

# National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE) Evaluation Final Report

Kristina Rosinsky, Carl Hanson,  
and Sharon Vandivere



## Table of Contents

Overview .....	2
Research Questions and Data Sources .....	3
Key Findings .....	5
Management and implementation.....	5
Implementation costs .....	10
Timeliness of ICPC case processing and other benefits.....	11
Interoperability .....	15
Sustainability.....	18
Conclusion.....	19
Appendices.....	21
Appendix A: Program Lead Survey Responses.....	22
Appendix B: IT Lead Survey Responses.....	56
Appendix C: Cost Tool Responses .....	66
Appendix D: NEICE Case Data Results.....	73
Appendix E: Initial Program Lead Survey .....	78
Appendix F: Follow-up Program Lead Survey .....	92
Appendix G: Initial IT Lead Survey .....	103
Appendix H: Follow-up IT Lead Survey .....	111
Appendix I: Cost Tool .....	120

Disclaimer: The NEICE is operated by the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC) and is made possible by grant number 90XA0151 from the Children’s Bureau. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the funder, nor do mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. This information is in the public domain.

## Overview

The National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE) is a software application that enables the electronic exchange of information that is required for interstate placements of children in foster care or adoptive settings.

The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) establishes the rules and regulations governing such placements. To promote timely placements, the ICPC sets target timeframes for various stages of the placement process. The traditional exchange of information for interstate placements, through postal mail, has been time-consuming and expensive. To address this problem and shorten the time needed to complete some ICPC steps, the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) collaborated with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC) to develop the NEICE. For more background about the NEICE, see APHSA's website.<sup>1</sup>

The Children's Bureau, an agency within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, funded APHSA and AAICPC to develop, implement, and manage the NEICE. APHSA/AAICPC contracted with the Tetras Corporation, which developed the NEICE software and provides technical assistance and training to NEICE users. The NEICE was piloted in six states in 2014; by early March 2018, 19 states were actively using it.

In the initial evaluation of the NEICE pilot in 2015, Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. (WRMA) found the following:

- Reduced copying and mailing costs related to the ICPC process
- Reduced staff time needed to process ICPC cases
- Decreased ICPC case timelines
- High-quality management of the pilot<sup>2</sup>

In early 2016, APHSA/AAICPC contracted with Child Trends to conduct a multi-year evaluation of the expansion of the NEICE. This evaluation was intended to (1) provide ongoing information to APHSA, AAICPC, and Tetras to help them improve NEICE implementation, (2) assess the costs associated with the NEICE, (3) assess the time elapsed between various ICPC steps and assess other potential benefits of the system, (4) describe interoperability of the NEICE with other data systems, and (5) examine the sustainability of the system.

Key findings from the evaluation include the following:

- **APHSA and AAICPC successfully managed and implemented the NEICE and attended to challenges as they arose.** Nineteen states have begun using the NEICE, and APHSA and AAICPC anticipate that up to 38 states will be using the NEICE by the end of 2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> APHSA (2015). *National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise*. Retrieved from:

<https://aphsa.org/AAICPC/NEICE.aspx?WebsiteKey=1c52ac76-f593-4bbc-8980-1820609f983a>

<sup>2</sup> WRMA, Inc. (2015). *Supporting Permanent Placements of Children in Foster Care through Electronic Records Exchange, National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE): Final Evaluation Report*. Arlington, VA: WRMA, Inc. Retrieved from <https://aphsa.org/AAICPC/NEICE.aspx?WebsiteKey=1c52ac76-f593-4bbc-8980-1820609f983a>

- **On average, states spend approximately \$32,000 to join the NEICE, and approximately \$3,500 per year to maintain the NEICE** (excluding the annual \$25,000 licensing fee). Staff time constitutes the primary ongoing cost.
- **The NEICE contributes to shorter ICPC case processing times and lower copying and mailing expenses, facilitates communication and tracking of cases within and between states, improves data integrity and accuracy, and improves the ability of states to comply with ICPC requirements.**
- **Although the NEICE has the capacity to be interoperable with other state data systems through its compliance with national data exchange and child welfare system standards, not all states chose to build an interface between the NEICE and their child welfare or ICPC systems.**
- **APHSA believes that enough states will join the NEICE in 2018 to ensure financial sustainability, although some states are concerned about their ability to continue paying the annual licensing fee.** The Family First Prevention Services Act of 2018 will contribute to the sustainability of the NEICE by mandating the use of an electronic data system for processing ICPC cases by 2027. The future governance structure of the NEICE remains to be defined and implemented.

## Research Questions and Data Sources

The research questions for this evaluation were as follows:

- Is the NEICE successfully managed and implemented by APHSA and AAICPC?
- How much does it cost to implement the NEICE? What factors affect costs?
- How quickly are ICPC cases processed when using the NEICE? What factors affect timeliness? Do states experience other benefits as a result of the NEICE?
- To what extent does the NEICE interoperate with other relevant data systems in each state?
- To what extent is the NEICE sustainable?

To address these research questions, Child Trends worked with APHSA/AAICPC to develop tools for collecting relevant data.

## Surveys

Child Trends administered surveys to two stakeholders in each NEICE state: the program lead and the information technology (IT) Lead. The program leads are responsible for managing all aspects of NEICE implementation, including coordinating the day-to-day use of the NEICE for processing ICPC cases. The IT leads are responsible for the technical aspects of NEICE implementation, such as managing interfaces between the NEICE and state data systems.

Program leads and IT leads received an initial survey one month after they actively began using the NEICE.<sup>3</sup> They also received up to three follow-up surveys periodically throughout the evaluation period (April 2017, September 2017, and February 2018).

---

<sup>3</sup> Pilot NEICE states received the initial survey later in their implementation of the NEICE since the current evaluation did not begin until 2016.

Separate surveys were developed for program leads and IT leads. The surveys collected information about training and technical assistance, the benefits of the NEICE, facilitators and challenges to implementation, interoperability with other state data systems, and more. Over the course of the evaluation, the APHSA/AAICPC project team’s requests for additional information—in addition to changes in NEICE implementation—necessitated modifications to the surveys. The final versions of all survey instruments are available in Appendices E–H.<sup>4</sup> Table 1 presents response rates.

**Table 1. Survey Response Rates**

	Sent	Received	Response rate
<b>Program Lead Survey</b>			
Initial Program Lead Survey	17	15	88%
Follow-up Program Lead Survey (April 2017)	10	8	80%
Follow-up Program Lead Survey (September 2017)	14	11	79%
Follow-up Program Lead Survey (February 2018)	16	10	63%
<b>IT Lead Survey</b>			
Initial IT Lead Survey	17	11	65%
Follow-up IT Lead Survey (April 2017)	10	6	60%
Follow-up IT Lead Survey (September 2017)	14	5	36%
Follow-up IT Lead Survey (February 2018)	16	5	31%

The response rates were fairly strong, with the exception of more recent IT Lead Surveys. When summarizing results, we gave more weight to program lead responses than to IT lead responses because the latter were less intimately involved in the management and use of the NEICE than originally anticipated. This may also explain why the response rate to the IT Lead Surveys decreased over time.

## Cost Tool

We asked state representatives to provide data related to the cost and sustainability of the NEICE using a Cost Tool. The Start-up Cost Tool focused on costs incurred during early NEICE implementation (up to one month after the state actively began using the NEICE). The Ongoing Cost Tool focused on costs incurred during a one-month period several months into NEICE implementation. Otherwise, the Start-up and Ongoing Cost Tools were identical and asked about staff, software, hardware, training, and other costs, as well as the financial sustainability of the NEICE. Respondents reported only costs associated with the administration and management of the NEICE, not those associated with using the NEICE to process cases.

Revisions of the Cost Tool clarified questions and simplified the tool. Child Trends originally sent the Cost Tool to IT leads (cc’ing program leads). After early responses indicated that IT leads were not able to supply all the requested information, we began asking program leads to spearhead the completion of the tool. We encouraged respondents to collaborate with others to complete the Cost Tools. The final Cost Tool instrument is available in Appendix I.<sup>5</sup> The response rates to the Cost Tools are provided in Table 2.

<sup>4</sup> Substantive changes between survey versions are noted when results are presented in Appendices A and B.

<sup>5</sup> Substantive changes between Cost Tool versions are noted when results are presented in Appendix C.

**Table 2. Cost Tool Response Rates**

	Sent	Received	Response rate
Start-up Cost Tool	17	8	47%
Ongoing Cost Tool	15	7	47%

## Interviews

At three times during the evaluation, a subset of program leads and IT leads participated in telephone interviews. These interviews were intended to shed light on the respondent’s experience with the NEICE and to follow up on missing or unclear responses in the surveys and Cost Tools. We sought to interview a mix of large and small, centralized and decentralized, and experienced and new NEICE implementers. We also selected interviewees based on their survey responses to ensure that we spoke to individuals with varying experiences and perspectives. In the fall of 2016, Child Trends interviewed five program leads and five IT leads; in the summer of 2017, four program leads and four IT leads; and in the winter of 2018, four program leads and three IT leads.

Child Trends also conducted interviews with APHSA and Tetrus staff to better understand the NEICE implementation process and to identify challenges and facilitators.

## NEICE data extracts

Tetrus provided Child Trends with anonymous data on the cases processed in the NEICE. These data included the dates for various ICPC process steps.

## Key Findings

We summarize key findings from across data sources below. As readers review the findings, we encourage them to keep in mind that, while we rigorously documented NEICE implementation and the factors that may have played a role in its implementation, the evaluation was not designed to test the causal impact of the NEICE on ICPC costs and timelines. An experimental or rigorous quasi-experimental design would be necessary to support such causal inferences. For this reason, the qualitative information regarding perceptions of state staff who work with the NEICE proved critical for gaining insight into the observed findings.

## Management and implementation

*Is the NEICE successfully managed and implemented by APHSA and AAICPC?*

APHSA and AAICPC led NEICE implementation. Their roles included:

- Contracting with an IT firm, Tetrus, to develop the NEICE software
- Recruiting states to join the NEICE
- Working with states to execute memoranda of understanding (MOUs), data sharing agreements, and other necessary paperwork
- Processing NEICE licensing fees
- Training and providing technical assistance (TA) to states
- Providing the overall governance structure for NEICE implementation
- Engaging federal stakeholders to support NEICE sustainability

Tetrus developed and continues to maintain the NEICE software. They also train new NEICE states, work with states to develop interfaces between state data systems and the NEICE, staff a Help Desk for NEICE users, and make ongoing improvements to the NEICE.

Six states piloted the NEICE beginning in 2014. As of early March 2018, 19 states were actively using the NEICE and an additional eight had signed MOUs with APHSA/AAICPC to begin using it prior to the end of 2018. An additional 11 states had committed to move forward with the NEICE.

APHSA/AAICPC originally offered two ways of implementing the NEICE:

- (1) Through a **central cloud-based web case management system (CMS)** that did not require any connection to or adaptation of state data systems; users log into an online system to process ICPC cases
- (2) Through the **Clearinghouse method**, which required states to add NEICE data fields to their administrative data systems so that NEICE information would be automatically shared between states to and from their existing data systems<sup>6</sup>

In 2017, APHSA/AAICPC introduced the **Modular CMS (MCMS)**—software installed on state servers that operates like the central cloud-based CMS. However, with the MCMS, data is housed within the state’s data system, rather than on the cloud. As of March 2018, 18 states were using the central cloud-based CMS and one state was using the MCMS. No states were using the Clearinghouse method. (All states, however, are now using the Clearinghouse information highway—the pipeline through which all NEICE data are sent—as described in footnote 6.)

Overall, APHSA and the states think that the NEICE roll-out has been a success. For example, most Program Lead Survey respondents described NEICE implementation as going well or very well. (See Appendix A, Table A24.) The following factors helped contribute to the success:

- **Help Desk and training/technical assistance.** Interview respondents commented throughout the evaluation period that the Help Desk and technical assistance (TA) they received from Tetrus was very helpful in implementing the NEICE. Most survey respondents rated the training and TA as somewhat or very effective, and the Help Desk support and TA as somewhat or very responsive (Appendix A, tables A16, A19, and A20; and Appendix B, Table B11). Interview respondents and Program Lead Survey respondents suggested that the initial orientation and training would have been even more effective if trainees were able to interact with the NEICE and implement their learning during or immediately after the training.
- **Ease of implementation of the central cloud-based CMS.** The central cloud-based CMS system was quick and easy to implement from an IT perspective if the state did not choose to set up interfaces between the NEICE and their state data systems. It allowed states to quickly come on-board to the NEICE. However, as described in more detail below, the choice to not set up an interface contributed to the need for ICPC staff to do double data entry.
- **Single person managing NEICE implementation in the state.** Interviewees indicated that NEICE implementation went more smoothly when one state staff person managed all aspects of the

---

<sup>6</sup> The Clearinghouse also refers to the information highway used to transmit NEICE information regardless of implementation option chosen. When the first state started using the Modular CMS (see below) in early 2018, Tetrus implemented the Clearinghouse information highway.

NEICE roll-out, rather than when NEICE management was spread across several people in the state or when there was turnover. It is vital to have a point person who coordinates with APHSA/AAICPC and Tetrus, ICPC staff, caseworkers, and state IT staff.

- **Common state partners on the NEICE.** Interviewees indicated that the benefits of the NEICE are maximized when the other states with which they frequently work on ICPC cases also use the system. ICPC cases with non-NEICE states are handled through traditional hard-copy (pre-NEICE) methods.
- **Sequencing staff training.** State staff determine how their staff are trained to use the NEICE. Reflecting on the effectiveness of their experiences, two states suggested that ICPC coordinators be trained first, followed by case workers (rather than everyone at the same time). APHSA also suggested that roll-out went more smoothly when the NEICE was implemented in stages rather than all at once statewide.
- **APHSA's connections to state child welfare directors, strong relationship with federal government, prior experience, and relationship with AAICPC.** APHSA indicated that it attributes the success of NEICE roll-out in part to its pre-existing relationship and reputation with many state child welfare directors and its experience managing large federal grants. In addition, APHSA said that supportive AAICPC leadership facilitated NEICE roll-out. APHSA also cited its strong relationship with and support from the Children's Bureau as a facilitator.
- **Hard-working, creative, and mission-oriented team members.** APHSA staff indicated that the project team implementing the NEICE (APHSA, AAICPC, and Tetrus) was comprised of creative, driven, mission-oriented people who worked hard to ensure that the NEICE was successful.
- **Clear and reasonable onboarding process.** The majority of respondents to the Initial Program Lead Survey indicated that the steps required for their state to join the NEICE were clear, understandable, reasonable, and fair. (See Appendix A, Table A7.)

However, as with all new initiatives, there were also challenges to implementation. Many challenges encountered were outside the control of APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus (for example, contextual issues and staff turnover). When other challenges were encountered, APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus made efforts to address them. Even with these challenges, overall NEICE implementation has been successful.

- **Changes in federal policies related to child welfare data.** In 2016, the federal government issued new data system guidance (Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System [CCWIS]) to replace old Statewide or Tribal Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS/TACWIS) guidance. Some states found that their IT staff were too busy to implement the NEICE because they were focused on developing plans to comply with CCWIS standards and implementing mandated child welfare components into the child welfare information system. At least one NEICE state indicated it did not move toward implementing the NEICE via the Clearinghouse method because it did not want to invest time in adapting its SACWIS system if the existing system would be replaced with a CCWIS system.
- **Staffing challenges.** Interview and survey respondents over the course of the evaluation period noted that staff turnover and staff resistance were challenges. (See Appendix A, Table A4 and Appendix B, Table B9.) NEICE training must be continuous, and turnover in IT staff can make it difficult to orient them to what is needed to build interfaces between state data systems and the NEICE. APHSA has developed webinars and online trainings in response to the need for ongoing trainings. More recent interviewees indicated that staff resistance has lessened as staff



developed familiarity with the NEICE. One state mentioned that Tetrus' training of staff helped reduce resistance. More generally, Program Lead Survey respondents consistently indicated that finding the time and resources to train staff was a challenge. (See Appendix A, Table A4.) Many IT Lead Survey respondents also indicated that insufficient staff numbers was a challenge. (See Appendix B, Table B9.)

- **Limitations in NEICE reporting capabilities.** Current NEICE data reports are aligned with federal requirements, but interview and Program Lead Survey respondents desired more meaningful summary reports. For example, one state indicated that some reports were not accurate because they marked "legacy" cases (those entered by another state before their state started using the NEICE) as still open in the system, which skews the data. Respondents were optimistic that states will have more control over the generated reports once they start using the MCMS, which allows flexibility to program custom reports.
- **The need for a single system to function for diverse contexts.** The ability to adapt the NEICE to the state's needs or preferences was consistently rated as a challenge by Program Lead Survey respondents (see Appendix A, Table A4), and interviewees described several changes they would like made. While APHSA/AAICPC and Tetrus made product improvements over time, APHSA and Tetrus staff noted that it was challenging to fulfill every state's requests because the system is national and must work for everyone. APHSA reported making changes and being as flexible as possible to ensure that individual states' needs were met.
- **Double data entry.** About half of the states did not choose to set up an interface between the NEICE and their other data systems. This means that staff must enter the same data in two or more places. Interview respondents from these states were dissatisfied with this double data entry requirement because it slowed the processing of ICPC cases and contributed to case backlogs. It is not surprising that most respondents to the latest Program Lead Follow-up Survey indicated that they used the NEICE only for cases with other NEICE states (presumably to minimize double data entry). (See Appendix A, Table A11.) In fact, when comparing states that submitted an Initial and Follow-up Program Lead Survey, we found that states moved away from entering all cases into the NEICE over time, despite having agreed to do so in their MOU. One contributing factor to this double data entry may be that, even when states transfer ICPC information from their child welfare information system(s) to the NEICE, most continue to use the NEICE and the ICPC data fields in their other systems concurrently. (See Appendix B, tables B3 and B4.) Respondents said that state rules and their desire to produce reports using ICPC data (given the NEICE reporting challenges described above) necessitated the concurrent use of two systems.
- **NEICE slow-downs and outages.** Over the course of implementation, there were increasing problems with the NEICE running slow or freezing (as indicated in Appendix A, Table A15).<sup>7</sup> Some interview respondents suggested that this happens each time a new state joins, while one state acknowledged that the slow-down issue was a problem caused by its own system set-up (e.g., firewalls) rather than the NEICE. Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that the NEICE was slowest during normal business hours, suggesting that a higher volume of users slows down the system. While at least half of Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that they

---

<sup>7</sup> This is also true when we restrict the analysis to states that responded to an Initial and Follow-up Program Lead Survey.

had been able to access NEICE when needed, access issues worsened over time. (See Appendix A, Table A21.)<sup>8</sup> NEICE slow-downs or outages have contributed to backlogs of ICPC cases. Tetrus expects that slow-downs will be less problematic once more states move to the MCMS, since the MCMS will minimize the amount of work NEICE users do outside of their state firewalls.

- **Insufficient documentation, particularly initially.** Early in the evaluation period, some interview respondents indicated that NEICE documentation was insufficient, but later said that it improved. On the other hand, IT Lead Survey respondents consistently listed documentation as a challenge throughout the evaluation period. (See Appendix B, Table B9.)<sup>9</sup>
- **User's Guide difficult to navigate.** Program Lead Survey respondents noted the difficulty of finding necessary information in the NEICE User's Guide. Most survey respondents indicated that the guide was "somewhat effective." (See Appendix A, Table A17.)
- **Cost and time required for NEICE management greater than expected.** APHSA initially planned to have two calls with each state to introduce the NEICE and technical requirements, and then enter into an MOU and arrange for training. In practice, states required multiple introductory calls; MOUs were much more involved than anticipated, given increasingly demanding data security requirements; and states required more documentation than originally anticipated. APHSA did not expect that it would need to develop a data security plan or secure liability insurance. The organization learned that every state's needs were different and, as a result, that the on-boarding process varied considerably across states. Because of the more extensive processes and unexpected costs, APHSA obtained additional funds from the Children's Bureau. In 2017, APHSA/AAICPC also introduced the MCMS to, in part, reduce the costs associated with storing and protecting the NEICE information in the central cloud-based CMS.
- **Mixed reactions to the MCMS.** APHSA initially told all states using the central cloud-based CMS that they would need to move to the MCMS, and that the central cloud-based CMS would be discontinued by May 2018. More recently, APHSA indicated that only states requiring a signed Business Associate Agreement would be required to use the MCMS (those with highly stringent data security requirements leading to high costs). APHSA/Tetrus indicated that Tetrus would install the MCMS on state systems free of charge, but that states would then be responsible for security since the NEICE data would reside on state servers. The MCMS would also enable states to program their own custom reports. While program lead interview respondents liked that the NEICE data would be stored within their state (as opposed to on the cloud), they had some concerns and frustrations. For example, it can be time-consuming to obtain more approvals and involve IT staff. Some respondents indicated that they did not like the idea that data storage/protection costs would be shifted to them, and that they might need to engage consultants to set up the MCMS. Some states were also concerned that each state may be able to change the MCMS too much, making it difficult to maintain the national system. While some of these concerns have subsided after APHSA/Tetrus provided more information to states about the MCMS, at least one state indicated that it may need to withdraw from the NEICE due to development costs associated with the MCMS or Clearinghouse options. As of March 2018, one state was using the MCMS; all others were still on the central cloud-based CMS. As of May 2018, five to seven states are planning to migrate to the MCMS.

---

<sup>8</sup> This is also true when we restrict the analysis to states that responded to an Initial and Follow-up Program Lead Survey.

<sup>9</sup> This is also true when we restrict the analysis to states that responded to an Initial and Follow-up IT Lead Survey.

- **Communication with states about system changes.** On the latest Program Lead Follow-up Survey, only half of the respondents indicated that they had been notified of system changes (such as outages or upgrades) in a timely fashion—a marked decrease over the evaluation period. (See Appendix A, Table A21.)<sup>10</sup> On several instances over the course of NEICE implementation, Tetrus made changes to the system without sufficient notice to users. APHSA and Tetrus have developed plans to formalize the product improvement process and improve communication about such changes.

## Implementation costs

*How much does it cost to implement the NEICE? What factors affect costs?*

Child Trends learned the following through the Cost Tool, surveys, and interviews:

- **Average NEICE start-up costs per state were \$31,841, excluding the NEICE licensing fee of \$25,000.** The largest category of expenses was staff hours spent on management/administration of the NEICE.<sup>11</sup> However, staff costs varied greatly, ranging from \$6,800 in one state to close to \$64,000 in another. Some states also reported hardware costs (average of \$2,000). No states reported software, training (besides staff time), travel, or other costs besides the NEICE licensing fee. (See Appendix C, Table C3.) Start-up costs did not appear to vary depending on when the state joined the NEICE.
- **The NEICE costs, on average, about \$3,500 per year to maintain, excluding the NEICE licensing fee of \$25,000.** The majority of this cost was for staff time. (See Appendix C, Table C7.)
- **Several key factors affect state NEICE costs:**
  - *Number of NEICE users.* States with many local or regional NEICE users could experience more staffing costs due to greater training needs.
  - *Type of NEICE implementation.* As stated above, interview respondents indicated that the central cloud-based CMS was much easier to implement than the MCMS or Clearinghouse. All states that responded to the Cost Tool were using the central cloud-based CMS, so we expect that start-up costs would be higher for states joining using an alternative NEICE implementation option.
  - *Interface between NEICE and state data systems.* Setting up interfaces between the NEICE and other state data systems is more resource-intensive from an IT perspective than having no interface, so states that set up interfaces may have greater start-up costs.
  - *Child welfare system structure and extent of implementation.* States with county-administered child welfare systems and/or ICPC processes faced more onboarding steps (e.g., setting up MOUs with individual counties) than more centralized states. The extent of implementation in decentralized states can affect costs (for example, whether they implement the NEICE only at the state central office, in a few large counties, or statewide).

---

<sup>10</sup> A marked decrease is also seen when the analysis is restricted to states that submitted an Initial and Follow-up Program Lead Survey.

<sup>11</sup> Respondents were asked to only report costs associated with the administration and management of the NEICE, and not costs associated with using the NEICE to process cases.

- *Pre-existing software and hardware.* Some states reported needing to purchase Adobe licenses, computers, and scanners.

### Timeliness of ICPC case processing and other benefits

*How quickly are ICPC cases processed when using the NEICE? What factors affect timeliness? Do states experience other benefits as a result of the NEICE?*

Below, we present findings from an analysis of the timeliness of ICPC cases processed using the NEICE (see Box 1 for information about the ICPC process).

