rounded up.

DWP Terminations

| | FFY 2005 Cases Reviewed = 292 |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Correct | 97% 284 cases |
| Incorrect – FS Eligibility was not determined. | 0% 0 cases |
| Incorrect – FS determined, but categorical eligibility was not considered. | 3% 8 cases |

FFY 2006 FSME: Based on the high accuracy rate in determining FS when DWP is terminated, this area will not be reviewed.

Application Processing Timeliness

30-Day Application Processing

Minnesota must achieve a timely processing rate of 98% or above as measured by quality control data to be competitive for a bonus on this measure. When determining overall performance to qualify for bonus funds, *FNS combines the quality control 30-day and expedited processing rates*. Success on this measure ensures that applicants are receiving benefits they are entitled to with a minimum waiting period.

Minnesota typically does well on the 30-day measure, but continues to struggle identifying and issuing expedited FS benefits. Counties who processing rate fell below 90% on either the 30-day or expedited measure were required to develop a corrective action plan.

Results:

A total of 347 cases (182 FS and 165 MFIP) were reviewed for timeliness of application processing of which 98% percent of the cases reviewed met 30-day processing requirements. Two agencies were required to develop and implement a corrective action plan. This is up from 97% of the counties reviewed in FFY 2004.

The following chart shows a breakdown of results for FFY 2005 & 2004. Results are rounded up.

Thirty Day Processing FFY 2005 & overall results for FFY 2004

| | FS Approvals Reviewed = 139 | FS Denials Reviewed = 43 | MFIP Approvals Reviewed = 104 | MFIP Denials Reviewed = 61 | | Total Cases Reviewed = 347 | 2004 Total Cases Reviewed = 380 |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Correct | 97% 135 cases | 88% 38 cases | 96% 100 cases | 100% 61 cases | | 96% 334 cases | 97% 368 cases |
| Incorrect – not processed within 30 days | 3% 4 cases | 12% 5 cases | 4% 4 cases | 0% 0 cases | | 2% 13 cases | 3% 12 cases |

Expedited Services

FS households appearing eligible for expedited services should be interviewed the day they file an application, and receive benefits within 24 hours of the interview.

Results:

A total of 540 cases appearing to meet expedited processing criteria were evaluated for timeliness of the interview and issuance. Seventy-four percent were processed correctly. The most problematic area for both FS and MFIP cases continues to be providing a same-day interview. Most of the cases with FS expedited service delays lacked documentation of the reason for the delay. Twenty-two agencies were required to develop corrective actions for this area.

The following chart shows a breakdown of review results for FFY 2004 & 2005. Results are rounded up.

Expedited Processing FFY 2005

| | Total FS Cases Reviewed = 304 | Total MFIP Cases Reviewed = 235 | | Total Cases Reviewed = 539 |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Correct | 77% 234 cases | 69% 162 cases | | 73% 396 cases |
| Incorrect for timely interview | 12% 37 cases | 13% 31 cases | | 13% 68 cases |
| Incorrect for timely issuance | 6% 17 cases | 11% 26 cases | | 8% 43 cases |
| Incorrect for both timely interview and issuance | 5% 16 cases | 7% 16 cases | | 6% 32 cases |

Expedited Processing FFY 2004

| | Total FS Cases Reviewed = 278 | Total MFIP Cases Reviewed = 217 | | Total Cases Reviewed = 495 |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Correct | 65% 180 cases | 61% 132 cases | | 63% 312 cases |
| Incorrect for timely interview | 18% 50 cases | 15% 33 cases | | 17% 83 cases |
| Incorrect for timely issuance | 9% 24 cases | 12% 26 cases | | 10% 50 cases |
| Incorrect for both timely interview and issuance | 9% 24 cases | 12% 26 cases | | 10% 50 cases |

FFY 2006 FSME: While significant progress has been made in accurately screening for and issuing expedited benefits in a timely manner, this area will continue to be reviewed. Expedited review results for FFY 2003 = 58%, FFY 2004 = 64% and FFY 2005 = 74%. As mentioned previously, bonus funds are awarded based on a processing rate that combines 30-day processing with expedited processing. The combined rate for FFY 2005 using ME findings is 86%. As of September 2005, the timeliness rate using quality control data was 87%.

