Table of Contents

Author: William L. Hamilton

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS STUDY

REPORT ON CENSUS OF STATE OPERATIONS: MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEMS

FINAL REPORT

February 1987

Prepared for:

Food and Nutrition Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, Virginia 22302

Prepared by:

Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Table of Contents

This report was prepared by Abt Associates Inc., subcontractor to Mathematica Policy Research under Contract No. 53-3198-5-51 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation.

This report represents a team effort to which many persons made important contributions. In particular, helpful guidance, information and support came from Boyd Kowal, the FNS project officer, as well as Jill Herndon and Christine Kissmer, also of FNS. Marie Hojnacki and Julia Daft patiently and skillfully conducted the telephone interviews, under the capable direction of Linda Wray. Harold Beebout and Alan Hershey provided overall direction to the project as well as helpful reviews.

Finally, this report could not have been produced without the extensive cooperation of officials in the State Food Stamp Agencies, who were generous with their time and information in responding to the survey.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... ii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... vii

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS OF MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEMS.. 2
B. SAMPLE AND INTERVIEWING METHODS..... 4
C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS..... 5
D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT..... 6

II. CATEGORIES OF CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY..... 7

A. NPA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY..... 8
B. PA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY..... 11
C. FUTURE PLANS..... 15

III. CONTENTS OF THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM..... 17

A. EARNED INCOME..... 17
B. UNEARNED INCOME..... 18
C. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION..... 20
D. RESOURCES..... 20
E. EXPENSES..... 20
F. FUTURE CHANGES IN HOUSEHOLD CIRCUMSTANCES..... 21
G. OVERALL LEVEL OF DETAIL..... 21

IV. MONTHLY REPORTING PROCEDURES..... 25

A. ASSIGNING CASES TO MONTHLY REPORTING..... 25
B. MAILING THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM..... 26
C. THE MONTHLY REPORTING SCHEDULE..... 27
D. STAFFING FOR MONTHLY REPORT PROCESSING..... 28
E. AUTOMATION..... 31
F. CERTIFICATION POLICY..... 32

Table of Contents

CONTENTS (continued)

V. OPERATING RESULTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING..... 39

A. MEETING THE REPORTING DEADLINE..... 39
B. INCOMPLETE REPORTS..... 40
C. REINSTATEMENTS AND REOPENINGS..... 42
D. INFORMATION LEADING TO CHANGES AND TERMINATIONS... 44

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING..... 47

A. DEVELOPMENT COSTS..... 48
B. ON-GOING OPERATING COSTS..... 48
C. WORKER TIME FOR MONTHLY REPORTS..... 49
D. ELIGIBILITY WORKER TIME FOR DIFFERING KINDS OF REPORTS..... 50

VII. EFFECTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING..... 53

A. IMPACT ON ERROR RATES..... 54
B. EFFECT ON BENEFIT PAYMENTS..... 55
C. EFFECT ON PROGRAM MANAGEMENT..... 57
D. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF MONTHLY REPORTING..... 58

APPENDIX A - SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

APPENDIX B - MONTHLY REPORTING STATE CENSUS INSTRUMENT

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE II.1 - CATAGORIES OF NPA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY..... 10

TABLE II.2 - CATEGORIES OF NPA AND PA CASES SUBJECT TO MONTHLY REPORTING..... 14

TABLE III.1 - STRINGENCY OF THE MONTHLY REPORT FORMS, BY TOPIC..... 19

TABLE III.2 - STRINGENCY OF THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM VS. PROPORTION OF NPA CASELOAD REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY..... 23

TABLE IV.1 - ELIGIBILITY WORKER RESPONSIBILITIES IN MONTHLY REPORT SYSTEM..... 30

TABLE IV.2 - ELIGIBILITY WORKER RESPONSIBILITIES FOR REPORT PROCESSING, BY LEVEL OF SYSTEM AUTOMATION..... 33

TABLE IV.3 - MEAN PERCENT OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR DIFFERING PERIODS..... 35

TABLE IV.4 - MEAN CERTIFICATION PERIOD FOR MONTHLY REPORTING NPA CASES, BY PROPORTION OF CASELOAD REPORTING..... 36

TABLE V.1 - EFFECT OF FORM COMPLEXITY AND DEADLINES ON FILING RATES..... 41

TABLE V.2 - EFFECT OF FORM COMPLEXITY AND DEADLINES ON INCOMPLETE FILING..... 43

TABLE VI.1 - ELIGIBILITY WORKER TIME IN MINUTES FOR DIFFERING MONTHLY REPORT SITUATIONS..... 52

TABLE VII.1 - EFFECT OF MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS ON PERCEIVED ERROR REDUCTIONS..... 56

TABLE VII.2 - EFFECT OF MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS ON PERCEIVED BENEFIT/COST RATIO..... 60

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1981, Federal legislation has required at least some food stamp recipients to file monthly reports on their income and other circumstances related to eligibility and benefit levels. Although the requirements have changed over time, they have consistently allowed States considerable variation in the administration of monthly reporting. States have discretion to select procedures in some areas, and in other areas they may request waivers of particular regulations.

There is no comprehensive source of information on the ways the States actually operate their monthly reporting systems. Accordingly, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has sponsored research to learn more about this aspect of the Food Stamp Program. Monthly reporting is one of six topics covered in a study of Food Stamp Program operations, being carried out by Mathematica Policy Research, with Abt Associates Inc. and The Urban Institute as subcontractors.

The first phase of the study involved interviews with food stamp personnel in the 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Questions in the monthly reporting component covered the categories of cases required to report monthly, operating procedures in local food stamp agencies, recipients' reporting patterns, administrative costs, and monthly reporting's effects on error rates and benefit outlays. In addition, the content and format of States' monthly report forms were reviewed.

This report describes the States' monthly reporting systems and their perceived effects. Findings are summarized below for each major topic area.

CATEGORIES OF CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT

About a quarter of the States have universal monthly reporting, while the remainder have received waivers to apply the policy selectively to particular segments of the caseload. Households with earnings and recent earnings history are the groups most commonly required to report, especially in the Public

Assistance (PA) caseload. About a third of the States with selective reporting require between 25 and 75 percent of the caseload to report, while a third apply the policy to less than 10 percent of their caseload.1/

INFORMATION OBTAINED ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

Monthly report forms typically cover six major topics: earned income, unearned income, resources (assets), household composition, expenditures, and future changes. Earned income is the most stringently covered, with detailed questions and required verification. Most of the other topics are covered in less detail, and each nonincome topic is omitted from a few States' forms. Complexity of the forms varies widely: a hypothetical household with 4 members and several kinds of income and expenses that is experiencing no changes would make 15 entries on the New York report form, compared to 141 on the Missouri form.

OPERATING PROCEDURES

Eligibility workers generally assign households to the monthly reporting or nonmonthly reporting status (in selective monthly reporting States). When new information is received that changes a household's monthly reporting status, the change takes effect immediately or with a 1-month delay.

Monthly reports are most often mailed from a central State location, almost always as a separate mailing. Most States include a return envelope and all but eleven States prepay the return postage.

1/Interviews were conducted prior to implementation of the monthly reporting provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985. The provisions of the Act require States to apply monthly reporting to households with earnings or a recent work history; States have discretion to require other categories of households to report. Some States are expected to modify their monthly reporting requirement as a result of these new regulations.