#### **Box 1. ICPC Process**

Although the ICPC process is complex, it generally follows these steps:

- The central office in the sending state (SS)—the state seeking placement of a child in another state—receives ICPC paperwork from a case worker.
- The SS sends the 100A form (a request for placement with details about the child and placement) to the receiving state (RS)—the state where placement is sought.
- The RS reviews the 100A, completes a home study, and sends the 100A back to the SS with its decision about whether placement is approved.
- If the RS approved the placement, the placement can then be made. The SS uses a 100B form to notify the RS when the placement is made. (The 100B has other purposes as well.) The 100B can be sent before or after placement occurs.

Guidelines for handling these ICPC steps differ depending on the type of case (regulation type). There are five ICPC regulation types related to types of cases:

- Regulation 1: For cases in which a child is already living with a state-approved placement, and the caregivers providing that placement want to move to another state with the child.
- Regulation 2: For cases when a home is sought in another state (for example, a state wants to place a child with a family in another state).
- Regulation 4: For cases in which a state wants to place a child in a residential facility in another state.
- Regulation 7: For cases in which a state wants to place a child with family members or their guardian in another state and the case qualifies for expedited placement decisions (due to incarceration, death, incapacitation of caregiver; child’s age; child’s relationship to the proposed placement resource; or child’s current placement in an emergency setting).
- Regulation 12: For private/independent adoptions occurring across state lines.

For more information about ICPC rules and regulations, please see the APHSA website ([https://aphsa.org/OE/AAICPC/ICPC\\_Regulations.aspx](https://aphsa.org/OE/AAICPC/ICPC_Regulations.aspx)).

- From June 1, 2015 to March 8, 2018, **29,563 children had their ICPC cases processed using the NEICE.**

- See Table 3 for the median number of days for various ICPC steps. (More detailed information is available in Appendix D.)

**Table 3. Median Time for ICPC Steps for Unique Child Placement Requests**

	Median Number of Business Days		
	Both SS and RS use NEICE	Only SS uses NEICE	Only RS uses NEICE
<b>Step 1:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100A	<b>2</b> (n=6,966)	<b>3</b> (n=11,906)	<b>2</b> (n=10)
<b>Step 2:</b> SS sends 100A → RS sends 100A back to SS	<b>38</b> (n=4,649)	<b>41</b> (n=8,647)	<b>51</b> (n=7)
<b>Step 3:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>30</b> (n=1,720)	<b>34</b> (n=3,519)	<b>88</b> (n=55)
<b>Step 4:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → placement	<b>8</b> (n=1,294)	<b>9</b> (n=2,976)	<b>12</b> (n=1,960)
<b>Step 5:</b> Placement → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>10</b> (n=1,178)	<b>11</b> (n=3,112)	<b>27</b> (n=41)
<b>Step 6:</b> Start of process → placement	<b>46</b> (n=1,281)	<b>47</b> (n=3,282)	<b>83</b> (n=111)
<b>Step 7:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>76</b> (n=2,038)	<b>85</b> (n=4,362)	<b>161.5</b> (n=56)

<sup>1</sup> Because the 100B can be sent for a variety of reasons, this item should be interpreted with caution.

- For nearly every step of the process, **the median times to complete each ICPC step are lower when both states use the NEICE than when only one state uses it.** Interview and Program Lead Survey respondents also indicated that case processing is faster with other NEICE states. When the other state is not on the NEICE, pre-NEICE methods are used.
- **Some evidence indicates that NEICE case timelines decrease once states gain more experience with the NEICE.** We considered the time between the start of the ICPC process and child placement to be the most important ICPC timeframe examined, because it indicates the amount of time required to achieve the desired outcome for a child: the interstate placement. We compared the median number of business days for this step when states had just started using the NEICE versus one year later, finding that the time improved (decreased) by three days (aggregated across all regulation types). This suggests that case timelines may continue to improve as current NEICE states gain more experience with the system.<sup>12</sup>
- **Some ICPC time benchmarks are being met, while others are not.** For example, 89 percent of Regulation 2 requests processed in the NEICE met the 180-calendar day benchmark for step 2

<sup>12</sup> We restricted this analysis to cases in which the SS and the RS were both NEICE pilot states. This ensures that both states have the same level of experience with the system. We compared cases that were received at the SS central office within months 1–5 of implementation to those received in months 13–17. We restricted the analysis to 12 months after the case was received at the SS central office to ensure that the period measured for both cohorts was the same. NEICE pilot states were considered to have formally started using the NEICE in September 2015, but they had been piloting the system before then. Therefore, they were already quite experienced by months 1–5 of formal implementation. We expect that if we were able to examine their case timelines at the very beginning of their NEICE implementation, we would see even greater timeline improvements. We did not consider the statistical significance of differences in the cohorts because we examined population data (all cases that met our criteria) rather than a sample. Therefore, a simple description of changes is appropriate. For the interested reader, no differences were statistically significant when comparing timeframes between the two cohorts.

(time elapsed between the SS sending the 100A, and the RS sending the 100A back to the SS). However, only 25 percent of Regulation 7 requests met the 20-business day benchmark for this step. (See Appendix D, Table D5.) There are no comparison data to know whether this is better or worse than before the NEICE.

- Some evidence suggests that ICPC case timelines may be shorter than they were before the NEICE.** As stated above, the evaluation of the NEICE pilot compared ICPC case timelines before the NEICE (baseline) to after it. When we made rough comparisons between NEICE timelines in the current evaluation period and the prior evaluation’s baseline findings, we found that ICPC case timelines were shorter now than before the NEICE. However, there are several limitations in making these comparisons. First, there were only two ICPC steps we could compare to the pilot baseline findings (steps 1 and 2) because of differences in the ICPC steps analyzed in the pilot and current evaluation.<sup>13</sup> Second, the pilot study used slightly different definitions of these two steps. (See table notes to Table 4.) Finally, the pilot used the average number of business days instead of medians. We present medians in the current study to reduce the effect of outliers; however, in Table 4, we present averages to enable comparisons.

**Table 4. Pilot versus Current Findings**

	Average Number of Business Days			
	Pilot Evaluation Baseline Findings		Current Findings when Both States Use NEICE	
	Regulation 7 Cases	Non- Regulation 7 Cases	Regulation 7 Cases	Non- Regulation 7 Cases
<b>Step 1:</b> Start of process <sup>1</sup> → SS sends 100A <sup>2</sup>	11 (n=33)	24 (n=229)	2.6 (n=786)	8.6 (n=6,180)
<b>Step 2:</b> SS sends 100A <sup>2</sup> → RS sends 100A back to SS	44 (n=16)	57 (n=194)	42.6 (n=562)	46.0 (n=4,087)

<sup>1</sup> The pilot evaluation used the date on which the case was identified as an ICPC case, while we used the date when the SS central office received documents from a local office. The latter variable is more consistently defined across states.

<sup>2</sup> The pilot evaluation used the date on which the RS received the 100A, instead of when the SS sent the 100A. However, for cases in which both states use the NEICE, the date the 100A was sent by the SS is the same as the date the RS received it (the transfer happens instantly).

- In surveys and interviews, NEICE states also reported experiencing reduced ICPC case timelines using the NEICE.** Interview and Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that the NEICE allows for faster transmission of ICPC information. On the latest Follow-up Program Lead Survey, most respondents indicated the NEICE has:
  - Expedited placement timelines for children. (See Appendix A, Table A2.)
  - Decreased the amount of time for staff to prepare, review, and/or send ICPC documents across states. (See Appendix A, Table A2.)

<sup>13</sup> The ICPC steps included in the current evaluation’s analyses were selected based on the quality of available data and alignment with steps that have timeline guidance in ICPC regulations.

- Decreased the overall time from starting the 100-A to placing a child. Most respondents indicated that the timelines have been reduced by 11 to 30 percent. (See Appendix A, Table A5.)<sup>14</sup>

However, respondents were divided on whether the NEICE has decreased the time needed to process ICPC cases *within* the state.<sup>15</sup> This could be because of double data entry, which slows down ICPC processing times and increases backlogs of ICPC cases. APHSA has suggested this could also be due to (1) the existence of state systems for electronically processing ICPC cases within the state prior to the NEICE, and (2) the state not rolling the NEICE out to all caseworkers.

- **Other factors affect timeliness of ICPC cases:**
  - *Transmission of ICPC information is just one part of the ICPC process that affects the timeliness of ICPC cases.* Interview and Program Lead Survey respondents noted that the most time-consuming aspects of the ICPC process are often the home study process, background checks, and other work unrelated to the transmission of information. The impact of the NEICE on ICPC case timelines is thus limited.
  - *Need to scan and upload documents to NEICE.* Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that having to scan and upload documents to the NEICE adds time to processing ICPC cases.
  - *NEICE system slow-downs.* As mentioned above, interview and Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that when the NEICE system is slow or not operating, they experience a backlog of ICPC cases that can negatively affect timelines.
- **States have experienced a variety of other benefits using the NEICE, including:**
  - *Fewer copying and mailing expenses due to electronic data transmission.* Interview and Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that electronic transmission of data means that staff do not need to spend time making copies or pay for postage. Approximately 90 percent of Program Lead Follow-up Survey respondents indicated that the NEICE led to reduced administrative costs. (See Appendix A, Table A2.)<sup>16</sup> In addition, half of all respondents to the latest Program Lead Follow-up Survey experienced a 1 to 10 percent reduction in costs associated with copying and mailing, and 30 percent experienced more than an 11 percent reduction in such costs. (See Appendix A, Table A5.)<sup>17</sup>
  - *The NEICE helps facilitate communication and tracking of cases within and between states.* On the Program Lead Follow-up Surveys, about three-quarters of respondents indicated that the NEICE improves the ability to track cases and monitor progress, and most indicated that it improves communication with other state ICPC coordinators. (See Appendix A, Table A2.)

---

<sup>14</sup> The same findings emerged when we examined the latest follow-up survey submitted by each state (even if it was not the Follow-Up Survey administered in February 2018).

<sup>15</sup> The same findings emerged when we examined the latest follow-up survey submitted by each state (even if it was not the Follow-Up Survey administered in February 2018).

<sup>16</sup> The same findings emerged when we examined the latest follow-up survey submitted by each state (even if it was not the Follow-Up Survey administered in February 2018).

<sup>17</sup> The same findings emerged when we examined the latest follow-up survey submitted by each state (even if it was not the Follow-Up Survey administered in February 2018).

- *Improved data integrity/accuracy of case information shared across states.* Most Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that they have experienced this benefit. (See Appendix A, Table A2.)
- *Improved ability to comply with ICPC requirements.* Many Program Lead Survey respondents noted that their state experienced this benefit. (See Appendix A, Table A2.) Respondents liked NEICE notifications about overdue cases.

## Interoperability

*To what extent does the NEICE interoperate with other relevant data systems in each state?*

The Administration for Children and Families defines interoperability as “the ability of two or more systems or components to exchange information and to use the information to make better decisions.”<sup>18</sup> Interoperability of state child welfare systems (including ICPC systems such as the NEICE) with other relevant state data systems is important because it makes more relevant information available for better decision making related to ICPC placements, and/or provides that information in a more efficient manner. Through our surveys and interviews, we learned the following about interoperability related to the NEICE.

- **The NEICE is designed to facilitate interoperability.** Tetrus reported that the NEICE is compliant with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM), National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA), and SACWIS standards.<sup>19</sup> The NIEM is a “common vocabulary that enables efficient information exchange across diverse public and private organizations.”<sup>20</sup> The NHSIA is a “framework to facilitate information sharing, improve service delivery, and prevent fraud.”<sup>21</sup> SACWIS standards are recommendations from the federal government for child welfare information systems. By complying with these standards, the NEICE has the potential to connect with other state data systems (such as child abuse and neglect registries, Medicaid healthcare exchanges, court data systems, and more) that also follow these standards. This connection could enable a NEICE user to access information from these other data systems directly from the NEICE, and/or allow users of those other systems to access information in the NEICE.
- **Currently, however, only some states have chosen to build an interface between the NEICE and their child welfare or ICPC data systems. There is no interface between the NEICE and other data systems (such as Medicaid healthcare exchanges and court systems) in any current NEICE state.** In many states, the NEICE does not interoperate with any data system—users must do double data entry to transfer information from their child welfare information system(s) to the NEICE, and vice versa.

---

<sup>18</sup> Administration for Children and Families (2017). *Interoperability*. Retrieved from: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/about/interoperability>

<sup>19</sup> The NEICE is not yet compliant with CCWIS standards because those standards are relatively new.

<sup>20</sup> National Information Exchange Model (n.d.). *NIEM*. Retrieved from: <https://www.niem.gov/>

<sup>21</sup> Administration for Children and Families (n.d.). *National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA) Definition*. Retrieved from: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/nhsia-definition>



- **Beyond states choosing not to set up interfaces, the lack of interoperability between the NEICE and other data systems is likely due, in part, to the variability in state child welfare systems' alignment with national standards and interoperability with other data systems in the same state.** Among the 19 current NEICE states, eight do not use a SACWIS-compliant system.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, some survey and interview respondents were unable to provide information about the extent of the alignment between their primary child welfare information system (or separate ICPC data system) and NIEM or NHSIA standards, or whether they interoperate with other state data systems. (See Table 5.) Among those who commented, most states reported no, or only partial, alignment with standards or interoperability with other systems. Very few survey respondents indicated that their primary child welfare information system or separate ICPC data system is used to connect to other systems in support of the ICPC process. (See Appendix A, Table A9 and Appendix B, Table B6.) These interoperability standards are relatively new, and states are likely to move toward them. Until states' own systems align with national interoperability standards, the NEICE's ability to interoperate with those systems will be constrained.

---

<sup>22</sup> Children's Bureau (2015). *SACWIS Status*. Retrieved from: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/sacwis-status>

**Table 5. Interoperability Findings from Latest IT Survey Received from Each State**

	Primary Child Welfare Information System (n=13)	Separate ICPC System (n=4)
<b>To what extent does data from your child welfare information system(s) interface with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) data elements in the Children, Youth, and Family Services (CYFS) domain?</b>		
Fully	15%	25%
Partially	0%	0%
Not at all	62%	75%
Not sure	23%	0%
<b>To what extent do your state's data sharing policies for your child welfare information system(s) align with the National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA)?</b>		
Fully	15%	0%
Partially	8%	0%
Not at all	15%	50%
Not sure	62%	50%
<b>To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data with other state child welfare data systems (particularly with child abuse and neglect registries)?</b>		
Fully	31%	0%
Partially	8%	0%
Not at all	31%	75%
Not sure	31%	25%
<b>To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data about children in foster care with your state's Medicaid healthcare exchange?</b>		
Fully	38%	0%
Partially	15%	0%
Not at all	31%	100%
Not sure	15%	0%
<b>To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data with county/state/federal court data systems?</b>		
Fully	15%	0%
Partially	62%	0%
Not at all	8%	100%
Not sure	15%	0%

## Sustainability

### *To what extent is the NEICE sustainable?*

It is important that the NEICE be self-sustaining because the initial funding for the effort will end in 2018. The NEICE will require software maintenance and modifications, coordination, and management, and states will need technical assistance on an ongoing basis.

- **APHSA/AAICPC is concerned that licensing fees may not cover all NEICE management costs in the short term.** While APHSA/AAICPC planned to have licensing fees cover the management of the NEICE after the end of grant funding, in the spring of 2018, increased costs incurred by Tetras necessitated a request for additional funding from the Children’s Bureau. This was necessary because not every state is using the NEICE. Once 37 or 38 states join the system, APHSA/AAICPC believes their licensing fees will cover the ongoing governance and administration of the NEICE, as well as system maintenance, user support, and system upgrades as needed.<sup>23</sup> This is important because, while IT leads reported needing less TA over the course of NEICE implementation,<sup>24</sup> Program Lead Survey respondents indicated that they still required some technical assistance. (See Appendix A, Table A20.)
- **Most NEICE states have a plan to finance the NEICE in the immediate future.** Top funding sources include state child welfare funds and federal dollars (predominately Title IV-E administrative costs and Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act [CAPTA] funds). Only one of the 10 states that submitted a Cost Tool indicated that it has no plan. Responses to the Cost Tool suggest that states have plans for covering the cost of the NEICE licensing fee, but not necessarily costs for staff time for managing/administering the NEICE. (See Appendix C, tables C13 and C14.)
- **Some states are concerned about the licensing fee.** Some interview and Program Lead Survey respondents expressed concerns about continued payment of the \$25,000 annual licensing fee. Survey respondents consistently listed costs of NEICE participation/financial resources as a challenge. (See Appendix A, Table A4 and Appendix B, Table B9.) Some interview and survey respondents suggested moving toward a tiered licensing fee that is adjusted based on the population of the state. APHSA plans to explore this idea.
- **Private attorneys may provide an additional revenue source for the NEICE.** APHSA is exploring giving private adoption attorneys access to the NEICE for a fee.
- **The Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) supports sustainability.** The FFPSA requires that all states use an electronic system to process ICPC cases by 2027.
- **The future governance structure of the NEICE is being determined.** As of March 2018, APHSA expected to continue to work with AAICPC to govern the NEICE.
- **Interoperability supports sustainability.** Because the NEICE is compliant with the NIEM, NHSIA, and SACWIS standards, it is likely compatible with future data systems and therefore technically sustainable.

---

<sup>23</sup> This statement is based on interactions with APHSA staff. It was outside the scope of the current evaluation to independently evaluate APHSA’s/AAICPC’s business plan for ongoing management of the NEICE.

<sup>24</sup> Based on an analysis of states that submitted an Initial and Follow-up IT Lead Survey.

## Conclusion

Despite encountering challenges over the course of NEICE implementation, AHPSA and AAICPC successfully implemented the NEICE in 19 states and have commitments from an additional 19 to continue to scale it nationwide. States are experiencing a variety of benefits, including reduced ICPC case timelines, lower administrative costs, better communication, and more accurate information. While some states are concerned about their ability to continue paying the NEICE licensing fee—and while AHPSA is concerned about current licensing fees covering all NEICE management costs in the short term—there are strong prospects for a financially sustainable NEICE once most states join. The NEICE is also technically sustainable given its compliance with various interoperability and data system standards.

When interpreting these findings, it is important to consider several limitations. First, as mentioned above, this study was not designed to test the causal impact of the NEICE on ICPC costs or timelines. Second, sample sizes for some surveys, cost tools, and interviews were small, and may not be representative of all NEICE states. Third, we encountered several NEICE data quality issues that suggested variation in the way states interpret data fields. We cleaned the data to the best of our ability and used only those variables that we had reason to believe were most accurate. However, the extremely large analytical sample (number of cases entered into the NEICE) gives us confidence in the validity of findings.

The following key recommendations should guide AHPSA/AAICPC as they continue to manage the NEICE:

- (1) **Implement a tiered licensing fee structure soon** to encourage smaller states to join, and ensure that smaller states that have already joined can continue to use the NEICE.
- (2) **Work with states to resolve NEICE slow-down and outage problems**, as these negatively affect ICPC case timelines.
- (3) **Help states move away from double data entry** by facilitating interfaces between the NEICE and state data systems, implementing the Clearinghouse method, and/or improving NEICE reporting features. Double data entry lengthens ICPC case timelines.
- (4) **Continue to move toward nationwide use of the NEICE**. This includes getting every state on board with the system and ensuring that all ICPC cases within NEICE states are processed using the NEICE.
- (5) **As states move toward CCWIS compliance, encourage them to consider interfaces with the NEICE** to fully realize the benefits that can be gained by full interoperability of data systems.
- (6) **Consider the implications for states of additional costs and time incurred** when states move from the CMS to the Clearinghouse or MCMS, and assist states with finding solutions to these challenges (e.g., identifying potential funding sources, providing more TA, brainstorming cost-effective solutions).

Beyond these specific recommendations, the NEICE implementation experience provides several lessons learned for other similar efforts, including:

- **Projects that require the storage and sharing of sensitive data are at high risk for delays and unexpected costs.** To mitigate this, allow ample time for planning and consult data security experts early to assist in realistically estimating costs.

- **When developing a national IT system, consider ways to allow local adaptation while retaining core functionality that is applicable for everyone.**
- **Consider the range of potential advantages and drawbacks of quick and low-cost implementation options.** For example, in the NEICE case example, although APHSA/AAICPC encouraged states to set up interfaces between their state data systems and the NEICE, they could not require states to do so. States that chose not to set up interfaces found the onboarding process to be relatively quick and easy from an IT perspective. However, this was accompanied by a need to enter data into two IT systems, which slowed ICPC case timelines. A slower initial implementation of a more robust system may have ultimately resulted in greater efficiency despite a greater initial investment in time and resources.

## Appendices

Appendix A – Program Lead Survey Responses

Appendix B – IT Lead Survey Responses

Appendix C – Cost Tool Responses

Appendix D – NEICE Case Data Results

Appendix E – Initial Program Lead Survey

Appendix F – Follow-up Program Lead Survey

Appendix G – Initial IT Lead Survey

Appendix H – Follow-up IT Lead Survey

Appendix I – Cost Tool

***Program Lead Survey Responses***

Appendix A: Program Lead Survey Responses

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A1. Motivations for Joining the NEICE (%)**

<b>Rating of importance among responding states (n=15):</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Slightly</b>	<b>Moderately</b>	<b>Very</b>	<b>Extremely</b>
Expedited placement timelines for children	0%	0%	7%	7%	<b>87%</b>
Improved placement stability for children	0%	0%	20%	27%	<b>53%</b>
Reduced administrative costs (e.g., document copying and mailing)	0%	0%	13%	<b>47%</b>	40%
Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send ICPC documents <i>across</i> states	0%	0%	13%	27%	<b>60%</b>
Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send required documents <i>within</i> the state (e.g., between localities and state offices)	0%	7%	<b>40%</b>	13%	<b>40%</b>
Improved data integrity/accuracy of case information shared across states	0%	0%	13%	27%	<b>60%</b>
Increased ability of staff to track cases/monitor progress	0%	0%	13%	40%	<b>47%</b>
Ability to interoperate with other data systems (e.g., law enforcement or judicial agencies, Medicaid agencies) using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards	20%	7%	20%	13%	<b>40%</b>
Improved communication with other state ICPC coordinators	0%	0%	20%	27%	<b>53%</b>
Improved ability to comply with ICPC requirements	7%	7%	13%	20%	<b>53%</b>

*Rows may not total 100% due to rounding. This question was only asked in the initial survey.*

**Comments about states' motivations to join the NEICE include (asked in initial survey only)<sup>25</sup>:**

- Increased accountability for ICPC process.
- This system has been helpful in regards to encrypted emails. When it comes through NIECE there is no need for encrypting.
- Since [state] had already experienced benefits from an electronic system within the state. Many of the items mentioned in question three above [state] had already begun experiencing. Therefore, believing we would experience the same and even more benefits nationwide was very motivational for joining NIECE.
- The [state] ICPC unit went live on the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE), a national electronic database for ICPC cases which facilitates quicker processing of ICPC requests. [State] is committed to utilizing NEICE.
- It is not clear how the NEICE, an electronic case management tool, would actually and in reality assist in accomplishing the above goals, but it was advertised as doing so. It has not done so to date.

<sup>25</sup> All open-ended responses are provided verbatim, except identifying information was removed or masked.



