

## DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



July 23, 1990

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE NO. 1-55-90

TO: ALL-COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

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

I am pleased to announce the recipients of my annual special awards for outstanding corrective action performance in the AFDC and Food Stamp programs. These awards, which I will present at ceremonies in each recipient County, acknowledge exemplary corrective action performance for the period October 1988 through September 1989.

The criteria for receiving the special award are: excellent error rate performance; substantive and timely corrective action plans; participation in corrective action activities and commitment to corrective action by management staff. The special awards are engraved plaques commemorating the County's achievement.

As part of the selection process, Counties were grouped in four categories: large, medium, small quality control (QC) Counties, and non-QC or "self-monitoring" Counties (see attachment). This year's recipient in each category and a brief summary of each County's accomplishments is described below. The error rates shown for QC Counties are for the two prior review periods; the first error rate\* is for the period October 1988 through March 1989; the second is for April through September 1989.

Large QC Counties

I have selected **San Joaquin County** as the recipient of my special award for large QC Counties. The County's error rates during this period were low, particularly in the AFDC program, 1.0 percent and 1.5 percent. Food Stamp error rates were 9.4 percent and 8.2 percent for the same periods (including underissuances).

\* The error rates shown are from State QC reviews performed by the County.

The County has an ongoing commitment to corrective action and error reduction, perhaps best demonstrated by the effort to reduce the Food Stamp error rate. Prior to Federal Fiscal Year 1988, San Joaquin County had an exemplary error rate. When the County's Food Stamp error rates increased in the following year, the County aggressively dealt with the problem by strengthening the efforts of County corrective action staff to identify problems and propose realistic solutions. Quality Control/Corrective Action Awareness Training was conducted in June 1989. Attendance was mandatory for all staff. To better understand the rise in Food Stamp errors, several of the training sessions were devoted to Food Stamp issues. This commitment to corrective action has contributed to the County's success in reducing errors.

#### Medium QC Counties

**Kern County** receives my special award for medium-size QC Counties. The County's error rates during this period were 0.0 and 0.6 percent for AFDC; and 4.8 and 4.6 percent for Food Stamps (including underissuances). Kern County performs extensive supervisory reviews. Corrective Action Plans which contain outstanding problem analyses are submitted timely. Individual memos are sent to the Director's office explaining the errors found, with copies to the Program Manager, Supervisor, and the Eligibility Worker responsible for the error. Stressing accountability has contributed to Kern County's continued success.

#### Small QC Counties

**Yuba County**, a small QC County, has been selected to receive my special award. The County's error rates during this period were 0.0 and 0.1 percent in AFDC and 5.8 percent and 2.2 percent in Food Stamps (including underissuances). Yuba County conducts a one hundred percent supervisory review in the AFDC and Food Stamp programs. The County has hired a Quality Control/Quality Assurance Review Supervisor to evaluate implemented corrective actions, and to gather monthly statistics to determine Eligibility Workers' specific problem areas related to individual or group training needs. This information is shared with the AFDC and Food Stamp Program Managers. The elements of effective corrective action analysis, determination of error cause, implementing a solution, and evaluating the effectiveness of the solution are part of an ongoing process in Yuba County.

Self-Monitoring Counties

Siskiyou County is recognized as an exemplary self-monitoring (non-quality control) County. Accuracy improvement, which involves all levels of staff, is seen as an ongoing activity, not something to think about twice a year when Corrective Action Plans are due. County staff was chosen to speak on the County's corrective action process at the Corrective Action Planning Workshop for non-QC Counties. The County's 1990 Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was also displayed as an example of a good CAP.

County management stresses the importance of casework accuracy. Siskiyou County has an excellent supervisory review process. In addition, Supervisors and Eligibility Workers participate in monthly unit meetings where workers raise problems and the unit works together to develop solutions. Supervisors emphasize the importance of accurate casework at these meetings. The Program Manager works to ensure that all units follow the same procedures. The corrective action process is effective because there is excellent communication among all levels of staff coupled with a strong commitment to case accuracy.

Congratulations to the four Counties mentioned in this letter! I hope they will share their insights with other Counties seeking to improve performance. As I have often said in talking with my Departmental staff as well as County staff, corrective action is a belief 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 applaud them for their success. I strongly support Counties' corrective action efforts and their continued emphasis on lowering the error rate.



LINDA S. McMAHON  
Director

Attachment

cc: CWDA

**County QC Categories**  
(determined by AFDC caseload size)

Large QC Counties (>15,000)

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

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

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

Small QC Counties (up to 4,000)

Humboldt  
Imperial  
Kings  
Madera  
Mendocino  
Placer  
San Luis Obispo  
San Mateo  
Marin  
Santa Cruz  
Yolo  
Yuba

Non-QC Counties

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