Table of Contents

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Most States did not have readily available "hard" figures on monthly reporting costs, but some were able to provide estimates and a few provided figures from special studies. The responses indicate a range of development costs from under $100,000 to over $2 million, depending in large part on the extent to which special automated support systems were developed. Ongoing operating costs were estimated to range between $1 and $16 per case month, with a median of $8.

Eligibility workers accounted for the largest share of the ongoing administrative costs in most States. Eligibility worker time to handle an on-time monthly report with no changes was usually between 9 and 16 minutes, with a median of 12 minutes. However, a report involving a termination or benefit change would take 40 to 60 minutes of eligibility worker time in a quarter of the States.

MONTHLY REPORTING EFFECTS

Although only a few States have actually measured the effects of monthly reporting, most were able to provide some perceptions of the nature and direction of the effects.

Regarding error rates, States are divided between those who believe monthly reporting has reduced (19 States), increased (18 States), or had no effect (12 States) on errors. Most respondents (28 States) feel monthly reporting does not affect benefit outlays, although 14 States believe reductions in outlays have occurred. A 2-to-1 majority believe that monthly reporting has had a negative rather than a positive impact on management of the Food Stamp Program in their State.

Asked whether monthly reporting's benefits exceed the costs in their States, 18 States said "yes," 32 said "no," and 2 were uncertain. States with universal monthly reporting tended to have the most favorable perceptions of monthly reporting on this question as well as on the questions about specific effects. This probably means that States with a strong belief in monthly reporting require it of all cases, rather than that universal monthly reporting is the most successful variation of the policy. More up-to-date case information is most frequently cited as a benefit of monthly reporting, while drawbacks frequently concern administrative costs.

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the results of a series of interviews concerning the monthly reporting systems used by Food Stamp Agencies. The interviews were conducted as part of the first phase of the Food Stamp Program Operations Study (FSPOS), which is being conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., under contract to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, with Abt Associates Inc. and The Urban Institute as subcontractors. Other topics covered in this first phase of the study, referred to in this report as the "census" of State agencies, are: automated certification systems, claims collection, computer matching, quality control, and job search activities. The results of the census interviews in these five other topic areas appear in companion reports.

The Program Operations Study consists of three phases of data collection and analysis. The first phase, the census, entailed telephone interviews with State agency staff in the 53 State-level Food Stamp Agencies (including the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) concerning practices and procedures in the six areas of food stamp operations named above. The second phase (October/November 1986) involves a survey of claims collection and computer match followup operations in a national sample of 191 local agencies. Finally, in the spring of 1987, the third phase of the study will consist of an intensive examination of selected sites, focusing on assessment of the costs and benefits of particularly promising examples of operations identified in the first two phases of the study.

This first part of the report outlines the goals of the census interviews related to monthly reporting. A brief review is then presented of the sources of the data, including a description of the agency sample and the interviewing methods used. The following section discusses some of the limitations of the data collected, and the last section describes the organization of the remainder of this report.

Table of Contents

A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS OF MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEMS

Federal legislation and regulations have mandated all States to require at least some portions of their food stamp caseload to file monthly reports. The monthly reports contain information on the household's income, resources, expenses, household composition, and other factors used to determine the household's eligibility and food stamp allotment. For households required to report monthly, meeting the reporting requirement is a condition of eligibility; households that do not meet the requirement have their benefits terminated.

Although the legislation and regulations mandate monthly reporting, States have considerable discretion in setting policies and procedures. For example, although regulations mandated monthly reporting for essentially the full food stamp caseload, States could request waivers to exempt selected categories of cases.1/ Thus, subject to FNS approval, States can decide whether all cases or only selected categories will have to report monthly, and, if they choose a selective policy, which categories will have to report. Similarly, States design the monthly reporting forms within certain legislative restrictions. States have full discretion on a number of topics, such as allocating responsibilities among eligibility workers and other staff, and determining what level of automation to use in managing the monthly reporting system. Little systematic information is available about the characteristics of the monthly reporting policies and procedures that States have actually implemented. Accordingly, one major objective of the census was to obtain descriptive information on policies and procedures.

A second major area of unknowns concerns the operating outcomes, costs, effects, and ultimately cost effectiveness of monthly reporting. Previous research includes a series of evaluations of monthly reporting demonstrations.2/ Those

---

1/ The Food Security Act of 1985 reduced the extent of mandatory monthly reporting coverage to cases with earned income or a recent work history.

2/ This research is summarized in William L. Hamilton, Monthly Reporting in the AFDC Program: Executive Summary of Demonstration Results. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1985.

Table of Contents

demonstrations differ sufficiently from the policies actually implemented in the Food Stamp Program so that the research results have questionable applicability.

Thus, FNS also wished to learn as much as possible from the census about monthly reporting's costs and effects. Because it was not expected that many States would have reliable data on these topics, the census was designed to obtain professional estimates from State food stamp officials as well as "hard" statistics where available.

Research Questions

The major questions guiding the census effort can be summarized as follows:

a. How is monthly reporting implemented?

- What categories of cases report monthly, and how are they identified?
- What information is obtained on the report form?
- What are procedures for mailing and processing forms?
- How are staff allocated to monthly reporting tasks?
- Where regulations permit operational variation, what procedures are used?
- What certification periods are used?

b. What are the patterns of client actions under monthly reporting?

- What percent report on time, late, and not at all?
- What actions (changes, terminations, reopenings) result from monthly reports?

c. What are the costs of monthly reporting?

- What are the development costs?
- What are the ongoing costs per case month?

d. What are the effects of monthly reporting?

- What is the effect on error rates?

best source for answers to specific questions; interviewers then contacted those persons. Of the 53 agency interviews completed, about a third involved contacting more than one respondent. Monthly reporting interviews lasted an average of 1 hour.

Although the instrument consisted almost entirely of structured response questions, the interviewing method used involved a great deal of discussion of the questions and probing for clarification of responses. Every completed interview was reviewed by the senior researcher assigned to monthly reporting. These reviews identified some apparent inconsistencies among interview responses and answers that, based on other information provided, indicated the intent of the question had not been clearly communicated. As the interviews proceeded, these reviews also identified the need for further clarification of specific questions and their interpretation in the context of particular system characteristics.

These reviews had two results. First, they prompted the preparation of "question clarification" Statements distributed to interviewers to guide them in further administration of particular interview questions. Second, they led to interviewer callbacks to respondents to clarify or confirm responses. Callbacks were made to about a quarter of the States.

C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS

The interviews were designed to provide consistent, systematic profiles of all of the State and local systems examined, and to present the data collected in a structured form to allow comparison of systems on commonly defined dimensions. As a result, the instrument design emphasized developing carefully worded questions that would elicit structured, codable responses. Although this approach makes it possible to compare systems and summarize system features, it also limits the instrument's ability to capture detail and subtle differences among systems.

Apart from this general feature of the survey approach, the data's major weakness stems from the limited information that States had on some topics. This applies mainly to questions about recipients' response patterns, monthly reporting costs, and the impacts of monthly reporting on error rates and benefit outlays. In all of these areas, States were asked to respond on the basis of routinely available statics or prior research, and most did not have such data readily available. (Even though it

Table of Contents

was not requested, some States made special computer runs or did special analysis of their accounting records to provide answers to the survey questions.) In States that could not provide "hard" data, we asked respondents to give their own professional estimates; some respondents, feeling that they did not have a sufficiently detailed familiarity with particular topics, declined to provide estimates. The number of States responding is described in the text for key items, and is shown on the tables for all items.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report is organized into six parts.

