



ADOA - ASET

Arizona Strategic Enterprise Technology

Project Investment Justification

Version 05

A Statewide Standard Document for Information Technology Projects

Project Title:

Child Protective Service IT Modernization

Agency Name:	Department of Child Safety (DCS)
Date:	03/13/2015
Agency Contact Name:	Dennis Espeland
Agency Contact Phone:	
Agency Contact Email:	

[Hover for Instructions](#)

I. Management Summary*

The Department of Child Safety (DCS) is requesting approval to proceed with a project to create the planning documents necessary to secure federal funding and ultimately engage a contractor to replace the Department's child welfare system – Children's Information Library and Data Source (CHILDS).

Initiated by the Social Security Act of 1993, CHILDS was implemented in 1997 to provide an efficient, effective and economical means of managing child welfare service delivery and exchange information between various State and Federal information systems. Additionally, CHILDS is in compliance with federal law that requires all States to submit data to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS) and the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) to support federal statistical reporting and analysis.

Replacement of the CHILDS system will be accomplished in two phases. The first phase (Phase 1) is a planning effort required to create the documents that the federal Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) requires for approval of federal cost sharing. The Implementation Advanced Planning Document (IAPD) is the document DCS submits to request the fifty (50) percent funding match from DHS/ACF. The second phase (Phase 2) will utilize the requirements developed in Phase 1 to procure an implementation contractor who will be responsible for replacing CHILDS with a system that achieves the goals and objectives of the DCS process improvements.

The Department seeks approval to enter into a contractual agreement with the contractor whose proposal scored highest in the evaluation. This contractor was selected after an evaluation of five (5) vendor proposals that responded to the Phase 1 Request For Proposal (RFP). This contractor will lead the DCS in development of system requirements and planning documents over approximately a five (5) month period.

II. Project Investment Justification (PIJ) Type*

Yes No Is this document being provided for a Pre-PIJ / Assessment phase?

If Yes,

Identify any cost to be incurred during the Assessment phase.	\$0
---	-----

Yes No Will a Request for Proposal (RFP) be issued as part of the Pre-PIJ or PIJ?

III. Business Case

A. Business Problem*

The CHILDS system was designed to meet the DHS/ACF Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) requirements enacted in 1993. SACWIS requirements were initiated to assist states with creation of systems to significantly improve foster care, adoption and child welfare services delivery. Improvements included better tracking of children, abuse reporting, provider recruitment and payment, and management information reporting. These systems also include interfaces to exchange data with other human services systems such as Medicaid, SNAP (food stamps), TANF (cash assistance) and Child Support. SACWIS compliance is necessary to qualify for enhanced federal funding. CHILDS utilizes legacy mainframe technology that is increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain, fix and enhance. Modern systems utilize internet based technologies that are significantly improved in function, data presentation, and ease of use. The next generation of Child Welfare Systems, in addition to meeting SACWIS requirements, include design and technology improvements that enhance caseworker performance and productivity. Significant case worker data entry is required to establish a case, initiate an investigation, conduct an assessment and request provider services. The CHILDS system does not provide real-time information about provider's availability to serve children requiring emergency placement in care facilities. This means that placement options which might better serve the child are not communicated to the worker. The replacement system must incorporate functionality to address all SACWIS requirements, but the primary focus will be to make the system easier for caseworkers to use and better deliver service to children and families. This means providing remote access to workers so they don't have to return to their offices to perform data entry and search for providers to request services. Workers also need robust Global Positioning System (GPS) enabled software to help with retrieval of relevant, nearby provider services, travel routing, worker location, and emergency response requests. Although DCS is conducting a thorough analysis of current business process and changing the way they deliver services, recent and planned business process improvements cannot easily be implemented in the CHILDS system. Also, technology improvements such as internet based remote access and mobile technology solutions (phones, tablets, etc.) cannot easily be integrated with CHILDS. The replacement system must be accessible to a broader user base that includes providers and clients through common, secured, web-based technologies.

B. Proposed Business Solution*

The DCS plan is to engage a contractor to assist the Department in development of the requirements and planning documents necessary to issue an RFP for replacement of the CHILDS system. The system requirements will describe the functionality necessary to enable implementation of the new Child Welfare business delivery model, provide new technology solutions for workers, and reduce enhancement timeframes and costs. The planning documents will evaluate replacement alternatives, estimate benefits and costs, and evaluate the feasibility of replacement alternatives.

The project will result in the creation of ten (10) contract deliverables, four (4) of which are documents necessary for Federal cost share approval and issuance of the RFP for the CHILDS replacement system. These four (4) deliverables are described below. The other six (6) deliverables are project management deliverables to monitor the progress and successful completion of the Phase 1 project.