Program Lead Survey Responses

Table A2. States Experiencing Benefits as a Result of Using the NEICE (%)

	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Expedited placement timelines for children</b>	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=10)
Yes	<b>63%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>60%</b>
No	38%	20%	20%
Unsure/too soon to tell	0%	10%	20%
<b>Improved placement stability for children</b>	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=10)
Yes	13%	20%	30%
No	25%	10%	30%
Unsure/too soon to tell	<b>63%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>Reduced administrative costs (e.g., document copying and mailing)</b>	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
Yes	<b>88%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>90%</b>
No	13%	9%	0%
Unsure/too soon to tell	0%	0%	10%
<b>Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send ICPC documents across states</b>	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
Yes	<b>50%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>70%</b>
No	25%	9%	30%
Unsure/too soon to tell	25%	0%	0%
<b>Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send required documents within the state (e.g., between localities and state offices)</b>	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
Yes	38%	36%	<b>40%</b>
No	13%	<b>45%</b>	<b>40%</b>
Unsure/too soon to tell	<b>50%</b>	18%	20%
<b>Improved data integrity/accuracy of case information shared across states</b>	(n=7)	(n=11)	(n=9)
Yes	<b>86%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>56%</b>
No	0%	9%	44%
Unsure/too soon to tell	14%	9%	0%
<b>Increased ability of staff to track cases/monitor progress</b>	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
Yes	<b>75%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>70%</b>
No	13%	18%	10%
Unsure/too soon to tell	13%	0%	20%
<b>Ability to interoperate with other data systems (e.g., law enforcement or judicial agencies, Medicaid agencies) using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards</b>	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=10)
Yes	0%	0%	10%

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

	<b>FOLLOW-UP 1</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 2</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 3</b>
No	<b>63%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>80%</b>
Unsure/too soon to tell	38%	30%	10%
<b>Improved communication with other state ICPC coordinators</b>	<i>(n=7)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
Yes	<b>71%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>60%</b>
No	29%	27%	20%
Unsure/too soon to tell	0%	0%	20%
<b>Improved ability to comply with ICPC requirements</b>	<i>(n=7)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
Yes	<b>100%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>50%</b>
No	0%	18%	30%
Unsure/too soon to tell	0%	18%	20%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. This question was only asked in follow-up surveys.*

**Table A3. Timing of Joining the NEICE (number of states reporting various reasons)**

<b>Among states that joined during pilot phase (n=6)</b>	
Favorable political or administrative conditions (e.g., strong leadership support for the NEICE)	4
Wanted to help test an electronic system that would improve the ICPC process	5
Wanted to be sure the national system would work for our state's needs	4
Other	2
<b>Among states that joined after the pilot phase (n=8)</b>	
Funding was available at that time that was not available earlier	2
Unfavorable political or administrative conditions earlier (e.g., lack of strong leadership support for the NEICE)	1
State was previously satisfied with existing ICPC process/system	1
State had significant IT development underway and this project was not a priority	2
Common state partners were not using the NEICE previously	3
We were not sure the NEICE would be around in the long run	1
Other	5

*Respondents could select more than one response. This question was only asked in the initial survey.*

## *Program Lead Survey Responses*

### **Comments from those who responded “other”:**

- Pilot states:
  - [Individual] insisted.
  - Wanted to provide consultation where needed in all areas (development, testing and rollout)...
- Non-pilot states:
  - ...As far as I know, [state] was not given an option to join the pilot earlier?...
  - [State] has been interested in joining. In [month], we had completed the administrative work required to join.
  - [State] was working diligently prior to join NEICE.
  - Concerns about confidentiality and security of information.
  - The NEICE Pilot did not offer IT requirement specifics until Spring 2015.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A4. Barriers/Challenges States Faced in Joining the NEICE or Concerns about Participating in the NEICE (%)**

Degree to which each item was a barrier/concern/challenge	INITIAL (n=5-15) <sup>1</sup>			FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=7-8) <sup>2</sup>			FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=10-11) <sup>3</sup>			FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=10)		
	Very much	Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>4</sup>	Not at all	Major	Minor/moderate <sup>4</sup>	Not at all	Major	Minor/moderate <sup>4</sup>	Not at all	Major	Minor/moderate <sup>4</sup>	Not at all
1. Cost of NEICE participation/financial resources <sup>5</sup>	33%	<b>47%</b>	20%	0%	<b>71%</b>	29%	0%	<b>91%</b>	9%	10%	<b>60%</b>	30%
2. Time/resources required to have staff trained and comfortable using the NEICE <sup>6</sup>	33%	<b>53%</b>	13%	0%	<b>86%</b>	14%	9%	<b>55%</b>	36%	20%	<b>70%</b>	10%
3. Staff resistance to a new ICPC system/process	20%	<b>53%</b>	27%	0%	<b>86%</b>	14%	0%	<b>73%</b>	27%	0%	<b>80%</b>	20%
4. Staff turnover	0%	<b>80%</b>	20%	0%	<b>57%</b>	43%	20%	30%	<b>50%</b>	20%	<b>50%</b>	30%
5. Local buy-in/leadership support	0%	<b>60%</b>	40%	0%	38%	<b>63%</b>	0%	40%	<b>60%</b>	0%	20%	<b>80%</b>
6. State buy-in/leadership support	0%	40%	<b>60%</b>	0%	38%	<b>63%</b>	0%	27%	<b>73%</b>	0%	10%	<b>90%</b>
7. Availability and quality of technical assistance	20%	<b>80%</b>	0%	0%	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	0%	45%	<b>55%</b>	10%	40%	<b>50%</b>
8. Ability to adapt NEICE to your needs or preferences	20%	<b>80%</b>	0%	13%	<b>75%</b>	13%	9%	<b>55%</b>	36%	20%	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>
9. System features (e.g., navigation, fields, structure)	20%	<b>80%</b>	0%	0%	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	0%	40%	<b>60%</b>	0%	<b>60%</b>	40%
10. Satisfaction with existing ICPC system/process (i.e., existing system working well for the state)	20%	20%	<b>60%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11. Concerns about whether the NEICE would improve timelines for ICPC process in the state	13%	<b>47%</b>	40%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12. Concerns about whether the NEICE would reduce ICPC-related costs for the state	13%	40%	<b>47%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
13. Confidentiality concerns around electronic data sharing/potential data breaches	21%	<b>50%</b>	29%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14. Concerns about ease of using the NEICE for non-ICPC staff	27%	<b>53%</b>	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Rows may not total 100% due to rounding. On the original initial survey, the response options were framed as barriers/concerns. In the revised initial surveys, they were framed as challenges/concerns. In the follow-up surveys, they were framed as challenges. Not presented in this table are other barriers/concerns/challenges that respondents were able to write in. On the initial survey, write-in challenges were 'concerns about dual entry,' 'there were IT

## Program Lead Survey Responses

barriers which prevented us from joining [earlier],’ and ‘insufficient time to train, insufficient & poorly organized training modules.’ At follow-up 2, write-in challenges were ‘communications from NEICE regarding changes to system’ and ‘issues surrounding the NEICE slowing down/freezing up of the system.’ At follow-up 3, write-in challenges were ‘having to duplicate entries into SACWIS’ and ‘issues surrounding the NEICE slowing down/freezing up of the system.’

<sup>1</sup> Items 1–3, 10–12, and 14 have an N of 15; item 13 has an N of 14; and items 4–9 have an N of 5 because we only recently began to ask the latter items on the initial survey.

<sup>2</sup> Items 1–4 have an N of 7; items 5–9 have an N of 8.

<sup>3</sup> Items 1–3 and 6–8 have an N of 11; items 4–5 and 9 have an N of 10.

<sup>4</sup> The response options in the initial survey were: ‘very much a barrier/concern,’ ‘somewhat of a barrier/concern,’ and ‘not at all a barrier/concern.’ The response options in the revised initial survey and in the follow-up surveys were ‘a major challenge,’ ‘a moderate challenge,’ ‘a minor challenge,’ and ‘not at all a challenge.’ For comparison purposes, we combined the ‘minor’ and ‘moderate’ response options and aligned them with ‘somewhat of a barrier/concern.’

<sup>5</sup> In the original initial survey, this item read ‘Cost of NEICE participation.’

<sup>6</sup> In the original initial survey, this item read ‘Time required to have staff trained and comfortable using the NEICE.’

**Table A5. Improvement as a Result of Using the NEICE<sup>1</sup> (%)**

	INITIAL <i>Improvement anticipated or already experienced</i>	FOLLOW-UP 1 <i>Improvement experienced</i>	FOLLOW-UP 2 <i>Improvement experienced</i>	FOLLOW-UP 3 <i>Improvement experienced</i>
<b>Overall time from starting the 100-A to placing a child</b>	<i>(n=15)</i>	<i>(n=8)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
None	13%	13%	18%	10%
Minor	13%	<b>25%</b>	0%	20%
Moderate	<b>33%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>50%</b>
Major	27%	13%	27%	0%
Don’t know	13%	<b>25%</b>	18%	20%
<b>Costs associated with ICPC-related document copying and mailing</b>	<i>(n=15)</i>	<i>(n=8)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
None	7%	13%	0%	0%
Minor	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>50%</b>
Moderate	20%	<b>25%</b>	18%	10%
Major	20%	13%	9%	20%
Don’t know	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	18%	20%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> None=about 0% change; Minor=about 10% or less reduction; Moderate=about 11%–30% reduction; Major=more than about 30% reduction.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Additional comments about the risks and benefits to state’s participation in the NEICE (only asked in initial survey):**

- Due to the involvement with NEICE and making case workers use the system to submit requests, there is an increased interest and awareness of the ICPC process in general.
- Risk is high in the area of estimating start of a 100a to placing a child due to lack of data. Reporting in NEICE is critical to this end. I highly suggest start up a reports committee for NEICE.
- I am confident [state] will see a greater increase in improvement over time. [State] has not been a part of NEICE for a period of 60 days presently.
- Because we are a small state, there was some concern around having to pay the same annual fee as a large state, and whether, given the state's current financial struggles, we would be able to afford the fees. We are hopeful that NEICE will move to the tiered fee structure.
- We are now less efficient, less competent in completing mandated tasks. We are required to print more documents at the State Central Office as local DSS will NEICE (electronically transmit) documents we must print, copy twice and still mail to 34 non-NEICE States and all non-NEICE users (parents, private attorneys, private adoption agencies, private RTC's). Many parties violate mandate confidentiality and e-mail un-encrypted confidential docs on children and parents.

**Table A6. Initial Information and Communication about the NEICE (%)**

<b>Helpfulness of information shared by APHSA/AAICPC before joining the NEICE as it relates to helping the state determine whether to join the NEICE (n=14)</b>	
Very helpful	<b>43%</b>
Somewhat helpful	29%
Neutral	21%
Somewhat unhelpful	0%
Very unhelpful	7%
<b>Was anything not shared with you prior to committing to joining the NEICE that you wish had been shared? (n=15)</b>	
Yes	<b>40%</b>
No	<b>40%</b>
Don't know	20%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. These questions were only asked in the initial survey.*

## ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

### **Comments about what could have made information shared before the state joined the NEICE more helpful (only asked in initial survey):**

- It would have been helpful for the IT team and ICPC coordinators to have a demonstration of NEICE before we onboarded so they understood the system better.... I was the only one who had an idea of what to expect because I saw a demonstration....
- Coming together as group and discussing whether we wanted to participate in the pilot verses being told this is what we are going to do.
- Details about how the information would be utilized would help prepare our framework.
- Access to the test environment to get a better feel for how the system operates and its capabilities. Coming on board felt a little like having blind faith – we were told what capabilities it had, but we had not seen for ourselves until we were committed and entered the training phase.
- Information regarding planned improvements to infrastructure and timeline for those...
- More transparency about the pros and cons, costs and benefits of joining the NEICE, especially with 34 States not using the NEICE and with a deadline of May 2018 for doubled NEICE annual fees (from \$25,000.00 per year to \$50,000.00 per year) and with statement that if 34 States not using NEICE by May 2018, the entire NEICE will stop, end. Stating "failure is not an option" is not a budget or a reasonable business plan, but this was shared as APHSA's plan in our May 2017 Annual Business Meeting in Maine.

### **Comments about information that would have been helpful to have prior to committing to use the NEICE (only asked in initial survey):**

- The cost our State would incur after the NEICE PILOT was not clearly stated and was not budgeted.
- How long it would take for requested enhancements to actually go to development and the process these requests have to go through.
- Annual fees.
- Emphasis on requirement to enter legacy cases. User agreement, though we understand this is being developed currently and this is a new process overall.
- Sustainability plans.
- That State Central Offices would be obligated to assume printing and mailing costs for non-NEICE States. That training would not be provided by child welfare ICPC professionals, but by computer software programmers. Aforementioned changed with roll-out of the E-Learning #101 and #102 modules, but these are time-limited as they are "costly", were not provided early enough, and that training - necessarily interactive - would not be, except for 2 staff doing so with all 52 States practicing users - an insufficient training plan.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A7. Satisfaction with Process of Joining NEICE (%)**

Rating of agreement (n=15):	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The steps required for my state to join the NEICE were clear and understandable.	7%	0%	13%	<b>73%</b>	7%
The steps required for my state to join the NEICE were reasonable/fair.	7%	0%	13%	<b>80%</b>	0%
The overall time it took to join the NEICE (from the initial interest communication with APHSA/AAICPC staff to the first time my state used the system) was reasonable.	7%	0%	33%	<b>53%</b>	7%

Rows may not total 100% due to rounding. These questions were only asked in the initial survey.

**Table A8. Separate System for ICPC Cases (%)**

In addition to your state’s primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system), does your state have a separate information system for ICPC cases? (n=15)	
Yes	53%

This question was only asked in the initial survey.

**Table A9. Uses of Primary Child Welfare Information System and Separate ICPC System in ICPC Process (%)**

	Primary child welfare information system (n=15)	Separate ICPC System (n=8)
To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets	27%	<b>63%</b>
To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data	<b>33%</b>	<b>63%</b>
To populate ICPC case packets with data	13%	25%
To transmit data <sup>1</sup>	13%	25%
To connect to other systems	0%	25%
Not used to process ICPC cases	<b>33%</b>	N/A
Don’t know	13%	0%
Other	7%	38%

Columns total to more than 100% because respondents could select more than one response. These questions were only asked in the initial survey.

<sup>1</sup> On the original initial survey, the response option was “to transmit data.” On the revised initial surveys, we created two response options: “to transmit data within the state” and “to transmit data between states.” For the purposes of this table, we counted a response of “to transmit data within the state” and “to transmit data between states” as a response of “to transmit data.” Of the five states that responded to the primary child welfare information system question with two response options, two indicated that they use the system to transmit data within the state and none use the system to transmit data between states. Of the three states that responded to the separate ICPC system question with two response options, none indicated that they use the system to transmit data within the state or between states.



**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A10. Connection to and Uses of NEICE**

	INITIAL (n=15)	FOLLOW- UP 1 (n=8)	FOLLOW- UP 2 (n=11)	FOLLOW- UP 3 (n=10)
Number of states using Clearinghouse <sup>1</sup> :	1	1	2	0
Number of states using central cloud-based Case Management System (CMS):	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
Number of states using Modular CMS <sup>1</sup> :	0	0	0	1
<b>Among those using the central cloud-based CMS, which of the following best describes how you are currently using the NEICE via the central cloud-based CMS? (%)</b>	<i>(n=13)</i>	<i>(n=6)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>	<i>(n=9)</i>
We enter all case and placement data directly into the NEICE CMS. This information is also entered into our state’s administrative data system(s) (e.g., SACWIS/other state system).	<b>54%</b>	17%	<b>50%</b>	<b>67%</b>
We export our child and placement resource information from our child welfare information system(s) to a secure FTP site. The information is then loaded into the NEICE CMS.	31%	<b>50%</b>	30%	11%
We use a web service to send the child and placement resource information through the web service to the NEICE CMS, and pull the data back into our child welfare information system(s).	0%	17%	0%	0
None of the above	15%	17%	20%	22%
<b>Among those using the Modular CMS, which of the following best describes how you are currently using the Modular CMS? (%)</b>	<i>(n=0)</i>	<i>(n=0)</i>	<i>(n=0)</i>	<i>(n=1)</i>
We enter all case and placement data directly into the NEICE CMS. This information is also entered into our state’s administrative data system(s) (e.g., SACWIS/other state system).	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>100%</b>
We export our child and placement resource information from our child welfare information system(s) to a secure FTP site. The information is then loaded into the NEICE CMS.	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%
We use a web service to send the child and placement resource information through the web service to the NEICE CMS, and pull the data back into our child welfare information system(s).	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%
None of the above	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Tetrus acknowledged that the various implementation options are difficult for a layman to understand. The Clearinghouse refers to both a way a state can use the NEICE (via data fields in their administrative data systems) and the way all NEICE information is transmitted (regardless of NEICE implementation option). This is apparent in the responses to the surveys. For example, some survey respondents reported that they used the Clearinghouse or Modular CMS when it was known that no states used either option.

**Comments from those who responded “none of the above”:**

- Central cloud-based CMS:
  - Initial Survey
    - The NEICE information is not shared in our child welfare system.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

- We export our child information and license placement resources and then we have to enter in all other relatives and unlicensed providers.
- Follow-up Survey 1
  - We only use the CMS except for three-state or independent placement private adoption cases.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - We scan the documents we receive from the [...] county and then send to the receiving state. We only process Reg 4 requests.
  - We export from internal database to NEICE in a daily sync.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - [State] only adds in Regulation 4 group home placements at this time.
  - The information from [our SACWIS] is saved to a desktop and then uploaded into NEICE.

**Table A11. Uses of NEICE (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Cases for which NEICE is used<sup>1</sup></b>	(n=15)	(n=7)	(n=11)	(n=10)
All cases	<b>73%</b>	<b>71%</b>	45%	40%
Only when working with other NEICE states	27%	29%	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>Steps for which NEICE is used<sup>2</sup></b>	(n=14)	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
100A	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
100B	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Home study request	93%	88%	82%	90%
Supporting documents	93%	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Totals do not add to 100% due to respondents being able to select more than one response.

**Table A12. Location of Users (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Where are people using the NEICE?</b>	(n=15)	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
State central office	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
All regional offices	20%	13%	9%	10%
Some regional offices	13%	38%	9%	20%
All county/local offices	20%	25%	9%	20%
Some county/local offices	20%	25%	27%	20%

Columns do not add to 100% due to respondents being able to select more than one response.

Program Lead Survey Responses

**Table A13. NEICE Users by Office (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Among users at state central office</b>	(n=15)	(n=8)	(n=11)	(n=10)
One NEICE/ICPC contact at the state central office	7%	0%	0%	0%
Several NEICE/ICPC contacts at the state central office	<b>53%</b>	13%	45%	30%
All state central staff	40%	<b>88%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>Among users at regional offices</b>	(n=5)	(n=4)	(n=2)	(n=3)
One NEICE/ICPC contact per office	20%	25%	0%	0%
Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in each office	0%	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>67%</b>
It varies: Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in one or more offices, but only one NEICE/ICPC contact in one or more offices	<b>40%</b>	0%	0%	33%
All regional office staff	<b>40%</b>	25%	<b>50%</b>	0%
<b>Among users at county/local offices</b>	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=4)	(n=3)
One NEICE/ICPC contact per office	0%	0%	<b>25%</b>	0%
Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in each office	20%	33%	<b>25%</b>	0%
It varies: Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in one or more offices, but only one NEICE/ICPC contact in one or more offices	<b>80%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>100%</b>
All county/office staff	0%	0%	<b>25%</b>	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

**Table A14. Frequency of NEICE Use (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>How often do you use/interact with the NEICE?</b>	(n=15)	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=10)
Hourly	27%	25%	<b>40%</b>	20%
Daily	<b>47%</b>	<b>38%</b>	20%	<b>30%</b>
Weekly	13%	13%	10%	20%
Monthly	13%	0%	10%	0%
Never	0%	0%	10%	10%
Other	0%	25%	10%	20%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

**Comments from those who responded 'other':**

- Follow-up Survey 1
  - 2-3 times per month.
  - More than weekly, but not on a daily basis.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

- Follow-up Survey 2
  - It waxes and wanes. Some days are hourly, and sometimes I may go a week without accessing it.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - As needed
  - NEICE is how we do every bit of our work. All files and information are on NEICE.

**Table A15. Reports of Slow Down (%)**

Does the NEICE ever slow down noticeably?	INITIAL <i>(n=14)</i>	FOLLOW-UP 1 <i>(n=8)</i>	FOLLOW-UP 2 <i>(n=10)</i>	FOLLOW-UP 3 <i>(n=9)</i>
Yes	29%	25%	100%	67%

**Comments on circumstances of slow down:**

- Initial Survey
  - Predominately in the creation of new cases and in uploading documents
  - Sometimes when something is submitted to another state they do not receive it right away. There have been times am waiting on a RTF approval and the other state has not received the request through NIECE. This happens on one of those slow days.
  - Occasionally staff will report that for certain functionality we need to restart the NEICE (log in and out) to have the ability to process.
  - Only when creating a new case.
- Follow-up Survey 1
  - No trend has been identified.
  - This is not a regular occurrence and happens rarely.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - All the time, slow downs are constant.
  - The primary places are creating a new case (after child and provider have already been created), and moving in or out of the Case Details tab. It seems slower in the morning, [...] So maybe it's related to the number of users active at any given time? It's fastest when I come in on Sundays.
  - The slowdown is sporadic.
  - Usually, in the morning (10-12). Navigating within the case there are slight delays (from documents section to case history or to transmittals).
  - When new states go LIVE.
  - No pattern to the slow down has been identified.

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- Between the hours of 9:30a and 4p it tends to slow down a bit more. Also, sending transmittals seems to be an activity where it slows down.
- At times the downloads. Recently it was due to an issue that Tetras was working on.
- All during the day with any activity.
- NEICE has completely stopped at times, and processing has been on hold when uploading information. Staff have had to wait until the system is working again and then review what was done and if work needs to be re-entered.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - No particular time of day.
  - Slow downs are less frequent lately. The only slow down that remains most noticeable still is when placement resource data is entered or modified. The screen takes a considerable amount of time to refresh.
  - Updates to the systems and new states being added.
  - Some weeks its in the morning, other times its in the afternoon. Otherwise we haven't seen a huge pattern. The biggest slow down is after an update has happened or new state comes on board.
  - I believe there were issues with transmittals taking a long time to download and then transmit. Staff put in tickets, but stopped after a while because they would have been spending too much time entering tickets instead of doing work.

### **Additional comments on state's current system connection and/or users:**

- Initial Survey
  - We would like to look toward implementation of the Clearinghouse.
  - Our SACWIS...is undergoing re-design to 2nd generation system known as CCWIS...I do not know what, if anything, will move to the new system or if NEICE use will even be required in the new system or if seamless CCWIS-to-CCWIS "communication" will eliminate the need for NEICE entirely.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - We utilize electronic storage of pdf files on our SACWIS which allows for emailing between our office and other states or locals. I hope to implement local training at the beginning of 2018 so that we can use NEICE to its fullest potential within the state.
  - We had a problem of having to log out of the system and come back in so we could get to different functions. It also would knock you out of the system.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - 1) Clicking between tabs is usually fairly fast. However, there tends to be a long wait when creating a new case, and we have noticed that sending transmittals seems to be taking longer than it used to. 2) We have discussed rolling it out to one to three users in the regional/key field offices, but are hesitant since we don't currently know what the interface is going to look like, or even if we will be able to remain users.

### **Program Lead Survey Responses**

- State office staff are now instructed to enter ALL cases into the NEICE, regardless of the other state's usage. Regional licensing and home study staff will be trained ... to use the NEICE in transmission of information to state office. Local foster care staff will be trained ... to use the NEICE in the transmission of information to state office.
- The system used to lock us out and slow down and we had to continually log onto the system. However, we discovered that the cause was on our side; not the NEICE system. Our IT staff was able to adjust our requirements so we are able to stay on the system longer before we have log in again and it is not slowing down.

**Table A16. Orientation/Initial Webinar/Ongoing Trainings (%)**

	<b>INITIAL</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 1</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 2</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 3</b>
<b>Participated in orientation/initial webinar/ongoing trainings</b>	<i>(n=14)</i>	<i>(n=8)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
Yes	93%	25%	30%	50%
<b>Effectiveness of orientation/initial webinar/ongoing trainings</b>	<i>(n=13)</i>	<i>(n=2)</i>	<i>(n=3)</i>	<i>(n=5)</i>
Very effective	<b>46%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Somewhat effective	<b>46%</b>	0%	0%	20%
Neutral	0%	0%	0%	20%
Somewhat ineffective	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very ineffective	8%	0%	0%	0%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents to the initial survey were asked about the orientation or initial training webinar. Respondents to the follow-up surveys were asked about any trainings since the survey was last administered.*

**Purpose of trainings that occurred since the initial survey (asked in follow-up surveys only):**

- Follow-up Survey 1
  - System modification changes conference calls.
  - Training for new agencies coming onto the system.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - System modification meetings and recent upgrades and fixes.
  - I am new to the ICPC program and Tom trained me and staff from [state] on the basics of administrative use of NEICE.
  - NEICE 101 for local workers.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - New staff was able to use the on-line training.
  - Address changes and updates to the NEICE.
  - [Colleague] recorded the training for APHSA.
  - Tom Livoti trained several states on the use of managerial reports and other topics.

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- New worker training for new users at the local level.