Parts II through IV describe the monthly reporting systems in the responding States, focusing in turn on the States' policies about who is required to report, the content of the monthly reporting form, and the operating procedures by which monthly reporting is implemented.

Parts V through VII look at the results of monthly reporting. Part V describes recipient response patterns, including the frequency with which monthly reports lead to benefit changes and closures. Part VI presents the data on development and operating costs for monthly reporting, and on staff time utilized in handling monthly reports. Part VII reviews the impacts (or our respondents' perceptions of impacts) of monthly reporting on error rates, benefit outlays, and the management of the Food Stamp Program. Appendix A contains the questionnaire used to structure the census interviews.

II. CATEGORIES OF CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

One of the main variations in the implementation of monthly reporting has concerned who must report--i.e., the portion of the recipient population to which the requirement is applied. The 1981 legislation mandating monthly reporting called for States to require all but two categories of food stamp recipients to report monthly. The exceptions were households with no earnings in which all adults are elderly or disabled and migrant farmworker households.

Subsequent legislation allowed States more flexibility in determining what categories of cases would report monthly. Legislation enacted in 1982 allowed States to request waivers from the monthly reporting requirements for additional categories of households beyond those exempted in the legislation itself. USDA could grant waivers to make food stamp and AFDC requirements consistent within a State, or because the State demonstrated that the costs of administering monthly reporting would exceed the benefits for particular categories of cases. Legislation in 1983 broadened the grounds for waivers. Finally, the Food Security Act of 1985 requires monthly reporting for households with earnings or recent work history, but allows States to determine whether other categories of cases should report.

Regulations implementing the 1985 Act became effective on June 20, 1986, during the period in which the survey interviews were conducted. Thus, the monthly reporting systems described here were for the most part shaped under the earlier regulations. Some States were already planning changes in their monthly reporting policies, as discussed later in this section.

Distinctions Between PA and NPA Cases

Many States distinguish between households receiving some form of public assistance (PA cases) and those not receiving public assistance (NPA cases) in establishing their monthly reporting requirements. Accordingly, the requirements are discussed separately below for PA and NPA cases.

In considering the PA and NPA results, it is important to note that the PA/NPA distinction is not consistent across States. In fact, States differ on two major dimensions in their operational definition of PA and NPA cases. One difference concerns the

Table of Contents

types of assistance that lead to a PA designation. Cases with Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) can be PA cases in all States. Not all States have General Assistance (GA) programs, but those States generally include GA cases in the PA category. Some States also consider households with Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to be PA cases.

The second difference concerns the degree of overlap between the food stamp household and the case as defined by the other assistance program. By the three most common definitions, a food stamp household is a PA case if: the food stamp case and an AFDC (or other program) case include exactly the same people; the head of the food stamp household is the head of an AFDC case; or any member of the food stamp household receives AFDC. Sometimes a single State uses different definitions for different purposes. For example, a food stamp case with one member (but not the head of household) receiving AFDC may be considered a PA case for purposes of monthly reporting, but not for recertification.

A. NPA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

Universal vs. Selective Reporting

Most States report that they apply monthly reporting selectively rather than universally. About a quarter--13 States--require all NPA cases to report monthly (except households excluded by statute).1/ With a few notable exceptions (such as California and Michigan), the States with universal reporting requirements are relatively rural, small-caseload States. The remaining States have received waivers exempting some categories of recipients from the monthly reporting requirement.

1/Figures here and throughout the report refer only to responses given in the survey. North Dakota did not respond to this part of the survey. Previously published data indicate that North Dakota applies monthly reporting to all NPA cases, making a total of 14 States with this policy. Also, Montana and Nevada have waivers exempting very small groups of cases (e.g., residents of group homes).

Table of Contents

Types of Cases Selected

Among the categories of cases selectively required to report monthly, households with earnings are by far the most common. Of the 39 States with selective requirements, all but 12 have either a general or a conditional requirement for earned income households to report (see Table II.1). Conditional requirements most often link earnings to household size (e.g., cases with earnings and four or more household members). Some States make the requirement conditional on earnings being more than a specified amount, being from particular sources, or being likely to fluctuate.

Households with unearned income also are often subject to monthly reporting requirements. Eleven States have requirements covering cases with unearned income. All are conditional requirements; typically, they specify irregular unearned income or income from particular sources. All but two of these States also require earned income households to report.

Only six States indicate that NPA cases with recent work history are subject to monthly reporting. This number is surprisingly small because AFDC regulations have required monthly reporting for such cases and most States require it for PA food stamp cases with recent earnings history. Recent work history generally means earnings within the past 2 or 3 months, although one State's requirement covers a 6-month period. All of these States require current earners to report monthly.

The other common monthly reporting requirement is the number of people in the household, used by 13 States. In most cases, the requirement is conditional on the household having earnings as well as exceeding the specified threshold size. The threshold ranges from three to seven household members, with five being the most common.

A number of categories defined by quite diverse criteria are used by only one or two States. Examples are: cases in which a household member has applied for unemployment compensation, persons convicted of fraud, cases with allotments over a specified amount, and cases that include one or more mandatory work registrants. Nearly all States have one or more special requirements of this sort.

Proportion Reporting Monthly

The diversity in categories required to report leads to a wide range in the proportion of the NPA caseload reporting--from 3 to 60 percent. Among those States, the median was about 18

Table of Contents

TABLE II.1

CATEGORIES OF NPA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY1/

Categories	Number of States
All Cases2/	13
Selected categories3/	
Earned income	27
Recent earnings history	6
Any unearned income	6
Irregular unearned income	7
Households of specified size	13
Other	38
Common combinations of categories4/	
Earned income or earned income with recent work history	11
Earned income and unearned income	10
Earned income and specified household size	6
Other combinations	12

1/Based on states' responses to the survey. Table A.1 in Appendix A displays responses by state.

2/Except statutory exemptions.

3/States generally require two or more categories of cases to report. Total categories selected thus exceeds the number of cases with selective policies (39).

4/These combinations are defined to be mutually exclusive. Nearly all states also have "other" uniquely defined categories, which are not considered in this classification.

Table of Contents

percent.2/ Thus, all NPA cases must report in about a quarter of the States, between 25 and 60 percent report in another quarter of the States, and less than 25 percent of the caseload reports monthly in the remaining half of the States. Appendix Table A.1 displays the percent of NPA cases subject to monthly reporting in each State.

B. PA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

Universal vs. Selective Reporting

The split between universal and selective application of monthly reporting requirements is about the same for PA as NPA cases--39 States require it for selected categories, and 12 for all cases.3/ Most States follow the same strategy for both caseloads, but exceptions exist. Kansas, Michigan, and New Mexico have universal reporting for NPA cases but selective PA reporting. Colorado and Mississippi require all PA cases to report monthly, but only selected categories of NPA cases. Individual States' responses are presented in Appendix A, Table A-2.