- **Requirements Document** – a detailed list of the capabilities and functionality needed in the CHILDS replacement system.
- **Alternatives Analysis** – looks at replacement options (transfer from another state, build new, COTS, etc.).
- **Cost/Benefit Analysis** – provides a financial analysis of the procurement costs and benefits to be achieved by replacing the system.
- **Feasibility Study** – an assessment of the likelihood of success for the alternatives proposed.

The US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) – Children’s Bureau approved the Department to draw 50/50 federal to state matching funds to complete the work activities defined for this project.

The DCS seeks ASET approval for the award of the CHILDS Replacement Project Phase 1 RFP selected contractor. This contractor has experience and knowledge of Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) requirements, advanced technology products, and information system security requirements. This firm proposes resources with the knowledge and experience necessary to conduct multiple concurrent Joint Application Design Session (JADS) in order to meet the timelines defined for the documentation of system requirements.

At the completion of this project the contractor will provide a Project Close out Report and Presentation of the three (3) alternatives that best address the Department’s goal of replacing CHILDS. The presentation will discuss:

- Findings
- Recommendations
- Issues, Risks and concerns
- Lessons Learned

C. Quantified Benefits*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Service enhancement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Increased revenue
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cost reduction
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Problem avoidance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk avoidance

Explain:

Service enhancement: The replacement of the CHILDS system will provide the program with new functional capabilities in support of revised business requirements.

Increased Revenue: The Title IV-E penetration rate, which provides for federal reimbursement for a portion of the maintenance and administrative costs of foster care for children, is lower than expected; a new system will improve State services and recover additional enhanced funding from the Title IV-E Social Security act.

Cost reduction: The current CHILDS system is very complex in design and requires highly skilled technical personnel to make changes to business processing rules. The DCS will be requesting functional capabilities to allow the modification of business rules by DCS business analysts.

Problem avoidance: The design of the current CHILDS system makes system access and usage a complex task for the DCS workforce. Replacement of the system will address current system access and usage problems. CHILDS is essentially a data entry system, and the current recommendations are to move to a decision support system that provides assistance to case workers in the management of case/client family situations.

Risk Avoidance: With the implementation of a new CHILDS system, decision support functionality will be built into the system to assist DCS workers with risk assessment, agency response and selection of service options. Decision support capability will ensure greater consistency in the agency response to similar family scenarios and needs. It will also reduce mistakes in investigation, case management and service delivery by providing guidelines for case workers to follow.

IV. Technology Approach

A. Proposed Technology Solution*

Deliverables for this project will not result in a technology solution. Outputs for this project will serve as input to a Federal approval process for a phase 2 grant that will allow issuance of a RFP to solicit vendor proposals for replacement of CHILDS. Therefore this section will be germane to the next PIJ which will be created after completion of this project, issuance of a phase 2 RFP, selection of a vendor proposal.

B. Technology Environment

Not applicable for this project as no IT changes will be occurring.

C. Selection Process

The DCS worked with the Arizona State Procurement Office (SPO) in the development, evaluation, and recommendation for award of a contract Phase 1 of the CHILDS Replacement Project. The selection was based upon a competitive bid process that evaluated vendor proposals submitted in response to the RFP. The membership of the evaluation teams was comprised of four individuals with program, technical, procurement, and business knowledge to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of all proposal submissions. Proposals were evaluated in three, weighted categories. The categories and available points for each category are as follows:

Evaluation Category	Points
1. Scope Of Work, Understanding and Approach	500
2. Oferror Experience, References and Employee Resumes	300
3. Cost	200

Seven (7) proposal submissions were received. Five (5) of which met the proposal submission requirements. The evaluation committee independently scored each proposal to determine which proposal provided the most comprehensive, cost effective solution. The selected vendor received 765 of the available points and scored the highest in evaluation categories two (2) and three (3). The next highest proposal scored 742 points, and was considerably higher in cost. The recommended proposal price is considerably lower than the DCS estimated cost of Phase 1 (\$3.2 million) due to the following factors:

- 1) The level of detail of requirements definition that the vendors proposed was not as extensive as anticipated when the original cost estimate was developed, but the vendors did adequately address the requirements of the RFP and the requirements that result should be sufficient to support the Phase 2 RFP.
- 2) The original estimate did not anticipate that DCS would create a baseline list of requirements with over 1,200 requirements that will be assessed during the project. This was possible due to the fact DCS was able to leverage requirements from other state RFPs and CHILDS system documentation.