Payment Accuracy

Food Support and MFIP/Food – Duplicate participation

Individuals cannot receive food assistance on more than one MFIP or FS case except in certain circumstances involving battered women's shelters (CM 11.21). To reduce the number of duplicate FS participants, a MAXIS program enhancement was installed in November 2005. Since this install, individuals receiving duplicate assistance have dropped from 151 individuals in November 2005 to 29 in January 2006! Counties should still use Infopac report FV120102, entitled, "Duplicate FS Eligibility by Person" created 12/26/03 to identify the few remaining individuals.

FFY 2006 FSME: Due to the effectiveness of the MAXIS enhancement this area will not be discussed with counties during the ME Review.

Non-Citizen Review

Reviewers determined whether U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) documentation in the case file was up to date and the IMIG panel in MAXIS was coded correctly. Accuracy on this review element affects program access, payment accuracy and is critical in determining federal or state food assistance correctly.

The immigration status of 681 FS applicants and/or participants was reviewed. Five hundred twenty-seven (78%) of these individuals had current USCIS data on MAXIS and supporting documentation in the hard file. Three counties had no non-citizen cases to review. Seventeen agencies required corrective action. The most common errors were expired or lack of documentation regarding status. Review results were similar to FFY 2004.

| | FFY 2005 Individuals reviewed = 681 | FFY 2004 Individual Reviewed = 444 |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Correct | 77% 527 individuals | 78% 350 individuals |
| Incorrect | 23% 154 individuals | 21% 94 individuals |

FFY 2006 FSME: This highly error prone area will continue to be reviewed.

Income Eligibility Verification System (IEVS)

Minnesota is very close to maintaining a standard of resolving 80 percent of all IEVS matches within 45 days. The latest IEVS Quarterly Timeliness Report FN750301 indicated an IEVS timely resolution rate of 84% for quarter ending September 2005, and 83% for quarter ending December 2005.

Eight counties required corrective action in resolving 80% of their IEVS matches within 45 days. A cumulative average of 72% of IEVS matches were resolved timely in the counties reviewed for FFY 2005 using MAXIS REPT/IEVC.

FFY 2006 FSME: IEVS matches for counties will continue to be monitored for timely resolution using INFOPAC report FN750301. Performance below the 80 percent benchmark will require completion of a corrective action plan. Counties should continue to use REPT/IEVC to monitor and resolve overdue matches on a monthly basis.

Negative Actions

Based on quality control reviews of 840 cases in FFY 2005, Minnesota is first in the nation for FFY 2005 in accurately denying or terminating Food Support cases. The official negative error rate will be announced by FNS this summer.

For FFY 2005, reviewers were focused on a different aspect of negative actions than what quality control evaluates for. The FSME focused on whether FS benefits were considered at the time of a termination or denial. Quality Control reviews focus on whether or not the denial or termination was for a valid reason.

FFY 2006 FSME: In addition to determining whether FS is being considered on FS and MFIP cases that are denied or terminated, the review will be expanded to also include; timeliness of denial (within 30 days), and review of whether 10 days was allowed to provide verifications. For FS cases only, reviewers will determine if pending notices were sent on the 30th day, or in the case of termination whether appropriate adverse action notice was given, and whether the denial reason was valid. On MFIP terminations, reviewers will determine if “Uncle Harry” household members were added to the FS unit at the time of MFIP termination.

Civil Rights Review

For FFY 2005, the civil rights review included; a MAXIS system review of cases for expedited service, 30-day processing, and MFIP denials to identify possible disparities in treatment between minority and non-minority households; county completion of a civil rights/affirmative action questionnaire, and collateral contacts with client service and advocacy groups in each project area.

No disparities were identified in the cases reviewed for the 33 counties. Minority and non-minority households received similar FS services with respect to expedited service, 30-day application processing and evaluation for stand-alone FS and/or categorical eligibility when MFIP was denied.

The following charts provide additional information on review findings in this area.