#### **Comments about what could have made the orientation/initial webinar/ongoing trainings more effective:**

- Initial Survey
  - If we were at our own computer.
  - Very little....
  - I was not the person who completed the training.
  - In person training.
  - Tetras staff understanding how our state is staffed and the limits of how we could use the system. Having uninterrupted sessions with trainer as they were interrupted by another call.
  - A demonstration by a child welfare staff trained in both ICPC and NEICE. A transparent discussion of the pros and cons of using NEICE given reality of non-NEICE States numbers and given the reality of using a non-user friendly electronic case management tool. An honest discussion of the training limitations using an interactive tool with no interaction - one cannot throw and catch a ball; someone must catch it and throw it back. ICPC is a 4 party, 4 player system over time. The NEICE tool training does not allow needed interaction over time, even condensed time period would be better.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Having a Q & A after the training, not during.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A17. User's Guide (%)**

	<b>INITIAL</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 1</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 2</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 3</b>
<b>Used the User's Guide?</b>	<i>(n=15)</i>	<i>(n=8)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
Yes	87%	0%	36%	50%
<b>Primary reason for using the User's Guide</b>	<i>(n=13)</i>			
To learn to use the NEICE (a general overview or orientation to the system)	46%	N/A	N/A	N/A
To answer a specific question I had	<b>77%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of the User's Guide in helping to learn to use the NEICE</b>	<i>(n=6)</i>			
Very effective	33%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat effective	<b>50%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Neutral	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat ineffective	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Very ineffective	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of the User's Guide in helping answer a specific question</b>	<i>(n=10)</i>			
Very effective	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat effective	<b>80%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Neutral	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat ineffective	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Very ineffective	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of the User's Guide in helping resolve your question/issue</b>		<i>(n=0)</i>	<i>(n=4)</i>	<i>(n=5)</i>
Very effective	N/A	N/A	0%	20%
Somewhat effective	N/A	N/A	<b>50%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Neutral	N/A	N/A	<b>50%</b>	20%
Somewhat ineffective	N/A	N/A	0%	0%
Very ineffective	N/A	N/A	0%	0%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents to the follow-up survey were asked whether they have used the user's guide since the survey was last administered.*

**Comments about how the User's Guide could be more effective:**

- Initial Survey
  - It needs to be broken up according to user roles.
  - If I had more familiarity with the system it might be easier to quickly find an answer to my questions.
  - As a person with the DELETE authority I had some difficulty making changes in the system using the guide. However, Help Desk was awesome and was able to resolve my issues very timely.
  - The guide can be difficult to follow.



### Program Lead Survey Responses

- User guide did not address the situation we were attempting to answer.
- Finding the correct place to look was difficult. The table of contents titles are somewhat vague, so an index would be helpful.
- Searching using alternate terminology.
- A table of contents geared to the ICPC user’s needs. A format that is about using the tool in real life. The User Guide and E-Learning should be revised and formatted for use by real life administrators and caseworkers. A revision should use terms common to ICPC users as well [...]-- very confusing having to learn a new language to do ICPC work.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - I don't recall what my particular issue was but once I didn't find it in the guide, I was able to get an answer from Tom immediately.
  - Needs to be more detailed.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Searchable guide.

**Table A18. Video Training Modules (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Viewed any video training modules?</b>	(n=15)	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=10)
Yes	27%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Video training modules viewed<sup>1</sup></b>	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)
NEICE Navigation for ICPC Coordinators	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEICE ICPC Coordinator Add New Case	25%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEICE Navigation for Case Workers	25%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEICE Case Worker Add New Case	75%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manage Child in NEICE	<b>100%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Managing Placement Resources in NEICE	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEICE State Administrator	75%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Effectiveness of video training modules<sup>2</sup></b>	(n=4)	(n=0)	(n=0)	(n=0)
Very effective	<b>50%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat effective	<b>50%</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Neutral	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat ineffective	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Very ineffective	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Respondents to the follow-up survey were asked whether they have viewed the video training modules since the survey was last administered.*

<sup>1</sup>*Totals do not add to 100% due to respondents being able to select more than one response.*

<sup>2</sup>*In the initial survey, respondents were asked how effective the video training modules were in helping them learn to use NEICE. In the follow-up surveys, respondents were asked how effective the video training modules were in helping them resolve their question/issue.*

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Comments about how the video training modules could be more effective:**

- Initial Survey
  - They are very, very helpful as they are actual ICPC users in the real world (at least one is) doing the training. They are not very experienced or informed social workers, but they are ICPC users (one is; the one that is not is limited in her understanding of how to use the NEICE tool). The modules should be more basic and more step-by-step procedures for the basic and very repetitive tasks in processing ICPC work.

**Table A19. Tetrus Help Desk Support (%)**

	<b>INITIAL</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 1</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 2</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 3</b>
<b>Contacted Tetrus Help Desk for support?</b>	<i>(n=15)</i>	<i>(n=8)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=10)</i>
Yes	80%	88%	100%	90%
<b>Frequency of contacting Tetrus Help Desk</b>	<i>(n=12)</i>	<i>(n=7)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=9)</i>
1–2 times/month	<b>58%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>56%</b>
3–9 times/month	33%	29%	27%	33%
10 or more times/month	8%	0%	27%	11%
<b>Tetrus Help Desk responsiveness</b>	<i>(n=12)</i>	<i>(n=6)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=9)</i>
Very responsive	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>56%</b>
Somewhat responsive	17%	0%	9%	44%
Neutral	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat unresponsive	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very unresponsive	0%	0%	9%	0%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents to the follow-up surveys were asked whether they contacted the Help Desk, the frequency of contact, and responsiveness since the survey was last administered.*

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A20. Technical Assistance (TA) (%)**

	INITIAL (n=15)	FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=8)	FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=11)	FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=10)
<b>How much TA required from APHSA, AAICPC, and/or Tetrus</b>				
Hourly	7%	0%	0%	0%
Daily	0%	0%	0%	10%
Weekly	33%	13%	27%	20%
Monthly	<b>40%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>45%</b>	30%
Never	7%	0%	0%	0%
Other	13%	38%	27%	<b>40%</b>
<b>Effectiveness of TA provided by APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus</b>				
Very effective	<b>73%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Somewhat effective	7%	0%	18%	30%
Neutral	7%	0%	0%	10%
Somewhat ineffective	13%	0%	9%	0%
Very ineffective	0%	0%	0%	0%
No technical assistance has been required in the time period specified <sup>1</sup>	N/A	0%	0%	0%
<b>Responsiveness of TA provided by APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus</b>				
Very responsive	<b>60%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Somewhat responsive	33%	0%	10%	30%
Neutral	7%	0%	0%	10%
Somewhat unresponsive	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very unresponsive	0%	0%	0%	0%
No technical assistance has been required in the time period specified <sup>1</sup>	N/A	0%	0%	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents to the follow-up surveys were asked about technical assistance since the survey was last administered.

<sup>1</sup> This response option was only provided on follow-up surveys.

**Comments from those who responded “other” to frequency of need for assistance:**

- Initial Survey
  - We need assistance in getting our local and regional staff trained. We do not have the time to go over the state and train.
  - Not sure; likely monthly?
- Follow-up Survey 1
  - Rarely
  - Individual specialist need bases only.
  - On occasion.
- Follow-up Survey 2

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- Rarely, the system is easy to use
- Rarely
- Since we don 't get a response, we typically don 't have any interaction with Tetrus.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Every few months
  - Occasionally
  - Rarely
  - Quarterly

#### **Comments on what could have made TA more effective:**

- Initial Survey
  - More training.
  - More training support for local staff.
  - It must be provided by real life, ICPC trained and ICPC using staff.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - The Microsoft issue slowing NEICE down took too long to diagnose.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Sometimes when we make a request for assistance we get an immediate acknowledgement of the request, but it may be a couple days before we actually receive the assistance. This has been more pronounced in the last month or so, since shortly before NM went live, so it may be connected to the testing and roll-out of the clearing house and the unexpected consequences thereof.

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A21. System Accessibility (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>I have been able to access the NEICE whenever I have needed to (i.e., have not had issues actually accessing the system)</b>	(n=15)	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=10)
Strongly agree	53%	75%	20%	40%
Agree	47%	25%	30%	30%
Neither agree nor disagree	0%	0%	0%	10%
Disagree	0%	0%	40%	20%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	10%	0%
<b>I have been notified of system changes (such as outages or upgrades) in a timely fashion by APHSA/AAICPC and/or Tetrus</b>	(n=14)	(n=8)	(n=9)	(n=10)
Strongly agree	36%	75%	67%	30%
Agree	57%	25%	33%	20%
Neither agree nor disagree	7%	0%	0%	10%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	30%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	10%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents to the follow-up surveys were asked to consider system accessibility since the survey was last administered.*

**Additional comments on training or technical assistance:**

- Initial Survey
  - We were told ... that we ... have to train our local and regional staff.....
  - Tetrus staff has been great help to me and my team. The entire team are very responsible, knowledgeable and professional.
  - It is critical that trainers be proficient, extremely so, in the ICPC process. That comes from doing the work in child welfare and ICPC. Computer programmers are not trained child welfare workers and are not ICPC trained users. Profoundly important is the understanding that the documents carried by the NEICE must be read and understood so that critical assessments and decisions (placement approvals, denials; permanency recommendations, etc.) that are to be made from the assessment documents, can be made. The screens and fonts are too small to easily read and too small and tedious to made comments needed, as well.
- Follow-up Survey 1
  - I requested technical assistance for the following reasons: 1. Password issues 2. Unable to delete a child/case 3. Unable to add a sibling to an existing case 4. Had to change from [state] to [state] as the sending State (Our SACWIS data error).
  - Great support. -Open to challenging questions -Provides assistance in a professional manner
  - Excellent technical assistance
  - We want to clone Susmita!
- Follow-up Survey 2

**Program Lead Survey Responses**

- Responsive
- When the upgrades rolled out in August we were unoperational for a couple days. The team was very responsive in trying to figure out the issue and resolve it. It turned out to be something with the interface with Microsoft if I remember correctly.
- We have received excellent technical assistance and all our issues has been resolved timely. At times, we have experienced slight delay in accessing NEICE, not sure, if this is due to our connection issues or increase in number of users or cases. This happens at least once a month.
- We noticed the slow downs when there were enhancements to the system.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Question 30 is disagree as I do not believe Tetrus was aware of the system issues that followed New Mexico therefore we could not be notified timely.
  - Way to go team! We're with you through it all!
  - A few times when the system was going to be down for a weekend, we didn't receive notification until late on Friday. Some of my staff work on the weekends and so that notification was too late.

**Table A22. Case Backlog**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Has starting up or operating the NEICE ever created or added to a backlog of ICPC cases?</b>				
	(n=15)	(n=8)	(n=10)	(n=9)
Yes	27%	25%	50%	78%
<b>Details about backlogs reported</b>				
Average number of cases currently in backlog as a result of NEICE participation	11.3 (n=2)	0.0 (n=1)	10.0 (n=2)	20.0 (n=7)
Average time to clear this current backlog (days)	7.5 (n=2)	N/A (n=0)	3.5 (n=2)	7.3 (n=6)

**Comments about why operating the NEICE has created or added to a backlog:**

- Initial Survey
  - It is not "user-friendly". It is not intuitive. It is not easy to move around in. It has no "dashboard" or easy way of understanding what you are looking at. It carries "legacy" cases which have not been fully completed by the initial, creating State and carries report data this is not accurate and of enormous quantity that is inaccurate. It allows any NEICE user to see confidential info in my State of a placement resource - that was unexpected.
- Follow-up Survey 1

### **Program Lead Survey Responses**

- Because it requires additional time by state representatives to enter those cases.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - Previously it was due to being inoperational for a couple days due to a glitch with Microsoft, or due to training. We currently have a backlog, but it's due to being short-staffed rather than due to NEICE.
  - Due to waiting on the system to be available and work can be done.
  - There was a slow down issue with Microsoft and NEICE.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Since we have chosen not to roll the program out to the field, we have to create the record for the case in NEICE at state office, which is in some cases duplicate entry.
  - Recent upgrades - adding the modular cms access.
  - The system was down for significant period of time and we were unable to enter siblings for two days.
  - Because of the time frame that it takes to enter a case into NEICE the limitations to adding multiple children in the case -Having to multi-task and NEICE shutting down when you come back to the case -Not having a "back" or "previous" button...
  - Because of the circle of death when waiting to send a transmittal or a screen to load completely.
  - Trying to make sure all of the new case notifications are addressed and assigned. In a few instances, new cases have fallen through the cracks because of the notification process.

**Table A23. Additional Case Processing Time (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Does using the NEICE add any extra time to processing cases, as compared to your previous system/process?</b>				
Yes	(n=15) 47%	(n=8) 50%	(n=9) 33%	(n=10) 60%
<b>Average amount of extra time needed per case due to NEICE</b>	(n=6)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=3)
Minutes	39.2	9.2	11.3	31.7

**Comments on why using the NEICE adds additional time:**

- Initial Survey
  - We have to enter the case twice - once in NEICE and once in SACWIS - when we are the sending state. This should be mitigated once we move to the clearinghouse.
  - Adding cases into the NEICE for states that are not on board yet. Also, scanning/uploading and double entry adds time.
  - Because we have to scan the information into NEICE. All of our counties and regional staff are not trained.
  - Manipulating the screens
  - We have to do double entry

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- We are not having staff initiate the referrals. ICPC coordinator is sole user of system.
- We must now pull staples from mailed reports, scan documents to be uploaded to the NEICE, scan two-sided pages mixed with one-sided printed pages. We must print 2 copies of reports (sometimes 100 pages) for non-NEICE States and there are 34 non-NEICE States at present. There is no uniform user rules – [one state] scans 50 pages as one PDF, [another state] scans 142 pages as one PDF. Some States create 100A's in NEICE and some only scan the 100A, etc.
- Follow-up Survey 1
  - NEW case creations due to NEICE currently does not provide a way for placement type conversions (e.g. relative to foster care; foster care to relative; relative to an adoption type placement). New case creations for reconsideration request within the allotted time frame.
  - Scanning of material into NEICE, and manually entering of additional youth.
  - Only because we have to enter data in more than one database and process cases in our state database, we also still save hard copies of all cases. NEICE alone would save time.
  - The system requires more information and research because the fields and layout are very different
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - Enter cases that are received into both SACWIS and NEICE as our SACWIS system only talks to NEICE with current Sending state information.
  - Because we still have to follow the internal process of entering the same information into our SACWIS.
  - Scanning documents to upload into the system. We do not have support staff responsible for this function.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Cases have to be entered in NEICE after entering in our regular computer system.
  - Duplicate entry of cases in NEICE and SACWIS.
  - When it is down like any system there is additional time added.
  - Cause we have to double input the information into our state system. -Time frame before logging out should be adjusted -Speed of navigation (time it takes to change between screens).
  - Duplicate and redundant entry into SACWIS to create a case record when we are the receiving state.
  - I do not have support staff who can upload documents so the Consultants have to perform that and other support staff functions to process cases.



**Program Lead Survey Responses**

**Table A24. Overall Feeling on Initial Integration with and/or Use of NEICE (%)**

	<b>INITIAL</b> <i>(n=15)</i>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 1</b> <i>(n=8)</i>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 2</b> <i>(n=10)</i>	<b>FOLLOW-UP 3</b> <i>(n=10)</i>
Very well	<b>47%</b>	<b>50%</b>	30%	20%
Well	27%	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Neutral	13%	0%	20%	20%
Poorly	7%	0%	0%	0%
Very poorly	7%	0%	0%	0%

*Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.*

**If selected poorly or very poorly, comments on what has not gone well and what contributed to this:**

- Initial Survey
  - The clearinghouse could have been implemented sooner.
  - IT planning, Training State-wide, Lack of equipment (scanners) needed to implement NEICE, false promise from Tetras that State would not "Go Live Production" until "comfortable with using NEICE."

**Based on your early experiences with the NEICE, what tool or feature do you find to be the most helpful to your state for the ICPC process? (asked on initial survey only)**

- Sending ICPC packets to participating states.
- The real time notification. Also, uploading documents
- Being able to see the progress of each request in real time.
- Interface between SACWIS and NEICE, Electronic uploading of documents, Transmitting ICPC referrals electronically.
- Population of resource and child information.
- Case processing in real time. Encourages more/better communication between state office and local liaison.
- Sending the transmittal straight there and relying on the notification emails to ensure that the referral has been sent; ease of information being located in one place.
- Generates the 100A
- The ability to view the cases statewide
- Mailing time is generally seven to 10 days to any other state, so knowing that the packet arrived immediately in the other state has been the most helpful.
- Instant transmittal; messaging and transmittal sheets
- There is not just one particular tool.

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- Rapid transmission of documents (referral, completed home study), but that was never the critical issue in ICPC completion time. The critical element is competent, sensitive, experienced staff doing comprehensive home studies, providing competent, timely post-placement services and making competent assessments for home study recommendations, progress reports and ultimately permanency recommendations.

#### **What tools or features (if any) did you use in your state's previous ICPC process/system that you wish were included in the NEICE? (asked on initial survey only)**

- Better reports for data extraction
- Overdue notification on the status bar, All ICPC documents to be housed in NEICE
- Consultant name and information on the transmittal page. Reports - child specific, residential reports, Case list by child not placement resource, IV-E Report by child - foster care and adoption
- Availability to edit document type labels. This has caused more problems than ever before. Time spent rescanning / uploading causes a lot of frustration and wasted time. Just due to human error along this feature must return as new states come aboard.
- A field that identified the biological mother and father. Now fields only state "parent 1" and "parent 2".

#### **Please describe at least two of the most significant benefits or strengths of the NEICE system. Please consider benefits or strengths for the state overall, ICPC staff, caseworkers, and children. (asked in follow-up surveys only):**

- Follow-up Survey 1
  - 1. Immediate Approval 2. Easier to use and saving time not having to make multiple copies.
  - 1. Ability to process and send ICPC referrals to other NEICE states timely and efficiently 2. Significant reduction of cost related to document copying, mailing and file cabinets 3. Ability to get accurate data reports; track sent and received cases according to states, type of request, pending decision etc.
  - 1. Improved communication between state ICPC staff with both other state's ICPC Liaisons and local caseworkers. 2. Provided transparency between states, caseworkers, and other stakeholders (GALs, Attorney's and the state court's staff).
  - Electronic submission of referral packets, specifically within the residential and private adoption cases. The decrease in mailing costs.
  - 1) Less emails and time spent for both caseworkers and ICPC staff communicating about the status of a case 2) Less duplication of information to complete on ICPC forms because the information autopopulates 3) Data collection on our state's & others' adherence to Safe and Timely Act.
  - Less paperwork and time savings.
  - Tracking the placement process of children and follow up regarding post placement visits and reports.
  - 1. All case information is in the automated system 2. NEICE states can transport information more quickly 3. Information is easily assessable in the system once everything is inputted.

## ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- Follow-up Survey 2
  - Electronic transfer of cases, basically user friendly.
  - We know that the packet has arrived pretty much immediately. This has been important documentation for the court in several instances. Typically mail takes 7 to 10 days to get to another state, so the arrival of the packet in real time is a huge benefit to us. Likewise with other documents like 100Bs. Communication with other states has improved, though with some states more than others. It seems when a request is sent as part of a transmittal rather than as a email, it is taken more seriously and acted upon more quickly. It has assisted us particularly with disruptions and urgent situations where we need quick action from the sending state, when an unsafe situation arises with a child placed in our state. I love the new 10-day notification feature. The ten days are usually enough for me to either poke my worker to get the study, or to complete a document to use as a preliminary report. I believe that we will be able to improve on timelines once we have most state signed on.
  - Timeliness, and low cost, not having to make copies.
  - Timely submission of referrals by the local workers to the state office. State ICPC coordinators ability to review and process requests more efficiently and timely. Ability to access cases and get status information more quickly and better tracking of cases.
  - Communication with other states, cost.
  - Electronic submission vs. US mail. 2 to 3 days off transmission. Easy to track progress of case.
  - 1. Communication tracking of cases both within the state and to external partners 2. Ability to gather data and monitor ICPC productivity and efficiency.
  - Timely delivery of requests, approvals and denials. NEICE is very user friendly.
  - Reports are easy to obtain and review online. Tracking the status of a request is very convenient.
  - 1. Information goes directly to the NEICE participating agency or state which is really good. 2. All the case information is kept in the file even when the case is closed.
  - Having everything done through the system has saved on time at the printer/scanner. NEICE provided us the justification to administration to make significant changes to our SACWIS system in order to align with NEICE.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Easy to upload, Good for independent adoptions.
  - 1) Especially in cases where there has been a delay in collecting the documents needed for a packet, being able to print the receipt showing that the package has been received by the other state has been helpful in proving reasonable/active efforts in legal proceedings. 2) Our state's email system is not secure, so we cannot transmit documents electronically to or receive them from non-NEICE states. Then has been problematic at times when working with other states that do not maintain hard-copy files. Using NEICE has allowed documents to be maintained electronically with access by both states for those states who are using NEICE.
  - 1. reduction in time of having to make multiple copies 2. quicker communication with states.

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- WEB BASED - System available 24/7. WORKERS -in local, state central and interstate offices have the ability to flex their time and manage work load as needed. View/Read Only roles allows the judicial system access for court hearings.
- The ability to communicate and transfer documents with NEICE participating states in "Live" time.
- 1. The ability to send documents to a destination the same day through a secured network. 2. Notification of overdue cases 3. A uniformity of the ICPC process with transferring information 4. Ability to hold records and receive reports.
- 1. Immediate delivery and the ability to process requests 2. Ability to check real time updates with other NEICE states.
- 1 - ability to have real-time information about the status of a case 2 - great tracking of time frames and due dates.
- 1. If we are processing a case to a NEICE to NEICE state and our local agency is also on the NEICE, the time to transmit documents is reduced considerably. 2. The information is stored in the system even when the case is closed.
- As more States get on board, it has been easier to get ICPC packets delivered. We are able to take the electronic documents from NEICE and transfer them to SACWIS without the need to print anything and vice versa.

**Please describe at least two of the most significant challenges or weaknesses of the NEICE system. Please consider challenges or weaknesses for the state overall, ICPC staff, caseworkers, and children. (asked in follow-up surveys only):**

- Follow-up Survey 1
  - 1. Difficult that the main states we work with are not on NEICE yet 2. The way you have to go to send a note when you are just asking a question or for a document, could be an easier way.
  - Assignment of case load to staff in the state office is a challenge (Assignments are usually done according to the last name of the child or by States). Getting technical assistance from the IT department. Since, very few States have joined NEICE, the Challenge of still sending ICPC referrals via mail and in triplicate continues.
  - 1. Lack ability of reporting accurate data for quality assurance/ performance improvement purposes.
  - That not all states are participating, and ICPC offices have to straddle two different systems. Participating states do not utilize NEICE consistently (as they use mailing/email/faxing as a means of communication and are not utilizing NEICE always in that function). The anticipation of the NEICE system to decrease the ICPC process request has not been realized. Not cost effective as system as all states are not on board, and this required continued "non electronic" means of processing cases.
  - 1) Other states requiring forms to be submitted in a specific order on NEICE...unable to specify the specific documents in NEICE 2) At times it's difficult to pull the data that we need to evaluate outcomes.
  - Bringing on field staff.
  - Our state still uses more than one database, so its extra work for us in processing cases. If we just used NEICE, it would be much simpler.
  - 1. Cannot get a IV-E report 2. Cannot get an individual ICPC worker caseload report 3. Cannot delete a transmittal when mistakes have been made 4. Case Review screen: cannot identify ICPC worker in the other state; cannot identify assigned worker in the... agency; and no case closure date - have to go to transmittal screen for this information and it takes up a lot of time.
- Follow-up Survey 2

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- Too slow, locks users out, system goes down too often.
- At this point we are still hesitant to roll it out to staff. There seems like a lot of uncertainty at the moment about the movement to CCWIS and how that will impact things, and our state is still exploring whether to go that direction. We don't want to move to NEICE phase 2 with our SACWIS if SACWIS is going away. That's not necessarily a function of anything with NEICE itself so much as it is with our IT system, but it leaves everything a bit up in the air. I would really appreciate a longer time before it times out and I have to log back in. Our state has a relatively low volume and only uses NEICE for cases we share with other NEICE states, so I am constantly having to stop and log back in over the course of the day some days. I waste a lot of time logging in between it and our encrypted email (which logs out every 10 minutes). I realize this is a security feature, but I'm in a locked office. If I walk away from my desk, no one is able to physically get to my computer. The reports don't make a lot of sense. I've tried to follow along in the manual...and finally just decided not to bother with them. There aren't enough states signed on right now for them to really show me usable information, and they are too hard to make sense out of for me to spend much time trying. They don't appear to be terribly customizable in the ways that would be helpful to me either.
- The modular system, now [...] are apprehensive about joining. The system keeps changing and it is frustrating to have to tell the counties/upper management of what is now expected. I think this is deterring other states from joining as well.
- 1. Currently, NEICE information (100- A, Home study & clearances, case notes etc) is not migrating to our SACWIS system. 2. Even with implementation of NEICE, there seems to be a long delay in getting home studies from local county agencies.
- Accuracy of reports. NEICE system running slow.
- Issues with system not working. [...] Not all states are on so separating those cases and processing 2 different ways.
- 1. Because all cases are on NEICE we are having issues with productivity due to the NEICE slowness issues they believe are due to Microsoft. We are at the mercy of technology being fixed. 2. We would like to customize reports so they make sense for our ICPC team and tracking.
- System slow down has been a challenge. Bringing on field staff.
- The states we move between most often do not participate in NEICE (yet). Our local staff have not been trained in NEICE (yet).
- 1. Notifications - if notifications could be especially identified if they are a new case or home study. 2. Cannot pull state specific reports.
- [State] didn't need another case management system, so staff are duplicating work, however it is still quicker than not having NEICE. The cost involved to use NEICE, we upgraded software and equipment. Again the upgrades have assisted in expediting requests, so it was worth it.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - Inability to delete transmittals; Notifications don't always show up.
  - 1) The biggest issue is the move to the modular system. At present it looks like the change will require us to modify our SACWIS in order to transmit to other states directly from our SACWIS, and that the NEICE online interface will go away. While we understand the need to make this change in terms of security and cost, it is becoming difficult to make the argument that we are getting adequate value for the amount we are paying in user fees, especially as a smaller state. Moving to tiered fees would help

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

me be able to make the argument for continued use, but at the present fee structure it looks like our state may have to withdraw from NEICE. Membership by the states we work with the most would also potentially help me make the argument to stay a member, but at present those states are indicating that it may be a while before they could participate for a variety of reasons. 2) The recent changes that resulted unintentionally from the roll-out of the clearing house for New Mexico have been challenging, but it looks like most of those issues have been temporarily resolved. The 10mb limit to transmittals, and having to create the 100A and 100B in NEICE have been the primary issues, especially when we are trying to close a case as the receiving state after denying a placement. Generally the receiving state does not create 100Bs. Also, if the system is going to require us to create the 100Bs, we should be able to send those 100Bs on the same transmittal as the denied home study and 100As, and not require us to create and send a second transmittal for the 100Bs. There is a lot of duplication of effort in an attempt to collect data when the data collection could be done in ways that are less obtrusive, by adding the fields into the tabs rather than having to launch the 100A or B and attach those documents to separate transmittals.