AFDC reporting requirements strongly influence the requirements for PA food stamp cases. Historically, this requirement has focused most strongly on cases with earnings or a recent history of earnings. The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 allowed States the option of determining what categories of cases should report monthly, except that reporting was mandated for earnings and recent work history cases. Previously, reporting had been required for all cases, but States could obtain waivers to exempt any categories except earnings cases.

Before the Food Security Act of 1985, legislation mandated States to apply the monthly reporting requirement to any food

---

2/ The median is a point in the distribution that evenly divides the responses: half of the responses are above the median, and half below. The median is used rather than the mean because, given the relatively small number of observations, the mean is unduly influenced by extreme values.

3/ North Dakota and the Virgin Islands did not respond to this part of the questionnaire. Previously published data indicate that North Dakota applies monthly reporting to all PA cases, while selected categories report monthly in the Virgin Islands.

Table of Contents

cases with more than a specified number of people in the household, cases that have children in particular age ranges (e.g., 16 to 18), and cases that receive or have applied for specified other kinds of assistance.

NPA vs. PA Strategies for Selection

A majority of the States--but only a slim majority--follow the same general strategy for PA and NPA cases, as illustrated in Table II.2 (combinations of categories required to report monthly are as defined above for Table II.1). Overall, 28 of the 51 States require approximately the same categories of NPA and PA cases to report.

States show greater consistency in their choice of universal or selective policies than in their choice of specific parts of the caseload to report monthly, however. Of the 15 States applying a universal requirement to one group or the other, 11 apply it to both. Of the 36 States using selective requirements, 17 require the same categories of both types of cases to report.

Where differences exist, they indicate a greater diversity in the NPA categories than the PA categories required to report. PA requirements closely follow the historical AFDC emphasis on cases with income. More States had "other" strategies for their NPA caseload (12 NPA vs. 4 PA), and more had strategies involving both earnings cases and households of a specific size (6 NPA vs. 0 PA).

Proportion of Cases Reporting Monthly

Overall, the proportion of the PA caseload subject to monthly reporting is similar to the NPA proportion. The entire PA caseload reports in about a quarter of the States. The proportion reporting ranges between about 25 percent and 75 percent in another quarter, and the remaining half of the States have fewer than 25 percent of their PA cases reporting monthly.

Among those States applying selective monthly reporting to both NPA and PA cases, the percentage subject to monthly reporting tends to be similar in the two parts of the caseload. For example, out of 16 States that require monthly reporting by less than a quarter of their NPA caseload, 13 apply the policy to less than a quarter of their PA caseload as well. A number of States that require monthly reporting for relatively large proportions of their NPA caseload, however, require smaller proportions of PA cases to report.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.2

CATEGORIES OF NPA AND PA CASES SUBJECT TO MONTHLY REPORTING

PA Cases Required to Report	NPA Cases Required to Report					
	All cases	Earned/ recent	Earned/ unearned	Earned/ HH size	Other	Total
All cases	11 1/	1	-	-	1	13
Earned/recent	-	8	3	2	5	18
Earned/unearned	2	1	6	4	3	16
Earned/HH size	-	-	-	-	-	0
Other	-	1	-	-	3	4
TOTAL	13	11	9	6	12	51

1/ Cell figures represent the number of states with this combination of requirements.

Table of Contents

C. FUTURE PLANS

Because the most recent food stamp legislation (the Food Security Act of 1985) grants States more discretion in deciding what cases must report monthly, the survey asked States whether they were planning any significant expansion or reduction in the proportion of cases required to report.

Most States (31) said they plan no changes. Of those who foresaw changes, 15 States expected to contract and 7 to expand the proportion of cases subject to monthly reporting. The Food Security Act has apparently influenced the plans: 11 of the 15 States planning contraction said they were considering the change because of the Act. Only one of the seven expecting expansion said the Act had affected the plan.

Table of Contents

III. CONTENTS OF THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

Federal regulations covering monthly reporting have two key requirements about the contents of the report form itself. They specify that the form shall collect information about:

- Budget month income; medical, dependent care, and shelter expenses; household composition; and other circumstances relevant to the amount of the food stamp allotment.

- Any changes in income; medical, dependent care, and shelter expenses; resources; or other relevant circumstances affecting eligibility that the household expects to occur in the current month or in future months, or that occurred in the budget month.

The regulations also specify that households must verify information concerning income (except unearned income that has not changed since the preceding monthly report) and utility and medical expenses. States may require verification of other information at their discretion.

States may request waivers from certain of these regulations. For example, waivers have been approved to allow some States to restrict coverage of the monthly report form to particular topics, or to limit verification requirements. In addition, States may vary within the regulations in the level of detail with which they request information.

As part of the census, States were asked to send copies of their monthly report forms; 43 States did so. We reviewed the forms and coded the nature of the information sought, the verification required, and other elements of the form's information collection strategy. This part of the report presents the results of that review.

A. EARNED INCOME

All of the forms request information on earned income in the budget month. In fact, the design of most forms implies that earned income is the form's central interest: the earned income section usually appears early in the form and consumes a large proportion of its space.

Table of Contents

Earned income information is generally collected in considerable detail. All forms ask for an exact statement of earnings, regardless of whether the amount of earnings changed in the past month. This is the only topic for which all households have to provide explicit information each month (Table III.1). All require households to provide information separately for each recipient with earnings. All require verification; pay stubs are typically specified. Appendix A, Table A.3 presents state-by-state information on these points.

The forms vary as to whether the household must enter total earnings for the month (by recipient) or provide the information by week or for each paycheck. Slightly over half--22 of the 43 responding States--ask for totals, while the remainder require disaggregated information.

B. UNEARNED INCOME

All of the forms cover unearned as well as earned income, but the reporting requirements for unearned income are somewhat less stringent. For example:

- six States only require households to report unearned income amounts if the amount has changed since the preceeding report;
- although most forms ask about specific types of unearned income, seven simply ask a general question (e.g., "list all income received by any member of your household"); and
- five States ask for total unearned income for the household rather than asking for separate entries for each recipient with income.

Verification requirements are considerably less stringent for unearned than earned income. Only a third of the forms require verification of all unearned income. Nearly a quarter have no explicit requirement, and over 40 percent require verification only if unearned income has changed since the previous month. (state-by-state data appear in Appendix A, Table A.4.)

Table of Contents

TABLE III.1

STRINGENCY OF THE MONTHLY REPORT FORMS, BY TOPIC

Topic	Number of states with: Data not Required for All Households	Basic Data Required	Detailed Data Required	Average Rating1/
Earned Income	0	0	43	3.0
Unearned Income	6	1	36	2.7
Household Composition	35	8	0	1.2
Resources	34	2	7	1.4
Expenses	13	1	29	2.4

1/ Forms were scored from 1 to 3, corresponding to the first three columns of the table. This column presents the average score for the 43 forms examined.

Table of Contents

C. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

All States' forms obtain information on household composition, as the regulations require. Most of the forms collect only limited information, however, as summarized in Appendix A, Table A.5.

Over 80 percent of the forms require information on household members only if household composition has changed since the previous month. Verification requirements are rare: three forms require verification if there has been a change in household composition, but the remainder have no explicit verification requirement.

D. RESOURCES

The regulations require monthly report forms to obtain information on changes in resources, and most forms have one or more questions explicitly on that topic. Four of the forms we examined have no explicit questions on resources, however.

The forms that ask about resources generally request limited information. Most of the forms (about 80 percent) ask about resources only if a change has occurred. Less than half ask for verification.