Civil Rights Review – 30-Day Application Processing

| | Non-Minority 30-Day Cases Reviewed = 225 | Minority 30-Day Cases Reviewed = 160 |
|-----------|---|---|
| Correct | 97% 219 cases | 97% 155 cases |
| Incorrect | 3% 6 cases | 3% 5 cases |

Civil Rights Review – Expedited Service

| | Non-Minority Expedited Cases Reviewed = 340 | Minority Expedited Cases Reviewed = 189 |
|-----------|--|--|
| Correct | 74% 253 cases | 70% 132 cases |
| Incorrect | 26% 87 cases | 30% 57 cases |

Civil Rights Review – MFIP Denials

| | Non-Minority MFIP Denial Cases Reviewed = 279 | Minority MFIP Denial Cases Reviewed = 156 |
|-----------|--|--|
| Correct | 78% 217 cases | 79% 124 cases |
| Incorrect | 22% 62 cases | 21% 32 cases |

FFY 2006 FSME: The civil rights review remains the same.

Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT)

The areas reviewed were EBT card accountability, EBT system security and access, and EBT roles and duties. Overall, agencies are doing well to keep EBT cards secure. The following issues were identified in a few counties: six counties were not physically counting their inventory on a regular basis, four counties were not using two people to do the inventory count, and two counties were not locking up cards during the day. DHS recommends locking cards during the day, and assigning two staff who do not issue benefits to count cards on a regular basis.

FFY 2006 FSME: Over the last three years, all counties have been reviewed for appropriate EBT security and relatively few have needed corrective action. This component of the review will not be included for FFY 2006. Instead, reviewers will determine if agencies have attempted to notify clients who have FS benefits scheduled to be moved off line (aged) when not accessed for 90 days. The notification should include information on when and how the client can get their benefits reinstated. (See MAXIS e-mail #6830065 sent 1/18/06, and POLI/TEMP TE16.03 Aging of Benefits).

In addition, two special projects will be conducted as part of the FFY 2006 FSME review. In the first, DHS staff will select a sample of cases from an Infopac report to determine if EBT cards have been replaced by the agency within two business days after notification of lost or stolen card. The second special review will be done to determine if Minnesota's EBT automated issuance schedule is being adhered to.

IRS Data Security

Overall, very good results were achieved in protecting sensitive material by ensuring that computer terminals are locked when workers leave their desks and passwords are protected. Thirty-two agencies passed the IRS security review. One instance was found of MAXIS being visible when the worker was away from his/her desk.

FFY 2006 FSME: IRS data security will again be evaluated for FFY 2006. Reviewers will observe whether workers lock, log off, or shut down system while away from his/her desk, and whether monitors in public areas are visible to others who walk by. Reviewers will inquire about password sharing policy.

Recipient Claims Management

FFY 2006 FSME: The Program Integrity section will focus its audit efforts on Hennepin County for FFY 2006. Hennepin County accounts for approximately 30 percent of total cash and food benefits issued so they have a large impact on all aspects of state performance, including recipient claims management.

The focus of the audit will be to review county procedures for establishing and recovering claims for FS and MFIP-Food. A sample of FS and MFIP- Food claims established in the past year will be reviewed to determine the correctness of the claim and any collection efforts. In addition, a random sample of FS and MFIP cases will be reviewed to determine whether a claim should have been established based upon known case information, i.e. IEVS matches, 30-day reporting, case notes, case documentation, etc.

Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNE)

For FFY 2005, Minnesota received a waiver from FNS to develop a review process and to pilot the review in one project site (rather than two as required). Review activities included; financial integrity review to determine if effective processes were in place to account for appropriate cost allocations and program income, and to determine if time and effort reporting documents were kept. Reviewers observed nutrition education delivery and targeting of delivery to FSP eligibles. Reviewers found no discrepancies in targeted review areas.

FFY 2006 FSME: The Department will use review guides and surveys developed and review two project sites. A metro area project site and out state project site will be selected. In addition, reviewers will determine whether county agencies are informing FS applicants and participants of opportunities to participate in FSNE services, and inquire about coordination efforts between counties and food support nutrition education efforts.