- 1. change to the modular, without a lot of states testing 2. potential changes annual fee, not a lot of direction, may impact smaller states.
- Reports, Case conversion at the local level.
- The issues with the system and update changes. This has been a huge challenge in the last month from uploading documents, adding siblings, creating a case, etc...
- 1. All states are not currently on the NEICE 2. No drop-down options when adding multiple children 3. Currently it is only used in the ICPC office not our county offices.
- 1. Anytime there is an update/new state joining, we've experienced significant time delays using the system 2. The inability to link cases together for different types of requests for the same child/placement resource slows down processing time. 3. Additional categories regarding the specific document types for attachments would be appreciated (available in test environment, but not live) 4. Allow ICPC Coordinators to have more editing power on the case manager requests and for those states that are on NEICE that don't utilize the system appropriately (use for every request or complete necessary data fields).
- 1 - inability of NEICE to create records in SACWIS - staff must create two sets of records for each case which is time consuming and redundant work 2 - limited states using system.
- These challenges do not include the challenges we all experienced from the new changes to the system since the upgrades in February. 1. Customized reports 2. Notifications cannot be processed or reviewed in a timelier manner because of the frequency. We need a way to identify the most important, i.e., new case, home study, etc.
- At times, NEICE will make changes to the system without notification which causes lost time because staff are trying to figure out how to work with the changes. States not using NEICE correctly. We have received faxes of NEICE transmittals.

## *Program Lead Survey Responses*

### **Additional comments:**

- Initial Survey
  - The training was primarily focused on creating and processing cases, but not much attention on logging the steps of the approval process (Decision and Placement Information section) and closing cases as sending versus receiving state. But the states who have been using it for a while walked us through things as they came up.
  - Initially, we had some resistance from staff in learning the NEICE system. Once we were familiar with the system and understood the importance and efficiency, we did embrace it. NEICE has made a significant impact in conducting Interstate business and all states should have adopted this several years ago.
  - [State's] early experience caused a slight but major change in our process. It removed the ability for new incoming mail to remain in a pending status. Now a case is in active status with documents being attached to a case already by the time the specialist access the case for the first time.
  - It's been a pleasant experience. My only suggestion would be for more detailed data reports with the admin view.
  - Not having enough counties or local offices using NEICE during the pilot stages and now trying to get them trained.
  - Generally, finding it to be helpful for processing time but still have limitations based on how the other states are using it. Likely need some additional usability surveys once more states are on to ensure that it is useful. One concern is withdrawing cases - if a sending state wants to withdraw, cannot close unless the sending state withdraws their referral.
  - Not enough practice time, not a good enough practice tool (UAT is not interactive, not sufficiently interactive), the NEICE was not really designed for ICPC work - if it was, it was poorly conceived, training is not provided in organized fashion for basic repetitive ICPC work and cannot be accessed to view process specific steps needed to be completed.
- Follow-up Survey 1
  - Our experience with the NEICE system has been very positive and benefited the local worker and the state ICPC worker tremendously in submitting referrals expeditiously. As a manager love the reports and tracking capabilities of NEICE.
  - [State] is still excited about our NEICE experience. Although we did not experience a significant change regarding spending on copiers, postage, etc. [...]. We have experienced wonderful communication and positive collaboration with every state that comes aboard regarding ICPC cases. Even our local [staff] has expressed joy in being given a voice regarding NEICE. Meaning now they can communicate more than just a document to Central Office but even their comments and concerns to Central Office [which is something we could not do before]. NEICE provides wonderful transparency of documents also with regards to [court staff] with read only access. We look forward to the continual growth in and with NEICE as more states join this awesome system.
  - Even our most resistant person who didn't want to learn a new system has been quoted to say that it is quite easy to use and much easier to process cases.
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - As of now, we have had positive experiences with NIECE and hope all 50 states will adopt NEICE and make it an efficient system.
  - This is only true if the system is fully operational.

### ***Program Lead Survey Responses***

- Follow-up Survey 3
  - To reiterate - our state may have to back out of using NEICE if we are required to move to the modular system (likely to the clearinghouse model since we already have an ICPC module in our SACWIS) and the tiered fee schedule has not been implemented. We simply cannot make an argument at this point that we would be getting good value for the money based on the number of cases that we have with other member states versus the development costs and user fees.
  - It has simplified the process.
  - So far we are plugging along. However, if there any more big changes like the one that occurred when New Mexico was uploaded into the Clearinghouse, those of us who are not in the Clearinghouse and will probably never be or it is a long way off, feel the brunt of those changes. It is hard enough to get staff acclimated to using the system, but this change really affect our process and if feels like we are all inconvenienced for one state. During this time, I instructed staff to put all new cases in our old system and that information will never be captured in NEICE.



*IT Lead Survey Responses*

Appendix B: IT Lead Survey Responses

## IT Lead Survey Responses

**Table B1. Number of States Using Each NEICE Connection Option**

	INITIAL (n=11)	FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=6)	FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=5)	FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=5)
Central Cloud-Based CMS	11	5	4	4
Modular CMS	0	0	0	0
Clearinghouse <sup>1</sup>	0	3	2	1

States could select all that apply.

<sup>1</sup>Tetrus acknowledged that the various implementation options are difficult for a layman to understand. The Clearinghouse refers to both a way a state can use the NEICE (via data fields in their administrative data systems) and the way all NEICE information is transmitted (regardless of NEICE implementation option). This is apparent in the responses to the surveys. For example, some survey respondents reported that they used the Clearinghouse or Modular CMS when it was known that no states used either option.

**Table B2. Primary Child Welfare Information System (%)**

	INITIAL (n=11)	FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=6)	FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=5)	FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=5)
SACWIS/other state system	82%	33%	80%	80%
Other automated system	18%	67%	20%	20%
Other non-automated/paper-based	0%	0%	0%	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

**Table B3. Use of Primary Child Welfare Information System for Tracking ICPC Cases (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Prior to or while using the NEICE, did/does your state track ICPC cases using your primary child welfare information system?</b>				
Yes	67% (n=3)	50% (n=6)	60% (n=5)	80% (n=5)
<b>Is the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) from your state's primary child welfare information system also available in the NEICE?<sup>1</sup></b>				
Yes <sup>2</sup>	50% (n=2)	33% (n=3)	67% (n=3)	100% (n=4)
<b>Do you still track information related to ICPC cases (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state's primary child welfare information system?<sup>3</sup></b>				
Yes, we use the NEICE and the ICPC fields in our primary child welfare information system concurrently.	100% (n=2)	67% (n=3)	100% (n=3)	75% (n=4)
No, we only use the NEICE now.	0% (n=2)	33% (n=3)	0% (n=3)	25% (n=4)

<sup>1</sup> This question read "Have you uploaded the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state's primary child welfare information system to the NEICE?" in the revised initial survey and the original follow-up survey.

<sup>2</sup> Among the two states that indicated the ICPC information is also available in the NEICE on Follow-Up 2, one state indicated that the information is made available to the NEICE via regular updates/interface and the other said it was manually entered by the user. Among the four states that indicated the ICPC information is also available in the NEICE on Follow-Up 3, three states indicated that the information is made available to the NEICE via regular updates/interface and the other said it was done through a one-time transfer.

<sup>3</sup>Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

## IT Lead Survey Responses

**Table B4. Separate System for ICPC Cases (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Prior to or while using the NEICE, did/does your state have a separate information system for ICPC cases (apart from the NEICE and your state’s primary child welfare information system)?<sup>1</sup></b>				
Yes	45% (n=11)	50% (n=6)	60% (n=5)	40% (n=5)
<b>Is the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) from your state’s separate ICPC information system also available in the NEICE?<sup>2</sup></b>				
Yes <sup>3</sup>	0% (n=1)	100% (n=3)	67% (n=3)	100% (n=2)
<b>Do you still use your separate ICPC information system to track information related to ICPC cases (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.)?<sup>4</sup></b>				
Yes, we use the NEICE and our separate ICPC information system concurrently.	100% (n=1)	100% (n=3)	67% (n=3)	50% (n=2)
No, we only use the NEICE now.	0% (n=1)	0% (n=3)	33% (n=3)	50% (n=2)

<sup>1</sup> This question read “Does your state have a separate information system for ICPC cases?” in the original initial survey.

<sup>2</sup> This question read “Have you uploaded the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state’s separate ICPC information system to the NEICE?” in the revised initial survey and the original follow-up survey.

<sup>3</sup> Among the two states that indicated the ICPC information is also available in the NEICE on Follow-up 2, they both indicated that the information is made available to the NEICE via regular updates/interface. Among the two states that indicated the ICPC information is also available in the NEICE on Follow-up 3, one indicated that the information is made available to the NEICE via one-time transfer; the other did not respond.

<sup>4</sup> Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

**Table B5. Data Exchange Interface Used by Central Cloud-based CMS (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Interface with primary child welfare information system</b>				
	(n=11)	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=4)
No interface (manual data entry)	64%	75%	67%	75%
Scheduled secure file transfer protocol (FTP)	27%	25%	33%	25%
Event triggered web service	9%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Interface with separate ICPC information system</b>				
	(n=4)	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)
No interface (manual data entry)	50%	50%	0%	100%
Scheduled secure FTP	50%	50%	100%	0%
Event triggered web service	0%	0%	0%	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

### Comments related to the frequency of FTP runs and event triggers for interfaces with the central cloud-based CMS:

- Initial survey:
  - FTP: The three states that indicated their primary child welfare information system uses a scheduled secure FTP interface said the FTP is scheduled to run daily. Among the two

## IT Lead Survey Responses

states that indicated their separate ICPC data system uses a scheduled secure FTP interface, one said it is scheduled to run daily and the other said it runs on demand.

- Event triggered web service: The one state that indicated their primary child welfare information system uses an event triggered web service said the event trigger is “user clicks button to send/receive.”
- Follow-up surveys:
  - FTP: At each follow-up survey, the one state that indicated their primary child welfare information system uses a scheduled secure FTP interface said the FTP is scheduled to run daily. The one state that indicated their separate ICPC data system uses a scheduled secure FTP interface at Follow-up 1 said the FTP is scheduled to run on demand. The one state that indicated their separate ICPC data system uses a scheduled secure FTP interface at Follow-up 2 said the FTP is scheduled to run daily.

**Table B6. Uses of Primary Child Welfare Information System and Separate ICPC System in ICPC Process (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Primary child welfare information system</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets	55%	33%	20%	20%
To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data	55%	50%	60%	60%
To populate ICPC case packets with data	36%	0%	40%	20%
To transmit data <sup>1</sup>	27%	0%	60%	20%
To connect to other systems	0%	0%	20%	0%
Not used to process ICPC cases	18%	33%	40%	0%
Don't know	0%	0%	0%	20%
Other	0%	17%	0%	20%
<b>Separate ICPC information system</b>	(n=5)	(n=3)	(n=2)	(n=1)
To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets	80%	67%	100%	0%
To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data	100%	100%	50%	0%
To populate ICPC case packets with data	40%	0%	0%	0%
To transmit data <sup>1</sup>	20%	0%	0%	0%
To connect to other systems	0%	33%	0%	0%
Don't know	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	0%	0%	100%

Columns total to more than 100% because respondents could select more than one response.

<sup>1</sup> On the original initial survey, the response option was “to transmit data.” On the revised initial survey and on the follow-up surveys, we created two response options: “to transmit data within the state” and “to transmit data between states.” For the purposes of this table, we counted a response of “to transmit data within the state” and “to transmit data between states” as a response of “to transmit data.” On the initial survey, of the three states that responded to the primary child welfare information system question with two response options, one indicated that they use the system to transmit data within the state and none use the system to transmit data between states. On the initial survey, one state responded to the separate ICPC information system question with two response options and that state did not indicate that the system was used to transmit data. On follow-up survey 2, of the three states that responded to the primary child welfare information system question with two response options, two indicated

## IT Lead Survey Responses

that they use the system to transmit data within the state and one uses the system to transmit data between states. On follow-up survey 3, the one state that responded to the primary child welfare information system question with two response options indicated that they use the system to transmit data within the state.

**Table B7. Interoperability of Primary Child Welfare Information System (%)**

	INITIAL (n=11)	FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=6)	FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=5)	FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=5)
<b>To what extent does data from your child welfare information system(s) interface with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) data elements in the Children, Youth, and Family Services (CYFS) domain?</b>				
Fully	9%	0%	20%	0%
Partially	18%	17%	0%	0%
Not at all	<b>36%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Not sure	<b>36%</b>	33%	<b>40%</b>	0%
<b>To what extent do your state's data sharing policies for your child welfare information system(s) align with the National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA)?</b>				
Fully	18%	0%	20%	0%
Partially	9%	17%	20%	0%
Not at all	9%	17%	0%	40%
Not sure	<b>64%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data with other state child welfare data systems (particularly with child abuse and neglect registries)?</b>				
Fully	18%	17%	<b>60%</b>	20%
Partially	18%	17%	20%	0%
Not at all	27%	<b>50%</b>	0%	<b>60%</b>
Not sure	<b>36%</b>	17%	20%	20%
<b>To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data about children in foster care with your state's Medicaid healthcare exchange?</b>				
Fully	<b>27%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Partially	<b>27%</b>	17%	20%	0%
Not at all	<b>27%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>40%</b>	40%
Not sure	18%	17%	0%	0%
<b>To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data with county/state/federal court data systems?</b>				
Fully	18%	17%	0%	20%
Partially	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Not at all	9%	33%	0%	0%
Not sure	27%	0%	0%	20%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

IT Lead Survey Responses

**Table B8: Interoperability of Separate ICPC Data System (%)**

	INITIAL (n=5)	FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=3)	FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=2)	FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=1)
<b>To what extent does data from your child welfare information system(s) interface with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) data elements in the Children, Youth, and Family Services (CYFS) domain?</b>				
Fully	0%	0%	50%	0%
Partially	40%	33%	0%	0%
Not at all	40%	33%	50%	100%
Not sure	20%	33%	0%	0%
<b>To what extent do your state’s data sharing policies for your child welfare information system(s) align with the National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA)?</b>				
Fully	20%	0%	0%	0%
Partially	0%	33%	0%	0%
Not at all	40%	33%	0%	100%
Not sure	40%	33%	100%	0%
<b>To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data with other state child welfare data systems (particularly with child abuse and neglect registries)?</b>				
Fully	0%	0%	0%	0%
Partially	20%	33%	0%	0%
Not at all	80%	67%	50%	100%
Not sure	0%	0%	50%	0%
<b>To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data about children in foster care with your state’s Medicaid healthcare exchange?<sup>1</sup></b>				
Fully	0%	0%	0%	0%
Partially	40%	0%	0%	0%
Not at all	60%	50%	100%	100%
Not sure	0%	50%	0%	0%
<b>To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data with county/state/federal court data systems?</b>				
Fully	0%	33%	0%	0%
Partially	40%	0%	0%	0%
Not at all	60%	67%	100%	100%
Not sure	0%	0%	0%	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup>The N for follow-up survey 1 is 2.

**IT Lead Survey Responses**

**Table B9. Degree to which Barriers/Challenges were Experienced (%)**

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
<b>Insufficient financial resources</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	9%	33%	0%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	18%	17%	60%	60%
Not at all	64%	17%	20%	20%
Do not know	9%	33%	20%	20%
<b>Insufficient overall process documentation</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	20%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	45%	33%	60%	60%
Not at all	55%	33%	20%	40%
Do not know	0%	33%	0%	0%
<b>Insufficient technical documentation</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	20%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	45%	33%	40%	40%
Not at all	55%	33%	20%	40%
Do not know	0%	33%	20%	20%
<b>Insufficient end user documentation</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	45%	33%	60%	20%
Not at all	55%	33%	20%	40%
Do not know	0%	33%	20%	40%
<b>Insufficient technical staff</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=4)
Very much	0%	17%	20%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	27%	33%	60%	25%
Not at all	73%	33%	20%	50%
Do not know	0%	17%	0%	25%
<b>Insufficient staff time</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	17%	40%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	55%	50%	40%	20%
Not at all	45%	17%	20%	40%
Do not know	0%	17%	0%	40%
<b>Staff turnover<sup>2</sup></b>	(n=3)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	33%	20%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	33%	17%	60%	0%
Not at all	33%	33%	20%	40%
Do not know	33%	17%	0%	60%
<b>Insufficient local buy-in/leadership</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	18%	17%	20%	0%
Not at all	82%	33%	60%	60%
Do not know	0%	50%	20%	40%
<b>Insufficient state buy-in/leadership</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	20%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	27%	50%	20%	0%
Not at all	73%	33%	60%	100%
Do not know	0%	17%	0%	0%
<b>Staff resistance</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	40%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	36%	33%	20%	40%
Not at all	64%	17%	20%	40%
Do not know	0%	50%	20%	20%
<b>Insufficient training</b>	(n=11)	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very much	0%	0%	0%	0%

## IT Lead Survey Responses

	INITIAL	FOLLOW-UP 1	FOLLOW-UP 2	FOLLOW-UP 3
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	18%	0%	20%	20%
Not at all	<b>64%</b>	33%	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Do not know	18%	<b>67%</b>	<b>40%</b>	20%
<b>Insufficient technical support</b>	<i>(n=10)</i>	<i>(n=6)</i>	<i>(n=5)</i>	<i>(n=5)</i>
Very much	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	20%	0%	<b>40%</b>	20%
Not at all	<b>60%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Do not know	20%	<b>50%</b>	20%	20%
<b>Insufficient end user support</b>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=6)</i>	<i>(n=5)</i>	<i>(n=5)</i>
Very much	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat or minor/moderate <sup>1</sup>	18%	0%	<b>40%</b>	0%
Not at all	<b>64%</b>	33%	20%	<b>60%</b>
Do not know	18%	<b>67%</b>	<b>40%</b>	40%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents to the initial survey were asked about barriers or challenges to onboarding or going live with the NEICE. Respondents to the follow-up surveys were asked about challenges encountered while using the NEICE.

<sup>1</sup> The response categories in the original initial survey were: 'very much a barrier,' 'somewhat of a barrier,' 'not at all a barrier,' and 'don't know.' The response options in the revised initial survey and follow-up surveys were 'a major challenge,' 'a moderate challenge,' 'a minor challenge,' 'not at all a challenge,' and 'don't know.' For comparison purposes, we combined 'minor' and 'moderate.'

<sup>2</sup> This item was not asked on the original initial survey.

**Table B10. Other Challenges Experienced (%)**

	INITIAL <i>(n=11)</i>	FOLLOW-UP 1 <i>(n=6)</i>	FOLLOW-UP 2 <i>(n=3)</i>	FOLLOW-UP 3 <i>(n=5)</i>
Yes	36%	0%	0%	20%

Respondents to the initial survey were asked about challenges in starting up or operating the NEICE. Respondents to the follow-up survey were asked about any challenges in using the NEICE.

### Comments from those indicating 'yes'<sup>26</sup>:

- Initial Survey:
  - The majority of states that [state] interacts with through the ICPC are not yet on the NEICE therefore the time and cost savings are not yet fully realized.
  - [Staff] have left positions recently, so we have lack of expertise in this area.
  - Some "glitches" in the NEICE system. E.g. No tickler for reports that are due, no report for foster care and adoption IV-E children, no report for residential placements and no report on caseload/workload for individual ICPC employees.
  - Production data available in non-production environment -lack of clarity on which system was prod and which was test -data security concerns -documentation from NEICE was incomplete and not available in a timely manner -missing or inaccurate information provided to us -we are doing duplicate data entry on our side.
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - The planned approach we originally agreed to was subsequently determined too costly to host state's data in the cloud. Now we must re-evaluate our options considering that we already have an ICPC module, the CCWIS regulations and the recent NEICE bill.

<sup>26</sup> All open-ended responses are provided verbatim, except identifying information was removed or masked.



## IT Lead Survey Responses

**Table B11. Technical Assistance (TA) from APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus (%)**

	INITIAL (n=11)	FOLLOW-UP 1 (n=4)	FOLLOW-UP 2 (n=5)	FOLLOW-UP 3 (n=5)
<b>How much TA needed</b>				
Hourly	0%	0%	0%	0%
Daily	0%	0%	0%	0%
Weekly	18%	0%	0%	0%
Monthly	<b>36%</b>	0%	0%	40%
Never	18%	<b>75%</b>	<b>80%</b>	0%
Other	27%	25%	20%	<b>60%</b>
<b>Effectiveness of TA</b>	(n=10)	(n=5)	(n=5)	(n=5)
Very effective	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	20%	<b>60%</b>
Somewhat effective	10%	20%	<b>40%</b>	0%
Neutral	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	40%
Somewhat ineffective	10%	0%	0%	0%
Very ineffective	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Responsiveness of TA</b>	(n=11)	(n=5)	(n=5)	(n=4)
Very responsive	<b>55%</b>	<b>40%</b>	20%	<b>50%</b>
Somewhat responsive	27%	20%	<b>40%</b>	25%
Neutral	18%	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	25%
Somewhat unresponsive	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very unresponsive	0%	0%	0%	0%

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

### Comments from those indicating 'other' frequency of assistance from APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus:

- Initial Survey:
  - We have not implemented the Clearinghouse therefore no IT related technical assistance has been needed. TA used to understand the NEICE, not for IT implementation.
  - Our need for technical assistance is rare, when we have needed assistance, Tetrus tech staff has been very quick to respond and very easy to work with.
  - We would not like to say NEVER, but not often
- Follow-up Survey 1:
  - Only during the project interface implementation
- Follow-up Survey 2
  - One per year
- Follow-up Survey 3
  - None now but will need in the future when we move to CCWIS.
  - State IT has not been engaged with any technical assistance sessions provided to the business owners.

### Comments from those indicating that APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus TA has been anything other than 'very effective':

- Initial Survey:
  - We have not implemented the Clearinghouse therefore no IT related technical assistance has been needed. TA used to understand the NEICE, not for IT implementation.
  - Based on our progress in integration, we are not in need of much assistance.
  - Better File Definitions regarding mapping specific data elements.

## ***IT Lead Survey Responses***

- Follow-up Survey 1:
  - I would need to ask the end users.
- Follow-up Survey 2:
  - More documentation.