Although most forms ask separate questions about particular kinds of assets, about 40 percent of the forms make more general inquiries. For example, the Alabama form contains the following instruction near the end of the form: "You MUST REPORT OTHER CHANGES IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CIRCUMSTANCES THIS MONTH. Changes which must be reported include dependent care costs which go up or down, getting another car, truck or vehicle, medical expenses that go up or down by more than $25, and household savings that go over a total of $1500." Appendix A, Table A.6 displays State-specific information on the forms' coverage of resources.

E. EXPENSES

Nearly all forms request some information on expenses (3 of the 42 do not), but they do not all cover the same expense categories. The regulations state that information must be obtained on medical, dependent care, and shelter expenses, and these are the primary categories covered. Of the 39 forms requesting shelter information, the proportion specifying

Table of Contents

information in these 3 categories is:

- medical expenses -- 72%
- dependent care expense -- 92%
- shelter expenses -- 82%

A few forms request information on other expenses, such as work expenses or support payments. Most of the forms ask about the various types of expenses separately; only a few make general inquiries.

Although the regulation requires obtaining information only on changes in expenses, three-quarters of the forms ask for a listing of all expenses in the specified areas, whether they have changed or not. Almost all of the forms also require verification of some or all reported expenses, although about 30 percent only ask for verification if the expense has changed since the previous month. Detail on these points is presented in Appendix A, Table A.7.

F. FUTURE CHANGES IN HOUSEHOLD CIRCUMSTANCES

Of the various topics mentioned in the regulations, future changes in household circumstances are the least well covered by the monthly report forms we examined. About 30 percent of the forms have no questions about future changes, making this the most frequently omitted area of information. The forms that do ask for information tend to be less stringent on this than on other topics. Only 10 percent of the forms ask separate questions about different types of potential changes, and just over 15 percent request verification of any changes reported.

G. OVERALL LEVEL OF DETAIL

Looking at the monthly report forms yields an impression that they vary greatly in their overall level of detail--and hence, in the time and effort that would be required to complete them. To get at least a crude measure of this variation, we defined two hypothetical food stamp households with the following characteristics:

- Case 1. The household consists of four people, including two with earned income in the budget month. One receives

Table of Contents

social security income and one receives alimony. The household has one car and one bank account, and has incurred medical, dependent care, shelter, and work expenses.

None of these factors changed in the past month, and no changes are expected next month.

- Case 2. This is the same household as Case 1, one month later. In the intervening month, one person has been added to the case and the amount of each type of income, resource, and expense has changed. A change in earned income is expected for next month.

For each case, we counted the number of separate entries that would be required on each State's monthly report form.

Variation in Stringency of the Form

The resulting measures vary widely, as expected. The median number of entries for Case 1 was 44. The New York monthly reporting form requires only 15 entries, however, while the Missouri form requires 141 entries. The number of entries for Case 2 ranges from 23 (Washington) to 185 (Missouri), with a median of 71.1/ Figures for individual States are shown in Appendix A, Table A.8.

One might expect that States whose monthly reporting policies were more stringent in terms of the proportion of the caseload required to report would also have the more detailed reporting requirements. This expectation is partially borne out, as shown in Table III.2. States with universal reporting requirements tend to have somewhat more detailed forms than selective States. Among States with selective reporting policies, however, the percentage of cases reporting monthly is not related to the form's level of detail.

1/ States were not asked whether they use separate forms for PA and NPA cases. It is possible, therefore, that some of the observed variation stems from including both PA and NPA forms in the analysis. (It was not usually possible to tell from the form itself what type of cases it would be applied to.)

Table of Contents

TABLE III.2

STRINGENCY OF THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM VS.
PROPORTION OF NPA CASELOAD REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

Number of entries for Case 1	Proportion required to report			
	All cases	16 to 99%	15% or less	Total
15-36	18%	43%	36%	33%
37-55	36	29	36	33
56-141	46	29	29	33
TOTAL1/	100	100	100	100
(Number of states)	(11)	(14)	(14)	(39)

1/Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding error

Table of Contents

IV. MONTHLY REPORTING PROCEDURES

Although the legislation and regulations set forth rather specific requirements as to who will be subject to monthly reporting and what information they must provide, States have substantial leeway to design the procedures for implementing the requirements. They have to determine how to apply and remove the monthly reporting requirement to particular households, how to mail out the form and get it returned, and how to deal with the form when it arrives.

Given flexibility on these issues, States have implemented varying approaches. This part of the report summarizes some of the key procedures they follow.

A. ASSIGNING CASES TO MONTHLY REPORTING

States that apply monthly reporting to selected categories of cases must assign individual households to a monthly reporting or nonmonthly reporting status. All households must be assigned a status upon certification. Households whose circumstances change must be reassessed to determine whether the change affects their monthly reporting status and, if so, they must be assigned to the new status.

Most States had no readily available figures on the proportion of households changing their monthly reporting status in an average month. Of the 18 States that did provide estimates, 11 cited proportions of 5 percent or less. (Appendix A, Table A.9 provides details). Although the questionnaire did not ask the cause of the reassignments, it is reasonable to assume that the appearance or disappearance of earned income is the most common reason.

Responsibility for Assignment

Monthly reporting status decisions are normally made either by the eligibility worker or by an automated review of case circumstances. Decisions by eligibility workers are more common, particularly at initial certification. Eligibility workers make the initial assignment in about two-thirds of the States, and the assignment is made automatically in the other third. Some States reported that the responsibility varies within the State where, for example, some counties are

Table of Contents

automated and some are not. A number of States also said that eligibility supervisors make the assignment in some special situations.

Most States use the same decision process (either eligibility or computer) for the initial assignment and for subsequent reassignments to or from the monthly reporting group. Seven States vary their procedures, however. Four of them have the eligibility worker make the initial assignments, while the computer handles reassignments. The other three States use varying combinations.

Effective Reassignments generally take effect immediately--that is, on

Reassignment (Appendix A, Table A.10). A few States have a 1-month lag, with the reassignment taking effect in the second reporting cycle after the change is reported. In addition, four States delay until the next recertification in taking a household off monthly reporting, although only one State waits until recertification when a former nonreporter changes to monthly reporting status.

B. MAILING THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

Table of Contents

C. THE MONTHLY REPORTING SCHEDULE

Monthly reports are usually mailed out near the end of the month. Of the 39 States that mail all forms on the same date, 26 mail them between the 27th and 30th of the month, and nearly all of the others mail their forms after the 20th (Appendix A, Table A.12). Most of the States with multiple mailing dates also do their mailings in the second half of the month.

Initial Deadline

Recipients must usually submit the completed forms between the 5th and 10th working day of the following month. This means that the recipient generally has about a week to file. In three-quarters of the States, the filing date is 5 to 10 days after the mailing date. The longest interval is about 3 weeks; the filing date comes between 2 and 3 weeks after the mailing date in seven States.1/

Warning Notice

If a household fails to file by the deadline, a warning notice is mailed out within a few days. The warning notice is usually mailed 3 to 6 days after the deadline. A few States mail the warning notice the same day as the deadline or the next day, and a few have 7 to 12 day lags.

Regulations require States to send recipients a reminder or warning notice if they fail to submit a complete monthly report form by the initial deadline. A number of States have requested and received waivers from this requirement, however.