SPECIAL NEEDS

This information is available in other forms to persons with disabilities by calling 651-296-4410, (effective April 10, 651-431-3936), or contacts us through the Minnesota Relay Service at 1 (800)-627-3529 (TTY) or 1 (877) 627-3848 (speech-to-speech relay service).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: "FFY 2005 ME Review Results from Case Reviews"

Attachment B: "Performance Measures for the FSP – High Performance Bonuses"

Attachment C: "FFY 2006 Program Access Checklist"

| FFY 2005 ME Reviews | ME review cycle | # of cases rev'd | # correct | CAP? | 30-Day Processing | # of cases rev'd | # correct | CAP? | Expedited Service |
|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | | | | % correct | | | | % correct |
| Anoka | 2 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 25 | 23 | N | 92.0% |
| Beltrami | 2 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 24 | 19 | Y | 79.2% |
| Cottonwood | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 15 | 12 | Y | 80.0% |
| Dakota | 2 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 23 | 17 | Y | 73.9% |
| Douglas | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 8 | Y | 57.1% |
| Faribault/Martin | 3 | 20 | 20 | N | 100.0% | 29 | 28 | N | 96.6% |
| Fillmore | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 14 | N | 100.0% |
| Goodhue | 3 | 9 | 9 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 14 | N | 100.0% |
| Hennepin | 1 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 33 | 30 | N | 90.9% |
| Kanabec | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 12 | 9 | Y | 75.0% |
| Kandiyohi | 2 | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% | 24 | 16 | Y | 66.7% |
| Lincoln | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 2 | 2 | N | 100.0% |
| Lyon | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 13 | 11 | Y | 84.6% |
| Meeker | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 15 | 14 | N | 93.3% |
| Mille Lacs | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 14 | N | 100.0% |
| Morrison | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 15 | 8 | Y | 53.3% |
| Murray | 3 | 9 | 8 | Y | 88.9% | 11 | 10 | N | 90.9% |
| Norman | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 12 | Y | 85.7% |
| Pennington | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 15 | 2 | Y | 13.3% |
| Pipestone | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 7 | Y | 50.0% |
| Pope | 3 | 10 | 7 | Y | 70.0% | 9 | 7 | Y | 77.8% |
| Ramsey | 1 | 25 | 25 | N | 100.0% | 32 | 12 | Y | 37.5% |
| Renville | 3 | 15 | 15 | N | 100.0% | 15 | 11 | Y | 73.3% |
| Rock | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 13 | 12 | N | 92.3% |
| Roseau | 3 | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% | 14 | 11 | Y | 78.6% |
| Scott | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 7 | Y | 50.0% |
| Sherburne | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 15 | 13 | Y | 86.7% |
| St. Louis | 2 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 27 | 20 | Y | 74.1% |
| Waseca | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 13 | 8 | Y | 61.5% |
| Washington | 2 | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% | 24 | 17 | Y | 70.8% |
| Watonwan | 3 | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% | 10 | 6 | Y | 60.0% |
| Winona | 3 | 9 | 9 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 4 | Y | 28.6% |
| Totals | | 347 | 340 | | | 540 | 398 | | |
| Cumulative avg | | | 98.0% | | | | 73.7% | | |
| CAPS - Y | | | | 2 | | | | 22 | |
| CAPS - N | | | | 30 | | | | 10 | |