### **Comments regarding any additional information about experiences with the NEICE:**

- Initial Survey:
  - [State]'s effort to develop a data transfer process was successful, in part, due to the efforts of both APHSA staff and Tetrus tech staff. With their assistance, our tech team was able to develop a simple, dependable, efficient process that did not consume much staff time or \$\$ and requires very little time and effort to maintain.
  - [State] was waiting to see if there would be more federal backing on this project before moving forward. We are also hoping our software provider ... would add this in as core functionality to their system.
  - In regards to the clearinghouse, lengthy response time in receiving requested information/documentation -in regards to the CMS, very good response time in supporting us when questions arose -appeared that NEICE/Tetrus was not prepared/clear with the requirements states needed to meet -we were unsure if the questions in this survey were directed towards identifying internal or external hurdles - we answered the questions in regards to our hurdles internally -as far as our SACWIS being able to interface with other areas, we have the capabilities but have not implemented or had a desire to.
- Follow-up Survey 1:
  - We are doing duplicate entry with our legacy case management system until we build our new CCWIS solution.
  - The state is using our case management system, as well as the NEICE portal for cases with other states who are also using NEICE. We do not have integration, so the technical team has not been involved in the process of using NEICE in the past year.
- Follow-up Survey 3:
  - State IT currently not engaged; therefore, unable to comment on technical assistance provided to business owners.
  - None. The system is working great.

***Cost Tool Responses***

Appendix C: Cost Tool Responses

## Cost Tool Responses

### Start-Up Cost Tool Findings

**Table C1. Number of Staff Hours**

Type of Staff	Mean average hours per person (n=3-4) <sup>1</sup>	Mean number of people (n=4)	Mean total hours (n=7-8) <sup>2</sup>	Minimum total hours (n=7-8) <sup>2</sup>	Maximum total hours (n=7-8) <sup>2</sup>
NEICE IT lead	59.0	1.3	28.9	0	130
ICPC program lead	111.7	1.0	64.0	0	300
Other ICPC program staff	11.7	2.5	51.3	0	240
Analyst	41.0	0.8	34.6	0	120
Programmer	76.3	0.5	78.1	0	260
Database administrator	1.3	0.3	3.1	0	20
Security administrator	7.5	1.3	6.3	0	26
Support/clerical	0.0	0.0	10.6	0	80
Procurement staff	0.8	0.3	2.3	0	10
Hardware technicians	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0
Helpdesk/IT user support	0.0	0.0	3.5	0	25
Caseworkers	0.0	62.5	85.7	0	600
Agency leadership and management	10.0	2.5	19.6	0	80
Legal/contracts staff	10.0	0.5	19.1	0	80

Note: Multiple versions of the Cost Tool have been used. In the first version completed by four states, respondents were asked for the total number of hours per staff category. In the revised version of the Cost Tool, respondents were asked for the average number of hours per person and the total number of people per staff category.

<sup>1</sup> The N is 3 for the NEICE IT lead, NEICE program lead, other ICPC program staff, and caseworkers. The N is 4 for all others.

<sup>2</sup> The N is 7 for the NEICE IT lead, NEICE program lead, other ICPC program staff, and caseworkers. The N is 8 for all others.

**Table C2. New Hires**

New hires related to the NEICE (n=7)	
# of states that made new hires	0

Note: This question was not asked on the latest iteration of the Cost Tool.

**Table C3. Expenditures by Type, Excluding the NEICE Licensing Fee**

Type of cost	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Staff hours (n=5)	\$29,032.86	\$6,800	\$63,845.30
Hardware (n=7)	\$2,006.01	\$0	\$7,381.07
Software (n=8)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Training (n=7)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Travel (n=8)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other costs (n=8)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Average total costs (excluding the NEICE licensing fee) (n=5)</b>	<b>\$31,841.27</b>	<b>\$6,800</b>	<b>\$71,226.37</b>

## Cost Tool Responses

**Table C4. Unanticipated Costs**

Unanticipated Costs Categories	# of States Reporting Unanticipated Costs
Costs in unanticipated categories ( <i>n</i> =8)	2
Higher than expected costs ( <i>n</i> =7)	2
Lower than expected costs ( <i>n</i> =7)	0

**Description of unanticipated costs:**

- \$600 for software
- Replacing incompatible laptop PCs, scanners at State Central Office.

**Description of higher than expected costs:**

- Licensing fee \$25,000 more than expected
- Licensing fee \$8,000 more than expected

**Additional comments on costs:<sup>27</sup>**

- The E-Learning #101 and #102 are critical, as is the UAT practice region. What these costs are are unclear, but repeatedly noted by NEICE, Tetras and APHSA to be "costly."

---

<sup>27</sup> All open-ended responses are provided verbatim, except when identifying information was removed or masked.

## Cost Tool Responses

### Ongoing Cost Tool Findings

**Table C5. Number of Staff Hours**

Type of Staff	Mean average hours per person (n=6)	Mean number of people (n=6)	Mean total hours (n=6)	Minimum total hours (n=6)	Maximum total hours (n=6)
NEICE IT lead	1.2	0.3	1.2	0	5
ICPC program lead	3.9	0.7	3.9	0	10
Other ICPC program staff	22.5	1.0	62.5	0	360
Analyst	0.8	0.2	0.8	0	5
Programmer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0
Database administrator	0.3	0.2	0.3	0	2
Security administrator	1.2	0.3	1.2	0	5
Support/clerical	0.1	0.2	0.1	0	0.3
Procurement staff	0.3	0.2	0.3	0	2
Hardware technicians	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0
Helpdesk/IT user support	0.1	0.2	0.1	0	0.5
Caseworkers	0.5	3.5	7.7	0	45
Agency leadership and management	0.5	0.5	1.5	0	9
Legal/contracts staff	0.3	0.2	0.3	0	2

**Table C6. New Hires**

New hires related to the NEICE (n=6)	
# of states that made new hires	0

Note: This question was not asked on the latest iteration of the Cost Tool.

**Table C7. Monthly Expenditures by Type (Excludes NEICE Licensing Fee)**

Type of cost	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Staff hours (n=5)	\$293.82	\$0	\$800
Hardware (n=6)	\$0.18	\$0	\$1.06
Software (n=5)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Training (n=6)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Travel (n=6)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other costs (n=6)	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Table C8. Unanticipated Costs**

Unanticipated Costs Categories	# of States Reporting Unanticipated Costs
Costs in unanticipated categories (n=7)	0
Higher than expected costs (n=7)	0
Lower than expected costs (n=7)	0

## Cost Tool Responses

### Sustainability Findings from Most Recent Cost Tool Submitted by Each State

**Table C9. Title IV-E Administrative Costs**

Has your state submitted, or will your state be submitting, the annual system fee for the NEICE to the federal government for partial reimbursement under Title IV-E administrative costs?	# of states (n=11)
Yes	7
No	2
Not sure	2

**Table C10. Future NEICE Funding**

	# of states
<b>Is NEICE-related work funded through the remainder of your current fiscal year? (n=9)</b>	
Yes	5
No	4
<b>Does your state plan to include costs for NEICE-related work in next fiscal year's budget? (n=10)</b>	
Yes	5
No	5

*Note: Multiple versions of the Cost Tool have been used. In the first version completed by four states, respondents were asked "Through which fiscal year is the NEICE-related work funded?" and given the following options: 'current fiscal year only,' 'current and next,' or 'beyond next fiscal year.' In the later versions of the Cost Tool, respondents were asked the questions presented in the table. To aggregate the information across Cost Tools, we coded responses of 'current fiscal year only,' 'current and next,' or 'beyond next fiscal year' as a 'yes' response to 'Is NEICE-related work funded through the remainder of your current fiscal year?' We recoded responses of 'current and next' or 'beyond next fiscal year' as a 'yes' response to "Does your state plan to include costs for NEICE-related work in next fiscal year's budget?"*

**Table C11. Amount Anticipated to Be Included in Next Fiscal Year's (FY) Budget for NEICE-related Costs (Among States Planning to Include Costs in the Next FY Budget)**

Future Funding	
Average amount anticipated to be included in next FY's budget for NEICE-related costs (n=3)	\$25,000+ <sup>1</sup>
Number of states concerned about whether NEICE-related costs will be approved (n=5)	3

<sup>1</sup> Two states said "\$25,000" and one state said "\$25,000 plus the number of hours."

**Reasons for concern:**

- Current functionality supports sending ICPC applications (and related documents) to another state. Receiving applications from other states, notifications of new applications, developing additional web services, and full integration into existing SACWIS system remain outstanding.

## Cost Tool Responses

**Table C12. Sources of Funding**

Funding Sources	# of states using each source (n=5)
State funds allocated to the state child welfare agency budget	3
State funds allocated to other state budget lines (outside of child welfare agency)	0
Federal IV-E/SACWIS/CCWIS reimbursement	3
Other federal funding sources (outside of IV-E dollars) <sup>1</sup>	1
Local or county funding	1
Foundation grant	0
Other	0

*Note: Multiple versions of the Cost Tool have been used. In the first version completed by four states, respondents were asked about the funding sources for NEICE funding for the current fiscal year, next fiscal year, and beyond next fiscal year. In the revised Cost Tool, respondents were asked about funding sources for NEICE funding for the next fiscal year.*

*States could select more than one response.*

<sup>1</sup> *In the original cost tool, this item read "Federal grant."*

**Table C13. Allocation of Funding for Next Fiscal Year**

Fund Allocation	# of states indicating funds are allocated for this purpose (n=3)	Average amount allocated among states indicating any amount was allocated (n=2)
Staff	0	N/A
Hardware	0	N/A
Software	0	N/A
Training	0	N/A
Travel	0	N/A
NEICE licensing fees	2	\$25,000
Other	0	N/A
Unallocated at this time	1	N/A

*Note: Multiple versions of the Cost Tool have been used. In the first version completed by four states, respondents were asked about allocations of NEICE funding for the current fiscal year, next fiscal year, and beyond next fiscal year. In the revised Cost Tool, respondents were asked about allocations for NEICE funding for the next fiscal year.*

**Table C14. Future Financial Plan**

How do you plan to finance the NEICE after the next fiscal year?	# of states (n=10)
No current plan	1
We will use the state child welfare agency funding	7
We will use funding from other state or local agencies (outside of the existing child welfare agency budget)	0
We will use federal funding	4
We will use private dollars (e.g., foundation)	0
Other <sup>1</sup>	1

*Note: Multiple versions of the Cost Tool have been used. In the first version completed by four states, respondents were asked 'What is your financial plan for continuing to use the NEICE after May 2018?' On the revised tool, respondents were asked the question presented in the table.*

*States could select more than one response.*

<sup>1</sup> *Other was described as 'A combination of state and federal funds.'*



## *Cost Tool Responses*

### **Additional comments on costs or sustainability plans:**

- We're dependent on CAPTA funds to keep [state] participating in NEICE.

***NEICE Case Data Results***

Appendix D: NEICE Case Data Results

**NEICE Case Data Results**

**Table D1. Number of Children Processed by NEICE States Since June 1, 2015**

	<u>State was the NEICE SS to:</u>		<u>State was the NEICE RS from:</u>	
	a NEICE RS	a non-NEICE RS	a non-NEICE SS	a NEICE SS
AL	313	2	0	245
AK	56	4	8	37
CA	965	137	5	802
DC	262	541	156	60
FL	2,039	6,983	4,359	1,086
GA	475	503	915	941
HI	12	12	5	6
IL	676	14	47	1,206
IN	878	8	7	744
IA	229	199	243	191
MD	71	85	129	116
MS	70	7	2	137
NE	217	838	693	242
NM	7	0	0	6
NV	758	1,903	1,228	684
RI	33	176	105	17
SC	325	154	176	536
VA	303	996	1,665	739
WI	509	49	0	542
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,198</b>	<b>12,611</b>	<b>9,743</b>	<b>8,337</b>

*This table presents the unique number of children served by each state for each arrangement presented once the state became a NEICE state. For example, the CA row excludes children for which CA was the sending state (SS) or receiving state (RS) prior to CA joining the NEICE. Those cases are included, however, in other state rows, if the other state involved in the placement with CA was already using the NEICE. Omitted from these counts are cases in which the SS or RS was missing.*

**NEICE Case Data Results**

**Table D2. Median Number of Business Days for Each ICPC Step for Unique Child-Placement Requests in which Both the RS and SS Participated in NEICE**

	Median	All cases		Non-Reg. 7	Reg. 7
		25 <sup>th</sup> percentile	75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	Median	Median
<b>Step 1:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100A	<b>2</b> (n=6,966)	0	7	<b>2</b> (n=6,180)	<b>1</b> (n=786)
<b>Step 2:</b> SS sends 100A → RS sends 100A back to SS	<b>38</b> (n=4,649)	3	64	<b>39</b> (n=4,087)	<b>29.5</b> (n=562)
<b>Step 3:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>30</b> (n=1,720)	13	73	<b>30</b> (n=1,503)	<b>28</b> (n=217)
<b>Step 4:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → placement	<b>8</b> (n=1,294)	1	23	<b>7</b> (n=1,130)	<b>18</b> (n=164)
<b>Step 5:</b> Placement → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1,2</sup>	<b>10</b> (n=1,178)	3	27	<b>11</b> (n=1,019)	<b>8</b> (n=159)
<b>Step 6:</b> Start of process → placement	<b>46</b> (n=1,281)	7	99	<b>39</b> (n=1,115)	<b>68</b> (n=166)
<b>Step 7:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>76</b> (n=2,038)	30	136	<b>76</b> (n=1,795)	<b>76</b> (n=243)

<sup>1</sup> Because the 100B can be sent for a variety of reasons, this item should be interpreted with caution.

<sup>2</sup> Values can be negative because a 100B can be sent prior to placement.

**Table D3. Median Time for Each ICPC Step for Unique Child-Placement Requests Overall, and When Only One State Participated in NEICE**

	Median Number of Business Days		
	ALL CASES (Only SS, Only RS, or Both NEICE)	ONLY SS IS NEICE	ONLY RS IS NEICE
<b>Step 1:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100A	<b>3</b> (n=18,882)	<b>3</b> (n=11,906)	<b>2</b> (n=10)
<b>Step 2:</b> SS sends 100A → RS sends 100A back to SS	<b>40</b> (n=13,303)	<b>41</b> (n=8,647)	<b>51</b> (n=7)
<b>Step 3:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>33</b> (n=5,294)	<b>34</b> (n=3,519)	<b>88</b> (n=55)
<b>Step 4:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → placement	<b>10</b> (n=6,231)	<b>9</b> (n=2,976)	<b>12</b> (n=1,960)
<b>Step 5:</b> Placement → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1,2</sup>	<b>11</b> (n=4,331)	<b>11</b> (n=3,112)	<b>27</b> (n=41)
<b>Step 6:</b> Start of process → placement	<b>48</b> (n=4,674)	<b>47</b> (n=3,282)	<b>83</b> (n=111)
<b>Step 7:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>83</b> (n=6,456)	<b>85</b> (n=4,362)	<b>161.5</b> (n=56)

<sup>1</sup> Because the 100B can be sent for a variety of reasons, this item should be interpreted with caution.

<sup>2</sup> Values can be negative because a 100B can be sent prior to placement.

**NEICE Case Data Results**

**Table D4. Median Time for Each ICPC Step for Unique Child-Placement Requests in Which Both the RS and SS Participated in NEICE, by Regulation Type**

	Median Number of Business Days				
	Reg 1	Reg 2	Reg 4	Reg 7	Reg 12
<b>Step 1:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100A	<b>3</b> (n=42)	<b>3</b> (n=4,721)	<b>1</b> (n=713)	<b>1</b> (n=786)	<b>3</b> (n=704)
<b>Step 2:</b> SS sends 100A → RS sends 100A back to SS	<b>56.5</b> (n=12)	<b>52</b> (n=2,799)	<b>1</b> (n=628)	<b>29.5</b> (n=562)	<b>1</b> (n=648)
<b>Step 3:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>147.5</b> (n=4)	<b>34</b> (n=746)	<b>18</b> (n=373)	<b>28</b> (n=217)	<b>39.5</b> (n=380)
<b>Step 4:</b> RS sends 100A back to SS → placement	<b>N/A</b>	<b>18</b> (n=622)	<b>6</b> (n=238)	<b>18</b> (n=164)	<b>0</b> (n=270)
<b>Step 5:</b> Placement → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1,2</sup>	<b>-1</b> (n=4)	<b>8</b> (n=552)	<b>8</b> (n=219)	<b>8</b> (n=159)	<b>28</b> (n=244)
<b>Step 6:</b> Start of process → placement	<b>5</b> (n=4)	<b>97.5</b> (n=600)	<b>9</b> (n=241)	<b>68</b> (n=166)	<b>4</b> (n=270)
<b>Step 7:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>1</sup>	<b>3.5</b> (n=32)	<b>112</b> (n=968)	<b>22</b> (n=408)	<b>76</b> (n=243)	<b>42</b> (n=387)

N/A: The sample size is too small to report any meaningful information (i.e., sample of 1 or 2).

<sup>1</sup> Because the 100B can be sent for a variety of reasons, this item should be interpreted with caution.

<sup>2</sup> Values can be negative because a 100B can be sent prior to placement.

**Table D5. Percentage of Unique Child-Placement Requests in Which Both the RS and SS Participated in NEICE that Met Relevant ICPC Time Benchmarks**

	Percentage of cases meeting benchmark				
	Reg 1	Reg 2	Reg 4	Reg 7	Reg 12
<b>Step 1:</b> Start of process → SS sends 100A					
2 business days for Reg. 7 cases	--	--	--	76% (n=786)	--
<b>Step 2:</b> SS sends 100A → RS sends 100A back to SS <sup>1</sup>					
180 calendar days for Reg. 1 and Reg. 2 cases	75% (n=12)	89% (n=2,799)	--	--	--
20 business days for Reg. 7 cases	--	--	--	25% (n=562)	--
3 business days for Reg. 4 and Reg. 12 cases	--	--	85% (n=628)	--	89% (n=648)
<b>Step 5:</b> Placement → SS sends 100B to RS <sup>2</sup>					
3 business days for Reg. 4 cases	--	--	34% (n=219)	--	--
5 business days for Reg. 12 cases	--	--	--	--	16% (n=244)

<sup>1</sup> Note that we calculated step 2 as the time between when the SS sends the 100A and when the RS sends the 100A back to the SS. The ICPC regulations prescribe time benchmarks based on the time between when the RS receives the 100A from the SS and when the RS sends the 100A back to the SS. However, since this analysis is conducted only on requests in which both the RS and SS participate in the NEICE, the time between when the SS sends the 100A and when the RS receives the 100A should be inconsequential due to instant electronic transmission.

<sup>2</sup> Because the 100B can be sent for a variety of reasons, this item should be interpreted with caution.

## ***NEICE Case Data Results***

### ***Technical notes regarding Tables D2-D5:***

- Calculations include all cases that had a non-missing date for both time points being analyzed. This means that there is a different sample for each ICPC step analyzed.
- We conducted calculations only among cases that followed the typical ICPC process (meaning that the following steps occurred in sequential order: start of process, SS sends 100A to RS, RS sends 100A back to SS, SS sends 100B to RS/placement). We cleaned variables by examining whether dates did not follow this typical ICPC process. When inconsistencies appeared, we first resolved any clear data entry errors (such as typing 2016 instead of 2015). When only one date for a case was illogical (for example, the start of the process being after all other ICPC steps), that date was set to missing. When it was not possible to make a reasonable assumption about which date was incorrect, we dropped the case from the analysis. ICPC violation cases (a placement being made prior to approval) or cases that represent special ICPC exceptions (like Regulation 1 cases being permitted to be placed in the RS prior to paperwork being filed) were also dropped from the analysis.

***Initial Program Lead Survey***

Appendix E: Initial Program Lead Survey

## Initial Program Lead Survey

### Introduction

The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), in conjunction with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC), has contracted with Child Trends, a nonprofit research institute, to evaluate the implementation of the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE).

This survey asks about your experiences with the NEICE. Your responses will help inform Child Trends' evaluation of the NEICE expansion efforts across the country.

The survey should take around 30-45 minutes to complete, and comprises five sections:

#### Section 1: Motivations for Joining the NEICE & Expectations

#### Section 2: Initial Information and Communications about the NEICE

#### Section 3: Current System Connection and Users

#### Section 4: Training and Technical Assistance/Support

#### Section 5: Impressions of the NEICE

If a question is not applicable, please leave it blank.

The purpose of the survey is to help APHSA/AAICPC make it easier for your state and other states to start up and use the NEICE.

**Please note that the survey is being conducted by Child Trends, and all responses will come directly to Child Trends staff. While the identity of your state is linked to your responses on this survey, we will only report de-identified information when reporting results to APHSA/AAICPC, Tetras, and others. In other words, your name and your state's name will NOT be included with the responses to the survey that we share outside of Child Trends. Therefore, please feel free to be candid in sharing your thoughts.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please call or e-mail Kristina Rosinsky at 240-223-9398 or [krosinsky@childtrends.org](mailto:krosinsky@childtrends.org).

Thank you for your time and for helping to improve the NEICE!

Name \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone # \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 1: Motivations for Joining the NEICE & Expectations

**#1. We are interested in learning more about your state's motivations for joining the NEICE. In the table below, please indicate how important each of the following potential benefits of the NEICE was (if at all) in your state's decision to join the NEICE. Please select one response in each row.**

	Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
a. Expedited placement timelines for children					
b. Improved placement stability for children					



**Initial Program Lead Survey**

c. Reduced administrative costs (e.g., document copying and mailing)					
d. Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send ICPC documents <i>across</i> states					
e. Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send required documents <i>within</i> the state (e.g., between localities and state offices)					
f. Improved data integrity/accuracy of case information shared across states					
g. Increased ability of staff to track cases/monitor progress					
h. Ability to interoperate with other data systems (e.g., law enforcement or judicial agencies, Medicaid agencies) using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards					
i. Improved communication with other state ICPC coordinators					
j. Improved ability to comply with ICPC requirements					
k. Other (please specify):					

**#2. Please use the space below for any additional comments or feedback about your state’s motivations to join the NEICE.**

**#3. [FOR NON-PILOT STATES] Your state joined the NEICE in [MONTH, YEAR]. Why did your state choose to join the NEICE at this point (as opposed to earlier)? (select all that apply)**

- Funding was available at that time that was not available earlier
- Unfavorable political or administrative conditions earlier (e.g., lack of strong leadership support for the NEICE)
- State was previously satisfied with existing ICPC process/system
- State had significant IT development underway and this project was not a priority
- Common state partners were not using the NEICE previously
- We were not sure the NEICE would be around in the long run
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**#4. We would like to understand what challenges, if any, your state faced in joining the NEICE, or concerns that your state had about participation. In the table below, please indicate how much of a**

**Initial Program Lead Survey**

**challenge or concern each of the following factors were (if at all) for your state. Please select one response in each row.**

	<b>Not at all a challenge/concern</b>	<b>A minor challenge/concern</b>	<b>A moderate challenge/concern</b>	<b>A major challenge/concern</b>
a. Cost of NEICE participation/financial resources				
b. Time/resources required to have staff trained and comfortable using the NEICE				
c. Staff resistance to a new ICPC system/process				
d. Staff turnover				
e. Local buy-in/leadership support				
f. State buy-in/leadership support				
g. Availability and quality of technical assistance				
h. Ability to adapt NEICE to your needs or preferences				
i. System features (e.g., navigation, fields, structure)				
j. Satisfaction with existing ICPC system/process (i.e., existing system working well for the state)				
k. Concerns about whether the NEICE would improve timelines for ICPC process in the state				
l. Concerns about whether the NEICE would reduce ICPC-related costs for the state				
m. Confidentiality concerns around electronic data sharing/potential data breaches				
n. Concerns about ease of using the NEICE for non-ICPC staff				
o. Other (please specify):				

**#5. Please estimate how much improvement (if any) you anticipate your state experiencing or that your state has already experienced with the following as a result of your use of the NEICE: Please select one response in each row.**

	<b>No improvement (about 0% change)</b>	<b>Minor improvement (about 10% or less reduction in time)</b>	<b>Moderate improvement (about 11% - 30% reduction in time)</b>	<b>Major improvement (More than about 30% reduction in time)</b>	<b>Don't know</b>

**Initial Program Lead Survey**

a. <b>Overall time</b> from starting the 100-A to placing a child	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	<b>No improvement (about 0% change)</b>	<b>Minor improvement (about 10% or less reduction in costs)</b>	<b>Moderate improvement (about 11% - 30% reduction in costs)</b>	<b>Major improvement (More than about 30% reduction in costs)</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
b. <b>Costs</b> associated with ICPC-related document copying and mailing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**#6. Please use the space below for any additional comments or feedback about the risks or benefits to your state's participation in the NEICE.**

**Section 2: Initial Information and Communications about the NEICE**

**#7. Thinking about the information shared with you about the NEICE by APHSA/AAICPC before your state committed to use the NEICE, how helpful was the information in helping your state determine whether to join the NEICE? (select one)**

- Very helpful
- Somewhat helpful
- Neutral
- Somewhat unhelpful
- Very unhelpful

**#7a. SKIP PATTERN: If any response other than "very helpful":** What do you think would have made the information more helpful?