Final Notice

In about half of the States, the warning notice is the same as the notice of adverse action--that is, it is the recipient's only notification (apart from statements on the form itself) that benefits will be terminated if the form is not submitted by a specified date. The other half of the States follow the warning notice with a separate notice of adverse action. Those States generally mail the notice of adverse action 10 days to 3 weeks after the warning notice.

1/ Numerous states described deadlines in terms of a range--for example, the initial filing deadline might be 6 to 10 days after the mailout date. This was particularly true in states with multiple mailout dates or filing schedules. Figures in Table A.12 show the mid-point of the range states reported, and this discussion is also based on the mid-point.

Table of Contents

Final Deadline

In a few States, recipients must meet the initial deadline to avoid a delay in receiving benefits. More typically, the last day that recipients can file and still receive their benefits on time is 2 to 3 weeks after the initial deadline, or 2 1/2 to 4 weeks after the forms were mailed out. Some States said that there is no clear last date to avoid delays; for example, a case with no changes may be more easily incorporated in the regular issuance run than a case with changes.

1-Month vs. 2-Month Cycles

Federal regulations allow States to organize their monthly reporting schedule into either a "1-month" or a "2-month" cycle. In the 1-month cycle, the issuance month comes immediately after the budget month--that is, the recipient files a report covering January circumstances, and the February allotment is based on this report. The 2-month cycle contains a "processing" month between the budget and issuance months. Thus, the January information determines the March allotment.

Practically all the States have 2-month cycles. The only exceptions indicated by the reported intervals between the mailing date for the form and the issuance reflecting information on the form, are Vermont and Oregon. In most States, the issuance date follows the mailing date by somewhat more than a month, typically about 5 weeks. In States that mail monthly report forms out near the beginning of the month, 60 days or more may elapse between mailing and issuance.

Reinstatement

The regulations permit (but do not require) States to reinstate households whose cases are closed for failure to file, as long as they provide all required information before the end of the issuance month. Thirty States have reinstatement policies. Most allow recipients the maximum time specified in the regulations, but some have earlier cutoffs (generally the end of the processing month rather than the end of the issuance month).

D. STAFFING FOR MONTHLY REPORT PROCESSING

States have three basic management options as they organize local offices to carry out monthly reporting functions. These concern whether the work will be done by eligibility workers, clerical staff, or computers.

Receiving the Form

When monthly report forms come into the office, for example, they may be sent directly to an eligibility worker to take any necessary action. Alternatively, a clerk may screen the form

for completeness, sending notices on incomplete forms and passing complete ones along. Still another option is to have a data entry clerk enter the information from the form, with an automated review to determine completeness and generate any necessary notices.

Immediate eligibility worker review is by far the most common choice, with 34 States indicating it as the main procedure in their State. Clerical or data entry personnel review most forms elsewhere--no State has automated this function. (See Appendix A, Table A.13 for details.)

Determining Action Required

Completed forms must be examined to determine whether any case action is required. Eligibility workers are even more dominant in this function; 42 States reported that eligibility workers make this decision. Only Wisconsin indicated that an automated process determines whether action is required.

If a returned form contains changes, the eligibility worker must nearly always take some action. All of the responding States said that the eligibility worker is usually or always involved in handling these cases.

Even when the form involves no change, however, most States said that the eligibility worker would be involved in its processing. Over 80 percent said the eligibility worker is usually or always involved, with only six States reporting little or no involvement.

Eligibility Worker Responsibility Level

The eligibility worker thus has the bulk of the report processing responsibility in most States' monthly reporting systems. Combining the responses concerning the 5 functions just discussed--reviewing the forms for completeness, handling incomplete reports, determining whether a case action is necessary, handling reports with no change, and handling reports with changes--25 of the 49 responding States said the eligibility worker has primary responsibility for all functions.

This is approximately the same pattern seen earlier concerning the assignment of cases to monthly reporting or nonreporting status. Somewhat surprisingly, however, the strategies for handling case assignment are not closely related to the strategies for processing reports, as shown in Table IV.1. States giving eligibility workers complete responsibility for case assignment are only fractionally more likely than average to make the eligibility worker solely responsible for report processing as well.

Table of Contents

TABLE IV.1

ELIGIBILITY WORKER RESPONSIBILITIES
IN MONTHLY REPORT SYSTEM

Report Processing Functions	Case Assignment Functions		
	All EW	Not all EW	Total
EW responsible for all	10 1/	8	18
EW responsible for some or none	11	10	21
Total	21	18	39

1/ Figures in cells are numbers of states

Table of Contents

Most States reported that monthly reporting cases are integrated into each worker's caseload (Appendix A, Table A.15). Only two States (Connecticut and the District of Columbia) said most monthly reporting cases are handled by separate eligibility worker units. Another 10 States have some specialization, with one or more eligibility workers in a unit handling the monthly reporting cases.

E. AUTOMATION

A 1985 FNS survey examined a number of aspects of States' automated systems, including the monthly reporting functions that the systems performed. All but 4 of the 42 States that reported having automated functions operate systems to generate monthly report forms for mailing. Most systems perform other functions as well, including:

- Tracking receipt of forms (24 States)
- Automatic termination for failure to file (23 States)
- Generating adverse action notice (20 States)
- Generating warning notice (18 States)
- Determination of monthly reporting status (18 States)

Number of Functions Automated

A summary index of States' automation of monthly reporting functions was created from these responses. Overall, about 30 percent of the States have none or only one function automated; 40 percent have two to four automated functions, and the remaining 30 percent have five or six.

The number of automated monthly report functions corresponds reasonably closely to the overall level of automation in the State measured in another part of the Program Operations Study.2/ The study of automated certification systems classifies States' systems into five types, as follows:

2/Alan M. Hershey, Food Stamp Program Operations Study Report on State Census: Automated Certification Systems (Draft). Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1986.

Table of Contents

1. Basic input and recording

2. Manual determination and automated results checking

3. Stand-alone eligibility and benefit determination

4. Integrated determination and update from input from

5. Application-based determination and update

As would be expected, 12 of the 15 of the States with 5 or 6 automated monthly report functions are in the highest system categories. Similarly, a majority (4 of 7) of the States with 0 or 1 automated function are in States with lower levels of automation.

The level of system automation is also related to the eligibility worker's responsibilities for processing monthly reports. Most States with relatively low levels of automation report that the eligibility worker is solely responsible for all report processing functions, as shown in Table IV.2. Conversely, the majority of the more highly automated States assign less reponsibility to the eligibility worker.

Relationship of Automation and Other MR Policies

States' level of automation of monthly reporting functions is not closely related to the monthly reporting characteristics examined in previous sections, such as the proportion of cases reporting monthly or the complexity of the monthly report form. Neither is it related to such general State characteristics as caseload size or percent urban population. It thus appears that the extent to which monthly reporting functions have been automated depends largely on idiosyncratic historical factors in the individual States.