| FFY 2005 ME Reviews | # of cases rev'd | # correct | MFIP Denials | # of cases rev'd | # correct | MFIP Terms | # of cases rev'd | # correct | CAP? | MFIP Denial/Terms Combined |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | | % correct | | | % correct | | | | % correct |
| Anoka | 25 | 23 | 92.0% | 25 | 22 | 88.0% | 50 | 45 | N | 90.0% |
| Beltrami | 25 | 16 | 64.0% | 19 | 11 | 57.9% | 44 | 27 | Y | 61.4% |
| Cottonwood | 15 | 12 | 80.0% | 15 | 4 | 26.7% | 30 | 16 | Y | 53.3% |
| Dakota | 24 | 11 | 45.8% | 25 | 18 | 72.0% | 49 | 29 | Y | 59.2% |
| Douglas | 10 | 7 | 70.0% | 15 | 14 | 93.3% | 25 | 21 | Y | 84.0% |
| Faribault/Martin | 25 | 19 | 76.0% | 25 | 24 | 96.0% | 50 | 43 | Y | 86.0% |
| Fillmore | 7 | 6 | 85.7% | 13 | 12 | 92.3% | 20 | 18 | N | 90.0% |
| Goodhue | 11 | 10 | 90.9% | 15 | 14 | 93.3% | 26 | 24 | N | 92.3% |
| Hennepin | 34 | 20 | 58.8% | 35 | 32 | 91.4% | 69 | 52 | Y | 75.4% |
| Kanabec | 6 | 4 | 66.7% | 15 | 15 | 100.0% | 21 | 19 | N | 90.5% |
| Kandiyohi | 25 | 21 | 84.0% | 25 | 21 | 84.0% | 50 | 42 | Y | 84.0% |
| Lincoln | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 2 | 2 | 100.0% | 3 | 3 | N | 100.0% |
| Lyon | 15 | 15 | 100.0% | 15 | 14 | 93.3% | 30 | 29 | N | 96.7% |
| Meeker | 13 | 11 | 84.6% | 12 | 4 | 33.3% | 25 | 15 | Y | 60.0% |
| Mille Lacs | 7 | 7 | 100.0% | 7 | 7 | 100.0% | 14 | 14 | N | 100.0% |
| Morrison | 7 | 7 | 100.0% | 15 | 14 | 93.3% | 22 | 21 | N | 95.5% |
| Murray | 0 | 0 | n/a | 9 | 9 | 100.0% | 9 | 9 | N | 100.0% |
| Norman | 5 | 4 | 80.0% | 9 | 9 | 100.0% | 14 | 13 | N | 92.9% |
| Pennington | 15 | 13 | 86.7% | 15 | 9 | 60.0% | 30 | 22 | Y | 73.3% |
| Pipestone | 12 | 9 | 75.0% | 7 | 2 | 28.6% | 19 | 11 | Y | 57.9% |
| Pope | 9 | 8 | 88.9% | 15 | 9 | 60.0% | 24 | 17 | Y | 70.8% |
| Ramsey | 25 | 21 | 84.0% | 35 | 26 | 74.3% | 60 | 47 | Y | 78.3% |
| Renville | 15 | 13 | 86.7% | 15 | 13 | 86.7% | 30 | 26 | Y | 86.7% |
| Rock | 6 | 5 | 83.3% | 9 | 9 | 100.0% | 15 | 14 | N | 93.3% |
| Roseau | 4 | 2 | 50.0% | 11 | 7 | 63.6% | 15 | 9 | Y | 60.0% |
| Scott | 15 | 12 | 80.0% | 15 | 10 | 66.7% | 30 | 22 | Y | 73.3% |
| Sherburne | 15 | 12 | 80.0% | 15 | 13 | 86.7% | 30 | 25 | Y | 83.3% |
| St. Louis | 24 | 17 | 70.8% | 25 | 17 | 68.0% | 49 | 34 | Y | 69.4% |
| Waseca | 10 | 10 | 100.0% | 15 | 12 | 80.0% | 25 | 22 | Y | 88.0% |
| Washington | 25 | 19 | 76.0% | 25 | 23 | 92.0% | 50 | 42 | Y | 84.0% |
| Watonwan | 15 | 13 | 86.7% | 14 | 13 | 92.9% | 29 | 26 | Y | 89.7% |
| Winona | 15 | 10 | 66.7% | 15 | 10 | 66.7% | 30 | 20 | Y | 66.7% |
| Totals | 460 | 358 | | 527 | 419 | | 987 | 777 | | |
| Cumulative avg | | 77.8% | | | 79.5% | | | 78.7% | | |
| CAPS - Y | | | | | | | | | 21 | |
| CAPS - N | | | | | | | | | 11 | |