**#8. Is there anything that was not shared with you that you wish had been shared prior to committing to use the NEICE?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**#8a. SKIP PATTERN: If "Yes":** What other information would have been helpful to have prior to committing to use the NEICE?

**Initial Program Lead Survey**

**#9. Thinking of the period between when you first started communicating with APHSA/AAICPC about joining the NEICE to the point when your state “went live” with the system, please note your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements: (Please select one response in each row.)**

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
a. The steps required for my state to join the NEICE were clear and understandable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The steps required for my state to join the NEICE were reasonable/fair.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The overall time it took to join the NEICE (from the initial interest communication with APHSA/AAICPC staff to the first time my state used the system) was reasonable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Section 3: Current System Connection and Users**

**#10. In addition to your state’s primary child welfare information system (e.g., Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS)/other state system), does your state have a separate information system for ICPC cases?**

- Yes
- No

**#11. How is your state’s primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system) used in the ICPC process? (select all that apply)**

- To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets
- To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data
- To populate ICPC case packets with data
- To transmit data within the state
- To transmit data between states
- To connect to other systems
- Not used to process ICPC cases
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don’t know

**#12. (SKIP PATTERN: If yes to #10): How is your state’s separate ICPC data system used in the ICPC process? (select all that apply)**

- To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets
- To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data
- To populate ICPC case packets with data
- To transmit data within the state
- To transmit data between states
- To connect to other systems
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don’t know

## Initial Program Lead Survey

### #13. How is your state currently connecting to the NEICE? (select all that apply)

- Through the central cloud-based Case Management System (CMS)—a website that staff use to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases and the data are stored centrally on the cloud
- Through the Modular Case Management System (CMS)—software provided by APHSA/AAICPC that is installed in your state’s data center or server (or state cloud) that allows you to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases
- Through the NEICE Clearinghouse—data fields within your state’s data system connect automatically to the NEICE without the use of the central cloud-based CMS or the Modular CMS

### #13a. **SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the central cloud-based CMS” is selected: Which of the following best describes how you are currently using the NEICE central cloud-based CMS? (select one)**

- We enter all case and placement data directly into the NEICE CMS. This information is also entered into our state’s administrative data system(s) (e.g., SACWIS/other state system).
- We export our child and placement resource information from our child welfare information system(s) to a secure FTP site. The information is then loaded into the NEICE CMS.
- We use a web service to send the child and placement resource information through the web service to the NEICE CMS, and pull the data back into our child welfare information system(s).
- None of the above
  - If “None of the above”: Please briefly describe how you are currently using the NEICE via the central cloud-based CMS: \_\_\_\_\_

### #13a. **SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the Modular CMS” is selected: Which of the following best describes how you are currently using the NEICE Modular CMS? (select one)**

- We enter all case and placement data directly into the NEICE CMS. This information is also entered into our state’s administrative data system(s) (e.g., SACWIS/other state system).
- We export our child and placement resource information from our child welfare information system(s) to a secure FTP site. The information is then loaded into the NEICE CMS.
- We use a web service to send the child and placement resource information through the web service to the NEICE CMS, and pull the data back into our child welfare information system(s).
- None of the above
  - If “None of the above”: Please briefly describe how you are currently using the NEICE via the Modular CMS: \_\_\_\_\_

### #14. For which cases is the NEICE used in your state? (select one)

- All cases
- Only when working with other NEICE states

### #15. For which ICPC steps is the NEICE used in your state? By “used” we mean whether your state electronically completes the following documents in the NEICE and/or uses the NEICE to transmit any of the following documents. (select all that apply)

- 100A
- 100B
- Home study request
- Supporting documents

**Initial Program Lead Survey**

**#16. In your state, where are people currently using the NEICE? (select all that apply)**

- State central office
- All regional offices
- Some regional offices
- All county/local offices
- Some county/local offices

**#16a. SKIP PATTERN: If state central office selected in #15:** Who uses the NEICE at the state central office? (select one)

- One NEICE/ICPC contact at the state central office
- Several NEICE/ICPC contacts at the state central office
- All state central office staff

**#16b. SKIP PATTERN: If all/some regional offices selected in #15:** Who uses the NEICE at the regional offices? (select one)

- One NEICE/ICPC contact per regional office
- Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in each regional office
- It varies: multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in one or more regional offices, but only one NEICE/ICPC contact in one or more regional offices
- All regional office staff

**#16c. SKIP PATTERN: If all/some county/local offices selected in #15:** Who uses the NEICE at the county/local offices? (select one)

- One NEICE/ICPC contact per county/local office
- Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in each county/local office
- It varies: multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in one or more county/local offices, but only one NEICE/ICPC contact in one or more county/local offices
- All county/local office staff

**#17. In general, how often do you use/interact with the NEICE? (select one)**

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Never

**#18. SKIP PATTERN: If "Through the central cloud-based CMS" is selected for #13:** Please help us assess the NEICE system speed. Local internet connections and state firewalls can affect the system so that one state may notice it takes slightly longer to complete a function than another state.

**In your experience, does the NEICE ever slow down noticeably?**

- Yes
- No

*Initial Program Lead Survey*

**#18a. SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”*** Please describe the circumstances surrounding slow downs— e.g., is there a certain time of day during which the NEICE seems to get slower? With which processes or activities does the NEICE operate more slowly?

**#19. Please use the space below for any additional information about your state’s current system connection and/or users.**

**Section 4: Training and Technical Assistance/Support**

**#20. Did you (and/or others from your state) participate in an orientation or initial training webinar with someone affiliated with the NEICE (i.e., APHSA/AAICPC or Tetras)?**

- Yes
- No

**#20a. SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”***: How effective was this orientation/training webinar in helping you and/or others in your state learn to use the NEICE? (*select one*)

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**#20a1. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”***: What could have made the initial orientation/training webinar more effective in helping you and/or others learn to use the NEICE?

**#21. Have you ever used the NEICE User’s Guide?**

- Yes
- No

**#21a. SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”***: What was your primary reason for using the User’s Guide? (*select all that apply*)

- To learn to use the NEICE (a general overview or orientation to the system)
- To answer a specific question I had

**#21a1. SKIP PATTERN: *If “To learn to use the NEICE” was selected***: How effective was the User’s Guide in helping you learn to use the NEICE? (*select one*)

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral

**Initial Program Lead Survey**

- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**#21a1i. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could make the User’s Guide more effective in helping you learn to use the NEICE?

**#21a2. SKIP PATTERN: *If “To answer a specific question I had” was selected:*** How effective was the User’s Guide in helping you answer a specific question you had about the NEICE? *(select one)*

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**#21a2i. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could make the User’s Guide more effective in helping you answer a specific question?

**#22. Have you ever viewed any of the video training modules (linked on APHSA’s website) for the NEICE?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”:***

**#22a. Which of the following video training modules have you viewed? *(select all that apply)***

- NEICE Navigation for ICPC Coordinators
- NEICE ICPC Coordinator Add New Case
- NEICE Navigation for Case Workers
- NEICE Case Worker Add New Case
- Manage Child in NEICE
- Managing Placement Resources in NEICE
- NEICE State Administrator

**#22b. Overall, how effective was/were the video training module(s) in helping you learn to use the NEICE? If some videos were more helpful than others, please do your best to respond about the effectiveness of the videos you viewed overall. *(select one)***

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective



*Initial Program Lead Survey*

**#22b1. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could make the video training modules more effective in helping you learn to use the NEICE?

**#23. Have you ever contacted the Tetrus Help Desk for support in using the NEICE?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”:***

**#23a. About how many times per month do you interact with the Tetrus Help Desk? If you have only been using the NEICE for one month, please report the number of times you interacted with the Tetrus Help Desk in that month. *(select one)***

- 1-2 times
- 3-9 times
- 10 or more times

**#23b. How responsive has the Help Desk been in helping you use the NEICE in your state? *(select one)***

- Very responsive: all requests addressed in a timely manner
- Somewhat responsive: most requests addressed in a timely manner
- Neutral
- Somewhat unresponsive: requests addressed within a week
- Very unresponsive: some requests not addressed at all

**#24. How much technical assistance do you and other staff in your state currently require from APHSA, AAICPC, and/or Tetrus? *(select one)***

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Never

**#25. How effective has the technical assistance provided by APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been in helping you and/or others in your state integrate with and/or use the NEICE? *(select one)***

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**#25a. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could make the technical assistance more effective in helping you and/or others in your state integrate with and/or use the NEICE?

**Initial Program Lead Survey**

**#26. How responsive has the technical assistance from APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been in helping you and/or others in your state integrate with and/or use the NEICE? (select one)**

- Very responsive: all requests addressed in a timely manner
- Somewhat responsive: most requests addressed in a timely manner
- Neutral
- Somewhat unresponsive: requests addressed within a week
- Very unresponsive: some requests not addressed at all

**#27. Please report your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements: (Please select one response in each row.)**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I have been able to access the NEICE whenever I have needed to (i.e., have not had issues actually accessing the system)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <b>SKIP PATTERN: If "Through the central cloud-based CMS" or "Through the Modular CMS" is selected for #13:</b> I have been notified of system changes (such as outages or upgrades) in a timely fashion by APHSA/AAICPC and/or Tetrus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**#28. Please use the space below for any additional comments or feedback about the training or technical assistance you have received about the NEICE.**

**Section 5: Impressions of the NEICE**

**#29. Has starting up or operating the NEICE created or added to a backlog of ICPC cases in your state? In other words, has the NEICE created or added to a queue of cases waiting to be processed?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN, if yes:**

**#29a. Why has operating the NEICE created or added to a backlog of ICPC cases?**

*Initial Program Lead Survey*

#29b. Approximately how many cases are *currently* in the backlog as a result of NEICE participation?: \_\_\_\_\_

#29c. Approximately how many days would it take to clear this *current* backlog?: \_\_\_\_\_

#30. Does using the NEICE add any extra time to processing cases, as compared to your previous system/process?

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN: *If yes:***

#30a. Why does using the NEICE add additional time?

#30b. Approximately how much extra time (in minutes) is needed per case due to the NEICE? \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

#31. Overall, how do you feel the initial integration with and/or use of the NEICE has gone for your state? (*select one*)

- Very well
- Well
- Neutral
- Poorly
- Very poorly

#31a. **SKIP PATTERN: *If “Poorly” or “Very Poorly”:*** Can you specify what has not gone well? What do you think contributed to this?

#32. Based on your early experiences with the NEICE, what tool or feature do you find to be the most helpful to your state for the ICPC process?

#33. What tools or features (if any) did you use in your state’s previous ICPC process/system that you wish were included in the NEICE?

#34. Please use the space below for any additional information about your state’s early experiences with the NEICE.

***Initial Program Lead Survey***

--

**#35. Approximately how many minutes did it take you and/or your colleagues to complete this survey? \_\_\_\_\_**

---THANK YOU!---

*Follow-up Program Lead Survey*

Appendix F: Follow-up Program Lead Survey

## Follow-up Program Lead Survey

### Introduction

The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), in conjunction with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC), has contracted with Child Trends, a nonprofit research institute, to evaluate the implementation of the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE).

This survey asks about your experiences with the NEICE system. Your responses will help inform Child Trends' evaluation of the NEICE expansion efforts across the country.

The survey should take around 20-30 minutes to complete, and comprises four sections:

#### Section 1: Benefits and Challenges

#### Section 2: Current System Connection and Users

#### Section 3: Technical Assistance/Support

#### Section 4: Impressions of the NEICE

If a question is not applicable, please leave it blank.

Some of the questions in this survey are similar or identical to questions asked in [the Initial Program Lead Survey/previous surveys]. We have included these questions because your responses may change over time (for instance, you may face different challenges over the course of NEICE implementation).

The purpose of the survey is to help APHSA/AAICPC make it easier for your state and other states to start up and use the NEICE.

**Please note that the survey is being conducted by Child Trends, and all responses will come directly to Child Trends staff. While the identity of your state is linked to your responses on this survey, we will only report de-identified information when reporting results to APHSA/AAICPC, Tetras, and others. In other words, your name and your state's name will NOT be included with the responses to the survey that we share outside of Child Trends. Therefore, please feel free to be candid in sharing your thoughts.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please call or e-mail Kristina Rosinsky at 240-223-9398 or [krosinsky@childtrends.org](mailto:krosinsky@childtrends.org).

Thank you for your time and for helping to improve the NEICE!

Name \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone # \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 1: Benefits and Challenges

**#1. In the table below, please indicate whether your state has experienced any of the following benefits as a result of using the NEICE. Please select one response in each row.**

	Yes	No	Unsure / too soon to tell
a. Expedited placement timelines for children			
b. Improved placement stability for children			
c. Reduced administrative costs (e.g., document copying and mailing)			

**Follow-up Program Lead Survey**

d. Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send ICPC documents <i>across</i> states			
e. Decreased time needed by staff to prepare, review, and/or send required documents <i>within</i> the state (e.g., between localities and state offices)			
f. Improved data integrity/accuracy of case information shared across states			
g. Increased ability of staff to track cases/monitor progress			
h. Ability to interoperate with other data systems (e.g., law enforcement or judicial agencies, Medicaid agencies) using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards			
i. Improved communication with other state ICPC coordinators			
j. Improved ability to comply with ICPC requirements			

**#2. We would like to understand what challenges, if any, your state has faced in using the NEICE. In the table below, please indicate how much of a challenge each of the following factors has been (if at all) for your state. Please select one response in each row.**

	Not at all a challenge	A minor challenge	A moderate challenge	A major challenge
a. Cost of NEICE participation/financial resources				
b. Time/resources required to have staff trained and comfortable using the NEICE				
c. Staff resistance to a new ICPC system/process				
d. Staff turnover				
e. Local buy-in/leadership support				
f. State buy-in/leadership support				
g. Availability and quality of technical assistance				
h. Ability to adapt NEICE to your needs or preferences				
i. System features (e.g., navigation, fields, structure)				
j. Other (please specify): _____				

**#3. Please estimate how much improvement (if any) your state has experienced with the following as a result of your use of the NEICE (as compared to before your state started using the NEICE): Please select one response in each row.**

	No improvement (about 0% change)	Minor improvement (about 10% or less reduction in time)	Moderate improvement (about 11% - 30% reduction in time)	Major improvement (More than about 30% reduction in time)	Don't know
a. Overall time from starting the 100-A to placing a child	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	No improvement (about 0% change)	Minor improvement (about 10% or less reduction in costs)	Moderate improvement (about 11% - 30% reduction in costs)	Major improvement (More than about 30% reduction in costs)	Don't know
b. Costs associated with ICPC-related document copying and mailing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Follow-up Program Lead Survey*

**#4. Please describe at least two of the most significant benefits or strengths of the NEICE system. Please consider benefits or strengths for the state overall, ICPC staff, caseworkers, and children.**

**#5. Please describe at least two of the most significant challenges or weaknesses of the NEICE system. Please consider challenges or weaknesses for the state overall, ICPC staff, caseworkers, and children.**

**Section 2: Current System Connection and Users**

**#6. How is your state currently connecting to the NEICE? (select all that apply)**

- Through the central cloud-based Case Management System (CMS)—a website that staff use to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases and the data are stored centrally on the cloud
- Through the Modular Case Management System (CMS)—software provided by APHSA/AAICPC that is installed in your state’s data center or server (or state cloud) that allows you to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases
- Through the NEICE Clearinghouse—data fields within your state’s data system connect automatically to the NEICE without the use of the central cloud-based CMS or the Modular CMS

**#6a. SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the central cloud-based CMS” is selected: Which of the following best describes how you are currently using the NEICE central cloud-based CMS? (select one)**

- We enter all case and placement data directly into the NEICE CMS. This information is also entered into our state’s administrative data system(s) (e.g., SACWIS/other state system).
- We export our child and placement resource information from our child welfare information system(s) to a secure FTP site. The information is then loaded into the NEICE CMS.
- We use a web service to send the child and placement resource information through the web service to the NEICE CMS, and pull the data back into our child welfare information system(s).
- None of the above
  - If “None of the above”: Please briefly describe how you are currently using the NEICE via the central cloud-based CMS: \_\_\_\_\_

**#6a. SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the Modular CMS” is selected: Which of the following best describes how you are currently using the NEICE Modular CMS? (select one)**

- We enter all case and placement data directly into the NEICE CMS. This information is also entered into our state’s administrative data system(s) (e.g., SACWIS/other state system).
- We export our child and placement resource information from our child welfare information system(s) to a secure FTP site. The information is then loaded into the NEICE CMS.



### ***Follow-up Program Lead Survey***

- We use a web service to send the child and placement resource information through the web service to the NEICE CMS, and pull the data back into our child welfare information system(s).
- None of the above
  - If “None of the above”: Please briefly describe how you are currently using the NEICE via the Modular CMS: \_\_\_\_\_

**#7. For which cases is the NEICE used in your state? (select one)**

- All cases
- Only when working with other NEICE states

**#8. For which ICPC steps is the NEICE used in your state? By “used” we mean whether your state electronically completes the following documents in the NEICE and/or uses the NEICE to transmit any of the following documents. (select all that apply)**

- 100A
- 100B
- Home study request
- Supporting documents

**#9. In your state, where are people currently using the NEICE? (select all that apply)**

- State central office
- All regional offices
- Some regional offices
- All county/local offices
- Some county/local offices

**#9a. SKIP PATTERN: *If state central office selected in #9:* Who uses the NEICE at the state central office? (select one)**

- One NEICE/ICPC contact at the state central office
- Several NEICE/ICPC contacts at the state central office
- All state central office staff

**#9b. SKIP PATTERN: *If all/some regional offices selected in #9:* Who uses the NEICE at the regional offices? (select one)**

- One NEICE/ICPC contact per regional office
- Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in each regional office
- It varies: multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in one or more regional offices, but only one NEICE/ICPC contact in one or more regional offices
- All regional office staff

**#9c. SKIP PATTERN: *If all/some county/local offices selected in #9:* Who uses the NEICE at the county/local offices? (select one)**

- One NEICE/ICPC contact per county/local office
- Multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in each county/local office
- It varies: multiple NEICE/ICPC contacts in one or more county/local offices, but only one NEICE/ICPC contact in one or more county/local offices
- All county/local office staff

*Follow-up Program Lead Survey*

**#10.** In general, how often do you use/interact with the NEICE? (*select one*)

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Never

**#11. SKIP PATTERN:** *If “Through the central cloud-based CMS” is selected for #6:* Please help us assess the NEICE system speed. Local internet connections and state firewalls can affect the system so that one state may notice it takes slightly longer to complete a function than another state.

In your experience, does the NEICE ever slow down noticeably?

- Yes
- No

**#11a. SKIP PATTERN:** *If “Yes”* Please describe the circumstances surrounding slow downs—e.g., is there a certain time of day during which the NEICE seems to get slower? With which processes or activities does the NEICE operate more slowly?

**#12.** Please use the space below for any additional information about your state’s current system connection and/or users.

**Section 3: Technical Assistance/Support**

**#13.** Since this survey was last administered, did you (and/or others from your state) participate in any training with someone affiliated with the NEICE (i.e., APHSA/AAICPC or Tetras)?

- Yes
- No

**#13a. SKIP PATTERN:** *If “Yes” to #13:* Please describe the purpose of the training.

**#13b. SKIP PATTERN:** *If “Yes” to #13:* How effective was this training in helping you and/or others in your state use the NEICE? (*select one*)

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

*Follow-up Program Lead Survey*

**#13b1. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could have made the training more effective?

**#14. Since this survey was last administered, have you used the NEICE User’s Guide?**

- Yes
- No

**#14a. SKIP PATTERN: *If “yes” was selected:*** How effective was the User’s Guide in helping you resolve your questions/issues? *(select one)*

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**#14a1. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could make the User’s Guide more effective?

**#15. Since this survey was last administered, have you viewed any of the video training modules (linked on APHSA’s website) for the NEICE?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”:***

**#15a. Which of the following video training modules have you viewed?** *(select all that apply)*

- NEICE Navigation for ICPC Coordinators
- NEICE ICPC Coordinator Add New Case
- NEICE Navigation for Case Workers
- NEICE Case Worker Add New Case
- Manage Child in NEICE
- Managing Placement Resources in NEICE
- NEICE State Administrator

**#15b. Overall, how effective was/were the video training module(s) in helping you resolve your questions/issues? If some videos were more helpful than others, please do your best to respond about the effectiveness of the videos you viewed overall.** *(select one)*

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral

**Follow-up Program Lead Survey**

- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**#15b1. SKIP PATTERN: *If anything other than “very effective”:*** What could make the video training modules more effective?

**#16. Since this survey was last administered, have you contacted the Tetrus Help Desk for support in using the NEICE?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN: *If “Yes”:***

**#16a. Since this survey was last administered, about how many times per month did you interact with the Tetrus Help Desk? *(select one)***

- 1-2 times
- 3-9 times
- 10 or more times

**#16b. Since this survey was last administered, how responsive has the Help Desk been in helping you use the NEICE in your state? *(select one)***

- Very responsive: all requests addressed in a timely manner
- Somewhat responsive: most requests addressed in a timely manner
- Neutral
- Somewhat unresponsive: requests addressed within a week
- Very unresponsive: some requests not addressed at all

**#17. How much technical assistance do you and other staff in your state currently require from APHSA, AAICPC, and/or Tetrus? *(select one)***

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Never

**#18. Since this survey was last administered, how effective has the technical assistance provided by APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been in helping you and/or others in your state use the NEICE? *(select one)***

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective
- No technical assistance has been required in the time period specified

**Follow-up Program Lead Survey**

**#18a. SKIP PATTERN: If anything other than “very effective” or “no technical assistance has been required in the time period specified”:** What could make the technical assistance more effective in helping you and/or others in your state use the NEICE?

**#19. Since this survey was last administered, how responsive has the technical assistance from APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been in helping you and/or others in your state use the NEICE? (select one)**

- Very responsive: all requests addressed in a timely manner
- Somewhat responsive: most requests addressed in a timely manner
- Neutral
- Somewhat unresponsive: requests addressed within a week
- Very unresponsive: some requests not addressed at all
- No technical assistance has been required in the time period specified

**#20. Please report your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements: (Please select one response in each row.)**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Since this survey was last administered, I have been able to access the NEICE whenever I have needed to (i.e., have not had issues actually accessing the system)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <b>SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the central cloud-based CMS” or “Through the Modular CMS” is selected for #6:</b> Since this survey was last administered, I have been notified of system changes (such as outages or upgrades) in a timely fashion by APHSA/AAICPC and/or Tetrus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**#21. Please use the space below for any additional comments or feedback about the technical assistance you have received about the NEICE.**

**Section 4: Impressions of the NEICE**

**#22. SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the Modular CMS” is selected for question 6:** You indicated above that your state is using the Modular CMS. Did your state ever use the central cloud-based CMS (a website that staff use to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases and the data are stored centrally on the cloud)?

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN, if yes:**

**#22a. Which system do you prefer?**

*Follow-up Program Lead Survey*

- Central cloud-based CMS
- Modular CMS
- No preference

**#22b. Has your state experienced any challenges in transitioning to the Modular CMS?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN, if yes:**

**#22b1. Please describe the challenges your state has faced with the transition to the Modular CMS.**

**#23. Has operating the NEICE *ever* created or added to a backlog of ICPC cases in your state? In other words, has the NEICE *ever* created or added to a queue of cases waiting to be processed? Answer yes if the NEICE has contributed to a backlog of cases in the past even if there is no backlog of cases currently.**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN, if yes:**

- **#23a. Why has operating the NEICE created or added to a backlog of ICPC cases?**

- **#23b. Approximately how many cases are *currently* in the backlog as a result of NEICE participation?: \_\_\_\_\_**
- **#23c. Approximately how many days would it take to clear this *current* backlog?: \_\_\_\_\_**

**#24. Does using the NEICE add any extra time to processing cases, as compared to your previous system/process?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN: If yes:**

**#24a. Why does using the NEICE add additional time?:**

**#24b. Approximately how much extra time (in minutes) is needed per case due to the NEICE?: \_\_\_\_\_**

*Follow-up Program Lead Survey*

**#25. Overall, how do you feel the use of the NEICE has gone for your state? (select one)**

- Very well
- Well
- Neutral
- Poorly
- Very poorly

**#25a. SKIP PATTERN: If "Poorly" or "Very Poorly": Can you specify what has not gone well? What do you think contributed to this?**

**#26. Please use the space below for any additional information about your state's experiences with the NEICE.**

**#27. Approximately how many minutes did it take you and/or your colleagues to complete this survey? \_\_\_\_\_**

---THANK YOU!---

***Initial IT Lead Survey***

Appendix G: Initial IT Lead Survey



## Initial IT Lead Survey

### Introduction

The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), in conjunction with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC), has contracted with Child Trends, a nonprofit research institute, to evaluate the implementation of the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE).