F. CERTIFICATION POLICY

Many of monthly reporting's original proponents saw this procedure as a substitute for frequent recertifications. The demonstrations of monthly reporting for AFDC all included 12-month redetermination intervals, rather than the normal 6-month period. In the Illinois demonstration of monthly reporting with the PA food stamp caseload, monthly reporting entirely replaced routine in-office recertification. Federal regulations require a certification period for monthly reporting households of at least 6 months, although some States have been granted waivers to have shorter certification periods for some monthly reporting

Table of Contents

TABLE IV.2

ELIGIBILITY WORKER RESPONSIBILITIES FOR
REPORT PROCESSING, BY LEVEL OF
SYSTEM AUTOMATION

	Automation Type:			
Report Processing Responsibility	1-2	3-4	5	Total
EW responsible for all	80%	52%	29%	54%
EW responsible for some or none	20	48	71	46
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
(Number of states)	(10)	(29)	(7)	(46)

Table of Contents

cases. No cases can be certified for longer periods than 12 months without a waiver, regardless of reporting policy.

Length of Certification Periods

On average, States have in fact established longer certification periods for monthly reporting cases than for cases not required to report. The difference lies mainly in the proportion of NPA cases with certification periods shorter than 6 months. Over three-quarters of the States providing information said that no monthly reporting NPA households are certified for less than 6 months; those with any short certifications for monthly reporting households said the policy applies to very few households. In contrast, about a third of the States certify over 25 percent of their nonmonthly reporting NPA cases for less than 6 months. (Appendix A, Tables A.16 and A.17 show details.)

The differential certification policy for monthly reporters is much more evident for NPA and PA cases, as shown in Table IV.3. For most PA cases, the certification period is set equal to the redetermination period for the other program, so the majority of cases follow the 6-month AFDC cycle. Very short certification periods are therefore rare for PA cases even in the absence of monthly reporting.

It is likely that the patterns in Table IV.3 understate the impact of monthly reporting on certification policy. States with selective policies usually apply monthly reporting to cases expected to have frequent changes or to be error prone. In the absence of monthly reporting, these cases would probably be given shorter than average certification periods. Thus, the longer-than-average certification periods for NPA cases probably reflect a substantial policy change.

Relationship of Certification to Other MR Policies

States with selective monthly reporting requirements tend to assign shorter certification periods to their monthly reporting cases than States with universal reporting. As Table IV.4 shows, most of the universal reporting States have average NPA certification periods of 11 to 12 months, while most of the selective reporting States certify for shorter periods. It must be remembered, however, that the monthly reporting caseload in the selective States mainly contains cases that would be expected to have relatively short certification periods. Thus, it is not clear whether the selective reporting States are less confident in monthly reporting's ability to obtain all necessary information, or whether the difference in

Table of Contents

TABLE IV.3

MEAN PERCENT OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR DIFFERING PERIODS[1]

Certification Period	NPA Cases		PA Cases	
	Monthly Reporters	Non-monthly Reporters	Monthly Reporters	Non-monthly Reporters
Less than 6 months	5%	24%	1%	7%
6 months	45	26	51	51
More than 6 months	50	50	48	42
Total	100	100	100	100
(Number of states responding)	(36)	(28)	(37)	(37)

[1] Unweighted means of states' responses.

Table of Contents

TABLE IV.4

MEAN CERTIFICATION PERIOD FOR MONTHLY REPORTING
NPA CASES, BY PROPORTION OF CASELOAD REPORTING

Mean Certification Period	Universal Reporting Requirement	Selective Reporting Requirement	Total
Less than 11 months	29%	67%	58%
11-12 months	71	33	42
TOTAL	100	100	100
(number of states)	(7)	(24)	(31)

Table of Contents

average certification periods simply reflects differences in the nature of the cases reporting monthly.

The data also reveal some tendency for the more automated States to use shorter certification periods, although the relationship is not strong. This may reflect a trade-off in the use of eligibility worker time: where eligibility workers are less responsible for processing monthly reports, they may be used to conduct more frequent certifications. The data do not allow direct examination of this hypothesis, however.

V. OPERATING RESULTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

Once sent to recipients, monthly report forms may follow a number of different paths. Some are not returned by the deadline, and some are returned with incomplete information. Either situation prompts a followup action by the local agency, which may result in a complete filing by the final deadline or may lead to suspension or closure. Cases that are suspended or closed may be reinstated without losing benefits, they may lose 1 or 2 months' benefits and then be certified as eligible again, or they may stay closed for a prolonged period. Complete monthly reports may contain information that leads to a change in termination of benefits, or they may provide no new information.

This part of the report reviews these various possible outcomes, based on a series of survey questions that asked respondents to estimate the percentage of cases for which each outcome occurs in a normal month. Most States did not have actual statistics readily available to answer most questions, so the respondents provide estimates based on their experience and familiarity with their programs.

A. MEETING THE REPORTING DEADLINE

A substantial proportion of households fail to meet the initial monthly reporting deadline. Estimates from the 39 responding States range from a high of 95 percent to as few as 33 percent that meet the initial deadline. In the median State, about a quarter of the monthly reporting households miss the deadline. Only 4 States said that at least 90 percent meet the initial deadline, while 6 States said that no more than half do so. (Appendix A, Table A.18 shows States' responses.)

Only 9 States had actual statistics on the proportion of cases meeting the deadline, so the overall estimates may contain some error. However, the figures from these States look very much like the overall pattern, ranging from 55 to 95 percent meeting the deadline, with a median of 75 percent.

Closure for Failure to File

Most households that fail to meet the initial deadline manage to file in time to avoid case closure. In the median State, about 5 percent of the monthly reporting cases are suspended or

Table of Contents

closed for failure to file in a normal month. While this figure is substantial--approximating the full caseload's closure rate for all reasons in many States--it is well under the 25 percent rate of failure to meet the initial deadline. (Moreover, many of these households are reinstated before actually losing benefits, as discussed below.) Among the 35 responding States, 14 put the closure rate for failure to file at 4 or 5 percent of the monthly reporting caseload; however, 9 cited closure rates of 10 percent or more.

Policies Related to Late Reporting

Two policies examined in previous chapters might be expected to influence the proportion of recipients filing on time: the complexity of the monthly report form and the length of time recipients have to file. As Table V.1 indicates, the evidence supports the first hypothesis, but not the second. The reported proportion of recipients filing late or being closed for failure to file is markedly higher in States with more complicated forms. The length of the filing period appears unrelated to filing patterns, however.

In some States, households that file late--i.e., that miss the initial deadline but are not closed--may receive benefits with some delay. Twenty-four States provided information on this point, and 5 of those indicated that their procedures do not allow any delayed issuance (households either receive their benefits on time or their cases are closed). Most of the remaining States said that 5 percent or fewer of the monthly reporting caseload usually receive late issuances. A few States cited higher percentages, however, with several reporting delayed issuance for at least 20 percent of the caseload.

B. INCOMPLETE REPORTS

Some households file monthly reports that lack some required information, verification, or signature. After the local agency informs the household about the missing information, some households succeed in meeting the filing requirements and others are ultimately closed.

The median State, among the 28 providing information, indicated that 15 percent of the households submit incomplete reports in a normal month. About a quarter of the States reported incomplete filing rates under 10 percent, and another quarter said the rates were 20 percent or more.