| FFY 2005 ME Reviews | # of cases rev'd | # correct | CAP? | DWP Terms |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | | % correct |
| Anoka | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Beltrami | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Cottonwood | 15 | 14 | N | 93.3% |
| Dakota | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Douglas | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Faribault/Martin | 18 | 18 | N | 100.0% |
| Fillmore | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% |
| Goodhue | 10 | 8 | Y | 80.0% |
| Hennepin | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Kanabec | 11 | 10 | N | 90.9% |
| Kandiyohi | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | 5 | 5 | N | 100.0% |
| Lyon | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Meeker | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% |
| Mille Lacs | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% |
| Morrison | 5 | 5 | N | 100.0% |
| Murray | 5 | 5 | N | 100.0% |
| Norman | 9 | 9 | N | 100.0% |
| Pennington | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Pipestone | 7 | 7 | N | 100.0% |
| Pope | 5 | 5 | N | 100.0% |
| Ramsey | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Renville | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Rock | 4 | 4 | N | 100.0% |
| Roseau | 3 | 3 | N | 100.0% |
| Scott | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Sherburne | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| St. Louis | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Waseca | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% |
| Washington | 9 | 9 | N | 100.0% |
| Watonwan | 7 | 7 | N | 100.0% |
| Winona | 10 | 10 | N | 100.0% |
| Totals | 293 | 285 | | |
| Cumulative avg | | 97.3% | | |
| CAPS - Y | | | 1 | |
| CAPS - N | | | 31 | |

| FFY 2005 ME Reviews | # of people rev'd | # correct | CAP? | Non-Citizen | # of cases rev'd | # correct | CAP? | Spoken/ Written Language |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| | | | | % correct | | | | % correct |
| Anoka | 68 | 63 | N | 92.6% | 25 | 23 | N | 92.0% |
| Beltrami | 4 | 1 | Y | 25.0% | 4 | 4 | N | 100.0% |
| Cottonwood | 20 | 12 | Y | 60.0% | 15 | 11 | Y | 73.3% |
| Dakota | 55 | 47 | Y | 85.5% | 25 | 20 | Y | 80.0% |
| Douglas | 5 | 4 | Y | 80.0% | 5 | 4 | Y | 80.0% |
| Faribault/Martin | 20 | 19 | N | 95.0% | 19 | 19 | N | 100.0% |
| Fillmore | 0 | 0 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | n/a | n/a |
| Goodhue | 13 | 8 | Y | 61.5% | 8 | 8 | N | 100.0% |
| Hennepin | 64 | 51 | Y | 79.7% | 35 | 26 | Y | 74.3% |
| Kanabec | 2 | 1 | Y | 50.0% | 2 | 2 | N | 100.0% |
| Kandiyohi | 34 | 27 | Y | 79.4% | 23 | 18 | Y | 78.3% |
| Lincoln | 0 | 0 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | n/a | n/a |
| Lyon | 34 | 32 | N | 94.1% | 15 | 11 | Y | 73.3% |
| Meeker | 10 | 9 | N | 90.0% | 9 | 9 | N | 100.0% |
| Mille Lacs | 1 | 1 | N | 100.0% | 1 | 1 | N | 100.0% |
| Morrison | 1 | 0 | Y | 0.0% | 1 | 1 | N | 100.0% |
| Murray | 4 | 4 | N | 100.0% | 3 | 1 | Y | 33.3% |
| Norman | 1 | 1 | N | 100.0% | 1 | 1 | N | 100.0% |
| Pennington | 11 | 5 | Y | 45.5% | 8 | 8 | N | 100.0% |
| Pipestone | 4 | 4 | N | 100.0% | 3 | 3 | N | 100.0% |
| Pope | 0 | 0 | n/a | | 0 | 0 | n/a | n/a |
| Ramsey | 83 | 60 | Y | 72.3% | 35 | 28 | Y | 80.0% |
| Renville | 15 | 15 | N | 100.0% | 14 | 12 | Y | 85.7% |
| Rock | 15 | 12 | Y | 80.0% | 6 | 6 | N | 100.0% |
| Roseau | 4 | 4 | N | 100.0% | 3 | 3 | N | 100.0% |
| Scott | 45 | 29 | Y | 64.4% | 15 | 12 | Y | 80.0% |
| Sherburne | 29 | 21 | Y | 72.4% | 14 | 12 | Y | 85.7% |
| St. Louis | 45 | 27 | Y | 60.0% | 25 | 23 | N | 92.0% |
| Waseca | 13 | 12 | N | 92.3% | 11 | 10 | N | 90.9% |
| Washington | 32 | 22 | Y | 68.8% | 25 | 21 | Y | 84.0% |
| Watonwan | 17 | 15 | Y | 88.2% | 15 | 14 | N | 93.3% |
| Winona | 32 | 18 | Y | 56.3% | 15 | 8 | Y | 53.3% |
| Totals | 681 | 524 | | | 380 | 319 | | |
| Cumulative avg | | 76.9% | 3 | | | 83.9% | 3 | |
| CAPS - Y | | | 18 | | | | 13 | |
| CAPS - N | | | 11 | | | | 16 | |