V. Project Approach

A. *Project Schedule**

Project Start Date: 03/23/2015

Project End Date: 08/28/2015

B. *Project Milestones*

<u>Major Milestones</u>	Start Date	Finish Date
Perform Project Initiation Activities (Vendor)	4/20/2015	4/21/2015
Conduct and Document Project Kick-off (Vendor)	4/23/2015	5/5/2015
Create the Project Master Plan (Vendor)	4/22/2015	4/28/2015
Review & Approve the Project Master Plan (DCS)	4/29/2015	5/12/2015
Create the Project Work Plan (Vendor)	4/22/2015	4/29/2015
Review and Approve the Project Work Plan (DCS)	4/30/2015	5/13/2015
Maintain the Project Work Plan (Vendor)	5/14/2015	9/3/2015
Create the Staffing and Org Chart (Vendor)	4/22/2015	4/29/2015
Review and Approve Staffing and Org Chart (DCS)	4/30/2015	5/13/2015
Maintain the Staffing and Org Chart (Vendor)	5/14/2015	9/3/2015
Create Requirements Management Plan (Vendor)	4/22/2015	5/5/2015
Review and Approve Requirements Management Plan (DCS)	5/6/2015	5/19/2015
Create the Requirements Document Template (Vendor)	4/22/2015	5/11/2015
Review and Approve Requirements Document Template (DCS)	5/12/2015	5/25/2015
Create the Functional and Non Functional Requirements (Vendor)	4/28/2015	8/3/2015
Review and Approve the Functional and Non Functional Requirements (DCS)	8/4/2015	8/17/2015
Create Analysis of Development Options (Vendor)	7/21/2015	8/17/2015
Review and Approve Analysis of Development Options (DCS)	8/18/2015	8/31/2015
Create Cost Benefit Analysis (Vendor)	6/29/2015	8/17/2015
Review and Approve Cost Benefit Analysis (DCS)	8/18/2015	8/31/2015
Create Feasibility Study and Recommendation (Vendor)	7/28/2015	8/20/2015
Review and Approve Feasibility Study and Recommendation (DCS)	8/21/2015	9/3/2015
Project Close-out Report and Presentation (Vendor)	8/5/2015	8/17/2015
Approve Close-out Report and Presentation (DCS)	8/18/2015	8/31/2015

VI. Roles and Responsibilities

A. Project Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Function	Responsibility	Responsible Individual
Project Sponsor	Executive	Initiate project, obtain funding, champion project, team staffing	Vicki Mayo, DCS Deputy Director
Project Manager	Contractor	Manage overall project management to include oversight and direction of DCS tasks and resources responsible for performing State contract responsibilities.	Dennis Espeland
Data and Technology Administrator	DCS IT Manager	IT Project Manager, facilitates and coordinates involvement of DCS IT resources with the Steering Committee	Ernest Baca
Network engineer	Configuration and deployment; testing and evaluation (limited role in Phase 1)	Help with network access and workstation setup for the project team	Mathew Iseghohimen

B. Project Manager Certification

- Project Management Professional (PMP) Certified
- State of Arizona Certified
- Project Management Certification not required

C. Full-Time Employee (FTE) Project Hours

Total Full-Time Employee Hours	0
Total Full-Time Employee Cost	\$0

VII. Risk Matrix, Areas of Impact, Itemized List, PIJ Financials

VIII. Project Approvals

A. Agency CIO Review*

Key Management Information	Yes	No
1. Is this project for a mission-critical application system?		X
2. Is this project referenced in your agency's Strategic IT Plan?	X	
3. Is this project in compliance with all agency and State standards and policies for network, security, platform, software/application, and/or data/information as defined in http://aset.azdoa.gov/security/policies-standards-and-procedures , and applicable to this project? If NO , explain in detail in the "XI. Additional Information" section below.	X	
4. Will this project transmit, store, or process sensitive, confidential or Personally Identifiable Information (PII) data? If YES , in the "XI. Additional Information" section below, describe what security controls are being put in place to protect the data.		X
5. Is this project in compliance with the Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) and GRRC rules?	X	
6. Is this project in compliance with the statewide policy regarding the accessibility to equipment and information technology for citizens with disabilities?	X	

B. Project Values*

The following table should be populated with summary information from other sections of the PIJ.

Description	Section	Number or Cost
Assessment Cost (if applicable for Pre-PIJ)	II. PIJ Type - Pre-PIJ Assessment Cost	\$0
Total Development Cost	VII. PIJ Financials tab	\$616,998
Total Project Cost	VII. PIJ Financials tab	\$616,998
FTE Hours	VI. Roles and Responsibilities	0

C. Agency Approvals*

Contact	Printed Name	Signature	Email and Phone
Project Manager:	Dennis Espeland		
Agency CIO:	Ernest Baca (Acting)		
Agency ISO	Vicki Mayo (Acting)		
Project Sponsor:	Vicki Mayo (Deputy Director)		
Agency Director:	Greg McKay		

IX. Optional Attachments

A. Final Phase 1 Evaluation Summary

X. Glossary

XI. Additional Information

Links:

[ADOA-ASET Website](#)

[ADOA-ASET Project Investment Justification Information Templates and Contacts](#)

Email Addresses:

[Strategic Oversight](#)

ADOA-ASET_Webmaster@azdoa.gov