This survey asks about your state's integration with the NEICE. Your responses will help inform Child Trends' evaluation of the NEICE expansion efforts across the country.

The survey should take no more than 20 – 25 minutes, and comprises four sections:

**Section 1: Status of NEICE Usage and Information System Interface with the NEICE**

**Section 2: Information System Alignment and Interoperability**

**Section 3: Challenges and Barriers**

**Section 4: Technical Assistance**

If a question is not applicable, please leave it blank.

The purpose of the survey is to help APHSA/AAICPC make it easier for your state and other states to start up and use the NEICE.

**Please note that the survey is being conducted by Child Trends, and all responses will come directly to Child Trends staff. While the identity of your state is linked to your responses on this survey, we will only report de-identified information when reporting results to APHSA/AAICPC, Tetras, and others. In other words, your name and your state's name will NOT be included with the responses to the survey that we share outside of Child Trends. Therefore, please feel free to be candid in sharing your thoughts.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please call or e-mail Kristina Rosinsky at 240-223-9398 or [krosinsky@childtrends.org](mailto:krosinsky@childtrends.org).

Thank you for your time and for helping to improve the NEICE!

---

### 1. Respondent

Name	State	Title	Telephone #	E-mail address
------	-------	-------	-------------	----------------

### Section 1: Status of NEICE Usage and Information System Interface with the NEICE

#### 2. My state is using (select all that apply):

Go Live Date

- Web Case Management System (CMS)
- Clearinghouse

#### 3. My state's primary child welfare information system is (select one):

## Initial IT Lead Survey

- Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS)/Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS)
  - Other automated system: (please specify the name of the system)\_\_\_\_\_
  - Other non-automated/paper based
4. **SKIP PATTERN: If #3 is SACWIS or 'other automated system':** Prior to or while using the NEICE, did/does your state track ICPC cases using your primary child welfare information system?
- Yes
  - No
- 4.a. **SKIP PATTERN: If Yes to #4:** Have you uploaded the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state's primary child welfare information system to the NEICE?
- Yes
  - No
- 4.b. **SKIP PATTERN: If yes to #4:** Do you still track information related to ICPC cases (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state's primary child welfare information system?
- Yes, we use the NEICE and the ICPC fields in our primary child welfare information system concurrently.
  - No, we only use the NEICE now.
5. Prior to or while using the NEICE, did/does your state have a separate information system for ICPC cases (apart from the NEICE and your state's primary child welfare information system)?
- Yes
  - No
- 5.a. **SKIP PATTERN: If Yes to #5:** Have you uploaded ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state's separate ICPC information system to the NEICE?
- Yes
  - No
- 5.b. **SKIP PATTERN: If Yes to #5:** Do you still use your separate ICPC information system to track information related to ICPC cases (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.)?
- Yes, we use the NEICE and our separate ICPC information system concurrently.
  - No, we only use the NEICE now.
6. **SKIP PATTERN: If 'CMS' was selected in response to question 2:** What type of data exchange interface is the NEICE CMS currently using with your state's information system(s)? (select one per column)

**Initial IT Lead Survey**

	<b>Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS)</b>	<b>(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system</b>
No Interface (manual data entry)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scheduled secure FTP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If checked: How frequently does the FTP run (e.g., hourly, daily, weekly, on demand)?</i>	_____	_____
Event triggered web service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If checked: What is the event trigger?</i>	_____	_____

**7. How is your state's primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS) used in the ICPC process? (select all that apply)**

- To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets
- To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data
- To populate ICPC case packets with data
- To transmit data within the state
- To transmit data between states
- To connect to other systems
- Not used to process ICPC cases
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**8. (SKIP PATTERN: If yes to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): How is your state's separate ICPC data system used in the ICPC process? (select all that apply)**

- To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets
- To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data
- To populate ICPC case packets with data
- To transmit data within the state
- To transmit data between states
- To connect to other systems
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Initial IT Lead Survey

Section 2: Information System Alignment and Interoperability

9. To what extent does data from your child welfare information system(s) interface with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) data elements in the Children, Youth, and Family Services (CYFS) domain? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. To what extent does your state's data sharing policies for your child welfare information system(s) align with the National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA)? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data with other state child welfare data systems (particularly with child abuse and neglect registries)? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Initial IT Lead Survey**

Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**12. To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data about children in foster care with your state’s Medicaid healthcare exchange? (select one per column)**

	<b>Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS)</b>	<b>(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if ‘yes’ to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered ‘yes’): Separate ICPC data system</b>
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**13. To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data with county/state/federal court data systems? (select one per column)**

	<b>Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/CCWIS)</b>	<b>(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if ‘yes’ to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered ‘yes’): Separate ICPC data system</b>
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Section 3: Challenges and Barriers**

**14. We would like to understand the challenges your state has encountered, if any, with onboarding or going live with the NEICE. In the table below, please indicate how much of a challenge each of the following factors were (if at all) for your state. Please select one response in each row.**

	Not at all a challenge	A minor challenge	A moderate challenge	A major challenge	Do not know
Insufficient financial resources					
Insufficient overall process documentation					
Insufficient technical documentation					

**Initial IT Lead Survey**

Insufficient end user documentation					
Insufficient technical staff					
Insufficient staff time					
Staff turnover					
Insufficient local buy-in/leadership support					
Insufficient state buy-in/leadership support					
Staff resistance					
Insufficient training					
Insufficient technical support					
Insufficient end user support					
Other (please specify):					

**15. Has your state encountered any other challenges in starting up or operating the NEICE (other than those already mentioned above)?**

- Yes
- No

**15a. SKIP PATTERN: *If yes:* Please briefly describe:**

**Section 4: Technical Assistance**

**16. How much technical assistance do you and other IT staff in your state currently require from APHSA/AAICPC and/or Tetras? Please do not consider the amount of technical assistance required by end users. (select one)**

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Never

**17. How effective has the technical assistance provided by APHSA/AAICPC/Tetras been in helping you and others in your state integrate with the NEICE? (select one)**

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

**Initial IT Lead Survey**

**17a. SKIP PATTERN:** *If anything other than “very effective”:* What could make the technical assistance more effective in helping you and others in your state integrate with the NEICE?

**18. How responsive has the technical assistance from APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been in helping you integrate with the NEICE in your state? (select one)**

- Very responsive: all requests addressed in a timely manner
- Somewhat responsive: most requests addressed in a timely manner
- Neutral
- Somewhat unresponsive: requests addressed within a week
- Very unresponsive: some requests not addressed at all

**19. Please use the space below for any additional information about your state’s experiences with the NEICE that you feel is important for APHSA, AAICPC, Tetrus, or other states to know.**

**20. Approximately how many minutes did it take you and/or your colleagues to complete this tool?**

\_\_\_\_\_

---THANK YOU!---

***Follow-up IT Lead Survey***

Appendix H: Follow-up IT Lead Survey



## Follow-up IT Lead Survey

### Introduction

The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), in conjunction with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC), has contracted with Child Trends, a nonprofit research institute, to evaluate the implementation of the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE).

This survey asks about your state's integration with the NEICE. Your responses will help inform Child Trends' evaluation of the NEICE expansion efforts across the country.

Most of the questions in this survey are similar or identical to questions asked in [the Initial IT Lead Survey/previous surveys]. We have included these questions because your responses may change over time (for instance, you may face different challenges over the course of NEICE implementation).

The survey should take no more than 20 – 25 minutes, and comprises four sections:

**Section 1: Status of NEICE Usage and Information System Interface with the NEICE**

**Section 2: Information System Alignment and Interoperability**

**Section 3: Challenges and Barriers**

**Section 4: Technical Assistance**

If a question is not applicable, please leave it blank.

The purpose of the survey is to help APHSA/AAICPC make it easier for your state and other states to start up and use the NEICE.

**Please note that the survey is being conducted by Child Trends, and all responses will come directly to Child Trends staff. While the identity of your state is linked to your responses on this survey, we will only report de-identified information when reporting results to APHSA/AAICPC, Tetras, and others. In other words, your name and your state's name will NOT be included with the responses to the survey that we share outside of Child Trends. Therefore, please feel free to be candid in sharing your thoughts.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please call or e-mail Kristina Rosinsky at 240-223-9398 or [krosinsky@childtrends.org](mailto:krosinsky@childtrends.org).

Thank you for your time and for helping to improve the NEICE!

---

### 1. Respondent

Name	State	Title	Telephone #	E-mail address
------	-------	-------	-------------	----------------

### Section 1: Status of NEICE Usage and Information System Interface with the NEICE

#### 2. My state is using (select all that apply):

- Central Cloud-Based Case Management System (CMS) -- a website that staff use to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases and the data are stored centrally on the cloud

## Follow-up IT Lead Survey

- Modular Case Management System (CMS)—software provided by APHSA/AAICPC that is installed in your state’s data center or server (or state cloud) that allows you to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases
- Clearinghouse—data fields within your state’s data system connect automatically to the NEICE without the use of the central cloud-based CMS or the Modular CMS

**3. My state’s primary child welfare information system is (select one):**

- Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS)
- Other automated system: (please specify the name of the system)\_\_\_\_\_
- Other non-automated/paper based

**4. SKIP PATTERN: If #3 is SACWIS or ‘other automated system’: Prior to or while using the NEICE, did/does your state track ICPC cases using your primary child welfare information system?**

- Yes
- No

**4.a. SKIP PATTERN: If Yes to #4: Is the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) from your state’s primary child welfare information system also available in the NEICE?**

- Yes
- No

**4.a.1. SKIP PATTERN: If yes to #4a: How was/is the ICPC-specific information made available to the NEICE?**

- One-time transfer
- Regular updates/interface
- Other (please specify:\_\_\_\_\_)

**4.b. SKIP PATTERN: If yes to #4: Do you still track information related to ICPC cases (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) in your state’s primary child welfare information system?**

- Yes, we use the NEICE and the ICPC fields in our primary child welfare information system concurrently.
- No, we only use the NEICE now.

**5. Prior to or while using the NEICE, did/does your state have a separate information system for ICPC cases (apart from the NEICE and your state’s primary child welfare information system)?**

- Yes
- No

**5.a. SKIP PATTERN: If Yes to #5: Is the ICPC-specific information (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.) from your state’s separate ICPC information system also available in the NEICE?**

- Yes

**Follow-up IT Lead Survey**

No

**5.a.1. SKIP PATTERN:** *If yes to #5a:* How was/is the ICPC-specific information made available to the NEICE?

- One-time transfer
- Regular updates/interface
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

**5.b. SKIP PATTERN:** *If Yes to #5:* Do you still use your separate ICPC information system to track information related to ICPC cases (e.g., ICPC-related forms, dates, decisions, etc.)?

- Yes, we use the NEICE and our separate ICPC information system concurrently.
- No, we only use the NEICE now.

**6. SKIP PATTERN:** *If 'central cloud-based CMS' was selected in response to question 2:* What type of data exchange interface is the NEICE central cloud-based CMS currently using with your state's information system(s)? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
No Interface (manual data entry)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scheduled secure FTP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If checked:</i> How frequently does the FTP run (e.g., hourly, daily, weekly, on demand)?	_____	_____
Event triggered web service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If checked:</i> What is the event trigger?	_____	_____

**6. SKIP PATTERN:** *If 'Modular CMS' was selected in response to question 2:* What type of data exchange interface is the NEICE Modular CMS currently using with your state's information system(s)? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is

**Follow-up IT Lead Survey**

	(e.g., SACWIS/other state system)	<i>skipped or answered 'yes':</i> Separate ICPC data system
No Interface (manual data entry)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scheduled secure FTP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If checked: How frequently does the FTP run (e.g., hourly, daily, weekly, on demand)?</i>	_____	_____
Event triggered web service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If checked: What is the event trigger?</i>	_____	_____

**7. How is your state’s primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system) used in the ICPC process? (select all that apply)**

- To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets
- To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data
- To populate ICPC case packets with data
- To transmit data within the state
- To transmit data between states
- To connect to other systems
- Not used to process ICPC cases
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don’t know

**8. (SKIP PATTERN: If yes to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered ‘yes’): How is your state’s separate ICPC data system used in the ICPC process? (select all that apply)**

- To collect data from manually filled-in ICPC packets
- To be the main data source for ICPC child and placement data
- To populate ICPC case packets with data
- To transmit data within the state
- To transmit data between states
- To connect to other systems
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don’t know

Follow-up IT Lead Survey

Section 2: Information System Alignment and Interoperability

9. To what extent does data from your child welfare information system(s) interface with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) data elements in the Children, Youth, and Family Services (CYFS) domain? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. To what extent does your state's data sharing policies for your child welfare information system(s) align with the National Human Services Interoperability Architecture (NHSIA)? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. To what extent is/are your state's child welfare information system(s) able to share data with other state child welfare data systems (particularly with child abuse and neglect registries)? (select one per column)

	Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system)	(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if 'yes' to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered 'yes'): Separate ICPC data system
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Follow-up IT Lead Survey**

Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**12. To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data about children in foster care with your state’s Medicaid healthcare exchange? (select one per column)**

	<b>Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system)</b>	<b>(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if ‘yes’ to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered ‘yes’): Separate ICPC data system</b>
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**13. To what extent is/are your state’s child welfare information system(s) able to share data with county/state/federal court data systems? (select one per column)**

	<b>Primary child welfare information system (e.g., SACWIS/other state system)</b>	<b>(SKIP PATTERN: Only show if ‘yes’ to #5 and #5b is skipped or answered ‘yes’): Separate ICPC data system</b>
Fully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partially	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Section 3: Challenges and Barriers**

**14. We would like to understand the challenges your state has encountered, if any, with using the NEICE. In the table below, please indicate how much of a challenge each of the following factors is (if at all) for your state. Please select one response in each row.**

	Not at all a challenge	A minor challenge	A moderate challenge	A major challenge	Do not know
Insufficient financial resources					
Insufficient overall process documentation					
Insufficient technical documentation					

**Follow-up IT Lead Survey**

Insufficient end user documentation					
Insufficient technical staff					
Insufficient staff time					
Staff turnover					
Insufficient local buy-in/leadership support					
Insufficient state buy-in/leadership support					
Staff resistance					
Insufficient training					
Insufficient technical support					
Insufficient end user support					
Other (please specify):					

**15. SKIP PATTERN: If “Through the Modular CMS” is selected for question 2: You indicated above that your state is using the Modular CMS. Did your state ever use the central cloud-based CMS (a website that staff use to enter and retrieve data on ICPC cases and the data are stored centrally on the cloud)?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN, if yes:**

**#15a. Which system do you prefer?:**

- Central cloud-based CMS
- Modular CMS
- No preference

**#15b. Has your state experienced any challenges in transitioning to the Modular CMS?**

- Yes
- No

**SKIP PATTERN, if yes:**

**#15b1. Please describe the challenges your state has faced with the transition to the Modular CMS.**

**16. Has your state encountered any other challenges in using the NEICE (other than those already mentioned above)?**

- Yes
- No

**16a. SKIP PATTERN: If yes: Please briefly describe:**

Section 4: Technical Assistance

17. How much technical assistance do you and other IT staff in your state currently require from APHSA/AAICPC and/or Tetrus? Please do not consider the amount of technical assistance required by end users. (select one)

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Never

18. How effective has the technical assistance provided by APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been? (select one)

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neutral
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

18a. **SKIP PATTERN:** *If anything other than “very effective”:* What could make the technical assistance more effective in helping you and others in your state?

19. How responsive has the technical assistance from APHSA/AAICPC/Tetrus been? (select one)

- Very responsive: all requests addressed in a timely manner
- Somewhat responsive: most requests addressed in a timely manner
- Neutral
- Somewhat unresponsive: requests addressed within a week
- Very unresponsive: some requests not addressed at all

20. Please use the space below for any additional information about your state’s experiences with the NEICE that you feel is important for APHSA, AAICPC, Tetrus, or other states to know.

21. Approximately how many minutes did it take you and/or your colleagues to complete this tool?

\_\_\_\_\_

---THANK YOU!---



***Cost Tool***

Appendix I: Cost Tool

## Cost Tool

### **NEICE Start-up and Ongoing Cost Tool for [STATE]**

The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), in conjunction with the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (AAICPC), has contracted with Child Trends, a nonprofit research institute, to evaluate the implementation of the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE).

This Cost Tool collects information about your state's costs associated with starting up and operating the NEICE Case Management System (CMS) and/or Clearinghouse.

Note that this tool only seeks to capture costs associated with the management/administration of the NEICE (training, IT system development, legal/contractual processes, etc.), not the costs associated with using the NEICE to process cases. Therefore, please exclude from this survey time it takes caseworkers/ICPC staff to work with the NEICE to process cases.

You will be asked to complete the Cost Tool two times: once to collect information about start-up costs, and 6 months into your use of the NEICE to collect information on operating costs.

**[IF START-UP COSTS ARE THE FOCUS]:** This version of the Cost Tool seeks to capture information about your [NEICE CMS/NEICE Clearinghouse] start-up costs. This period covers the time prior to regular operation of the NEICE (regular operation of the NEICE is defined as 30 days after your state "went live." For [STATE], this means we are interested in costs prior to [DATE]).

**[IF OPERATING COSTS ARE THE FOCUS]:** This version of the Cost Tool seeks to capture information about your [NEICE CMS/NEICE Clearinghouse] ongoing operating costs. This period covers the time between [DATE OF 1ST DAY OF 6TH MONTH] through [DATE OF LAST DAY OF 6TH MONTH].

Your responses will be helpful to other states as they plan their NEICE use, and may lead to future cost reductions for your state and other states. You do not need to provide exact figures, but the more accurate you are, the more useful the data will be.

**Please note that the survey is being conducted by Child Trends, and all responses will come directly to Child Trends staff. While the identity of your state is linked to your responses on this survey, we will only report de-identified information when reporting results to APHSA/AAICPC, Tetras, and others. In other words, your name and your state's name will NOT be included with the responses to the tool that we share outside of Child Trends. Therefore, please feel free to be candid in sharing your thoughts.**

If you have any questions about this tool, please call or e-mail Kristina Rosinsky at 240-223-9398 or [krosinsky@childtrends.org](mailto:krosinsky@childtrends.org).

Thank you for your time and for helping to improve the NEICE!

**Cost Tool**

**NEICE Cost Tool for [STATE]**

1) Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone #: \_\_\_\_\_  
 E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Costs**

2) Cost Categories

	<u>Average Hours per Person</u>	<u>Number of People</u>	<u>Total Cost</u> (in dollars)
<b>a) Staff hours</b> (Please include time spent attending trainings, participating in phone calls, attending meetings, getting legal paperwork processed, budgeting, creating and/or making technical adaptations to data systems, and any other tasks associated with the management/administration of the NEICE. <u>Definitions of each position are available at the end of this tool.</u> )			
i. NEICE IT Lead			
ii. ICPC Program Lead			
iii. Other ICPC Program Staff			
iv. Analyst			
v. Programmer			
vi. Database Administrator			
vii. Security Administrator			
viii. Support/Clerical			
ix. Procurement Staff			
x. Hardware Technicians			
xi. Helpdesk/IT User Support			
xii. Caseworkers			
xiii. Agency Leadership and Management			
xiv. Legal/Contracts Staff			
xv. Other (please specify): _____			

### Cost Tool

	<u>Units</u>	<u>Total Cost</u> (in dollars)
<b>b) Hardware</b> (Please report hardware costs only. Any staff time associated with purchasing, installing, or otherwise working with hardware should be reported in section A, above.)		
i. Personal Computer		
ii. Scanner		
iii. Communications Equipment		
iv. Server(s), or share of expense for dedicated portion of server(s)		
v. Other (please specify): _____		
<b>c) Software</b> (Please report software costs only. Any staff time associated with purchasing, installing, or otherwise working with software should be reported in section A, above.)		
i. Browser		
ii. Operating System		
iii. Communications		
iv. Security		
v. Adobe Document Management		
vi. Data Management System		
vii. Add-ons and Utility Programs		
viii. Other (please specify): _____		
<b>d) Training</b> (Please report training costs only (e.g., cost of renting space, refreshments, materials). Any staff time associated with training should be reported in section A, above.)		
i. State Level Staff		
ii. Local Level Staff		
<b>e) Travel</b> (Please report travel costs only. Any staff time associated with travel should be reported in section A, above.)		
Travel		
<b>f) NEICE User Fees</b> (Please report user fees only. Any staff time associated with processing user fees should be reported in section A, above.)		
NEICE User Fees		
<b>g) Other Costs</b> (Please report other non-staff time costs. All staff time costs should be reported in section A, above.)		
i. Specify: _____		
ii. Specify: _____		
iii. Specify: _____		

## Cost Tool

- 3) During the timeframe designated for this survey, did you incur any costs in unanticipated categories related to the NEICE? In other words, did you have to pay for expenses you didn't plan to have to pay for at all?

- 3a) If yes, please describe the costs that were unanticipated.

- 4) During the timeframe designated for this survey, did you incur any costs related to the NEICE that were *higher* than you had expected?

- 4a) If yes, please describe the costs that were higher than expected.

- 5) During the timeframe designated for this survey, did you incur any costs related to the NEICE that were *lower* than you had expected?

- 5a) If yes, please describe the costs that were lower than expected.

**Cost Tool**

**Financial Sustainability**

6) The fiscal year for my state starts  /  (month/day)

7) Has your state submitted, or will your state be submitting, the annual system fee for the NEICE to the federal government for partial reimbursement under Title IV-E Administrative costs?

8) Is NEICE-related work funded through the remainder of your current fiscal year? Consider only costs associated with the management/administration of the NEICE (user fees, training, IT system development, legal/contractual processes, etc.), not costs associated with using the NEICE to process cases.

9) Does your state plan to include the costs for NEICE-related work (including user fees) in next fiscal year's budget?

**If Yes:**

9a) Approximately what amount, in total, do you anticipate including in next fiscal year's budget for NEICE-related costs (including user fees)?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

9b) Are you, or others, concerned about whether these NEICE-related costs will be approved?

9b1) If yes, please explain.

**Cost Tool**

10) From which sources is the total amount of funding reported on line 9a to be obtained? Please place an 'X' next to all that apply in the table below.

	<b>Source of funding</b> (Please place an 'X' in this column if funding is to be obtained from the corresponding source.)	<b>Amount</b> (In dollars. If you placed an 'X' in the column to the left, please specify the amount from that source.)
a) State funds allocated to the state child welfare agency budget		
b) State funds allocated to other state budget line items (outside of child welfare agency) (please specify the sources): _____		
c) Federal IV-E/Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS)/Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) reimbursement		
d) Other federal funding sources (outside of IV-E dollars) (please specify): _____		
e) Local or county funding		
f) Foundation grant (please specify): _____		
g) Other (please specify): _____		

## Cost Tool

11) How does your state plan to allocate the total amount of funding reported on line 9a?

Category	Amount, in dollars (or percentage of total if exact figures unknown)
a) Staff	
b) Hardware	
c) Software	
d) Training	
e) Travel	
f) NEICE User Fees	
g) Other Costs	
h) Unallocated at this time	

12) How do you plan to finance the NEICE after the next fiscal year?

- No current plan
- We will use state child welfare agency funding
- We will use funding from other state or local agencies (outside of the existing child welfare agency budget)
- We will use federal funding
- We will use private dollars (e.g., foundation)
- Other (please specify):

13) Is there anything else that you would like to share about your state's NEICE-related costs or plans for sustainability?

14) Approximately how many minutes did it take you and/or your colleagues to complete this tool?  minutes

---THANK YOU!---



## Cost Tool

### Staff Category Definitions

One person may fill two or more of the roles defined below. In documenting costs, please do so by function, even if they are performed by the same person. These individuals may work within the child welfare agency or in other departments or outside agencies.

- NEICE IT Lead: The state technical lead for the NEICE.
- ICPC Program Lead: The state ICPC program lead for the NEICE.
- Analyst: Person who determines needs and prepares specifications for implementing the NEICE.
- Programmer: Person who writes code needed to implement the NEICE.
- Database Administrator: Person responsible for administering state databases in support of the NEICE.
- Security Administrator: Person responsible for ensuring that the NEICE is installed and operated in a secure environment.
- Support/Clerical: Persons who perform non-technical tasks in support of the NEICE.
- Procurement Staff: Persons who procure needed hardware, software, and other supplies in support of the NEICE.
- Hardware Technicians: Persons who install and maintain the hardware needed to run the NEICE.
- Helpdesk/IT User Support: Persons in the state who respond to end user and technical staff queries concerning the NEICE.