Attachment B

Performance Measures for the Food Support Program - High Performance Bonuses

Participant Access Rate

- ◆ \$12 million total
- ◆ Divided among the 4 states with the highest and the 4 states with the most improved participant access rate
- ◆ Measured by census data and state administrative data. The numerator will be the average monthly state participation as reported to FNS. The denominator will be the number of people below the poverty line in each state.

Application Processing Timeliness

- ◆ \$6 million total
- ◆ Divided among the 6 states with the highest percentage of timely processed applications
- ◆ Measured by QC data. This measure will be based on new applications certified during the measurement year. New applications that are processed outside the federal 30-day processing standard will be considered untimely for this measure. Exception: Cases that the State agency properly pended due to incomplete verification will not be counted towards this performance measure.

Payment Accuracy (Active Case Error Rate)

- ◆ \$24 million total
- ◆ Divided among the 7 states with the lowest and the 3 states with the most improved combined payment error rate
- ◆ Measured by quality control (QC) data

Negative Error Rate (Error rate for denials and terminations)

- ◆ \$6 million total
- ◆ Divided among the 4 states with the lowest and the 2 states with the most improved negative error rate
- ◆ Measured by QC data

Customer Service – Required Practices

1. Are application packets complete and current?
2. Are applications available to all who request one?
3. Are FS applications accepted with the minimum required information – name address and signature?
4. Are “out of county” applications forwarded to the county of residence the same day received?
5. Does the agency have workers available during all office hours to answer questions about programs, eligibility requirements and how to apply?
6. Are clients screened for expedited throughout the business day?
7. Are clients scheduled for an interview if not interviewed on the day they submit their application?
8. Does the agency accommodate the needs of people with special circumstances - working households, elderly, disabled, those without transportation, ill, etc?
9. Does the agency follow their Limited English Plan (LEP) when working with LEP clients?
10. Does agency identify client needs and provide resource referrals during initial contact as well as during screening/interview?
11. Does agency provide help to complete applications if needed?
12. Are the four required posters up-to-date and easy to see?
13. Does the agency inform the client of their responsibility to reschedule when an initial interview is missed, either verbally or by written notice? Is action documented?
14. Are non-civil rights complaints resolved? Is a file kept and reviewed annually?

Customer Service – Recommended Practices

1. Is the agency performing at or above the state average participation rate?
2. Is the agency easy to access?
 - A. Was the address and phone number easily accessed?
 - Was information from directory assistance easily obtained and accurate? Was information contained on the agency website complete and accurate?
 - B. Are office operations identified and hours clearly posted?
 - Are hours posted on the exterior of the building?
 - Is it clear to the public that they can apply for FS in the building?
 - C. Is there transportation available for those who need it?
3. Are FS resources (brochures and posters) available and current?
4. Is FS participation being encouraged and barriers minimized by:
 - A. Promoting outreach activities through presentations or multiple FS application locations?
 - B. Requiring minimal lengths of wait time before being seen?
 - C. Developing special initiatives?
 - D. Expecting courteous and professional staff behavior?
 - E. Providing staff coverage throughout the day?
 - F. Returning phone calls within 24 hours?
 - G. Drop box?
 - H. Training or cheat sheets provided to assist in determining potential for Expedited FS or Categorical eligibility?
 - I. Documenting as required?
 - J. Are staff trained to refer FS clients to nutritional education classes through UofM Extension Service?
 - K. Other?