Table of Contents

TABLE V.1

EFFECT OF FORM COMPLEXITY AND DEADLINES ON FILING RATES

	Percent of states with:					
	>75% filing on time	<75% filing on time	(N)	<7% closing for failure to file	>7% closing for failure to file	(N)
Number of entries in monthly report form for no-change case						
15-36	67%	33%	(9)	62%	38%	(8)
37-55	23	77	(13)	75	25	(12)
56-141	30	70	(10)	89	11	(9)
TOTAL						
Number of days from mailout to initial deadline						
<8	38%	62%	(16)	80%	20%	(15)
8-10	27	73	(11)	78	22	(9)
>10	42	58	(12)	54	46	(11)
TOTAL						

Table of Contents

Policies Related to Incomplete Filing

Simpler forms and longer filing periods appear to contribute to households' ability to file complete reports. As Table V.2 indicates, States with less complex forms generally said they get somewhat lower than average proportions of incomplete reports. The States reporting relatively low proportions also tended to have somewhat longer periods between the mailout of the monthly report form and the filing deadline.

Like the households missing the initial deadline, most of those filing incomplete reports manage to meet the reporting requirements without having their case closed. The median State reported closing about 3 percent of the monthly reporting caseload for failure to complete. Less than a fifth of the States gave closure rates above 5 percent.

C. REINSTATEMENTS AND REOPENINGS

In addition to their varying policies on reinstatement, as discussed in Part III, States differ on the point at which they consider a case "closed" or "suspended" for failure to meet the reporting requirements. Some enter a closure or suspension flag to the automated case record if the initial deadline passes without a complete report. Others do not consider a closure to have occurred until the end of the last month in which the household receives an issuance, which may be a month or more after the household's final filing deadline.

Thus, many of the households whose cases are closed or suspended for failure to meet the reporting requirements actually are reinstated and continue to participate without losing benefits. The frequency of such reinstatements, however, varies enormously from state to state. Some report hardly any reinstatements, while others say they reinstate nearly all cases that are closed or suspended. Of the 20 States responding, 7 said that at least 75 percent of the suspended/closed cases are reinstated. At the other extreme, six States reported reinstatement proportions of 11 percent or less.

Cases that are fully closed--i.e., that miss at least 1 month's benefits--may subsequently reapply and be certified eligible. None of the States had actual statistics on how often this happens, but 19 respondents were willing to provide estimates based on their own experience. All felt that only a minority of the fully closed cases reopened quickly. Eleven estimated that 5 percent or fewer reopened within 3 months, three cited rates of 10 percent, and the other five gave rates of 20 percent or more.

Table of Contents

TABLE V.2

EFFECT OF FORM COMPLEXITY AND
DEADLINES ON INCOMPLETE FILING

	Percent of states with:			
	>12% filing incomplete reports	≤12% filing incomplete reports	Total	(N)
Number of entries in monthly report form for no-change case				
15-36	29%	71%	100%	(7)
37-55	33	67	100	(9)
56-141	67	33	100	(9)
TOTAL	44	56	100	(25)
Number of days from mailout to initial deadline				
< 8	50%	50%	100%	(8)
8-10	33	67	100	(9)
>10	25	75	100	(8)
TOTAL	40	60	100	(25)

Table of Contents

D. INFORMATION LEADING TO CHANGES AND TERMINATIONS

The main purpose of monthly reporting is to obtain information on any change in a household's circumstances that may require a change in benefits or termination. Often, of course, a monthly report provides no new information because the household's circumstances have not changed. However, many reports do lead to case actions.

Benefit Changes

Nearly all respondents agreed that monthly reporting increases the frequency with which benefit changes are made. Of 50 states responding, 47 said that monthly reporting increased the frequency of changes, and only 3 saw no effect (Appendix A, Table A.19).

Estimates varied greatly, however, as to the proportion of monthly reports causing changes in a normal month. The 25 States providing estimates cited figures ranging from 10 percent or less (3 States) to 90 percent (3 States). The median response was 55 percent.

Benefit changes occur much less frequently without monthly reporting, according to the respondents' estimates. The estimates range from 5 to 40 percent of the caseload with changes each month, with a median of 15 percent. Most respondents felt that the change rate with monthly reporting was two to five times greater than the rate without monthly reporting; the median response was 3.3 times as many changes with monthly reporting.

These responses probably overstate the true effect of monthly reporting, because the cases selected for monthly reporting are generally those most likely to have changes. Even so, the consistency of the perception is striking. It is worth noting, too, that previous research has consistently found monthly reporting to increase the frequency of benefit changes.

Terminations

With respect to terminations, the pattern is less clear. A small majority of respondents believes that more monthly reporting than nonmonthly reporting cases terminate each month. Most of the rest feel that monthly reporting has no effect; only two said that monthly reporting has reduced the frequency of terminations.

When asked to estimate the overall rate of termination with and without monthly reporting--including closures for failure to file, closures related to new information on a monthly report, and closures unrelated to monthly reporting--only 14 States were able to provide figures. The median estimates are 10 percent with monthly reporting, compared to 5 percent without. Again, the more volatile nature of cases selected for monthly reporting means that the responses probably overstate monthly reporting's true effect.

States with universal monthly reporting were particularly likely to say that monthly reporting leads to more terminations. All

gave this response, compared to less than half of the selective reporting States. The reported effect on termination seemed unrelated to other monthly reporting policies, however.

Table of Contents

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

Monthly reporting entails a variety of administrative costs. Developing and implementing the monthly reporting policies can be expensive, especially if a State requires substantial additions or modifications to its automated system. Once the system is in place, forms must be printed and mailed. Workers, sometimes in conjunction with automated systems, track forms to make sure that they are returned, receive and review returned forms, and take any necessary actions regarding households' benefits or eligibility.

The cost of all these activities is not clear. Some of the evaluations of the monthly reporting demonstrations analyzed their administrative costs, and found monthly reporting systems to cost from $2.40 to $6.70 per case month.1/ But the demonstrations involved quite extensive new automated systems, applied monthly reporting for the full caseload, and generally reduced certification effort (by lengthening certification periods substantially) while implementing monthly reporting. Thus, the research findings may not be applicable to the question of food stamp administrative costs, because few States have the same combination of characteristics present in the demonstrations.

This survey effort provides a different perspective, asking all of the States to provide estimates of their monthly reporting costs, both for development and for ongoing operations. Not surprisingly, most States do not have exact figures. Few routinely separate the costs of particular activities within the overall certification function, although some have performed special analyses of monthly reporting costs (often to support a request to waive the monthly reporting requirement for selected categories of cases). Where States could provide figures from such a study, we obtained them. In other cases, respondents were asked to provide estimates based on their own familiarity with operations and administrative costs in their States. This part of the report presents an overview of these estimates.

1/ Hamilton, op. cit.

Table of Contents

A. DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Only six States were able to provide figures on the costs of developing their monthly reporting systems. These ranged from a low of just under $100,000 to a high of more than $1.5 million in Colorado (one of the original monthly reporting demonstration sites). Developing the automated system was generally, but not always, the most expensive part of the process. System development costs ranged from less than $10,000 to over $1 million. Some States reported no costs for policy and procedures development, but those indicating any cost gave estimates ranging from $80,000 to $450,000.

Fifteen States that could not provide development cost figures in dollars gave person-year estimates. These ranged from about 1 person year (in five States) to a high of 42 person years. If we assume the average person year to entail about $50,000 in expenditures, the range is from around $50,000 to $2.1 million (this assumption is used in Appendix A, Table A.20, which presents reported costs by State). The high figure is comparable to development costs for the demonstration systems in Illinois, Massachusetts, and Michigan.

The pattern in the responding States suggests that the higher-cost monthly reporting systems tended to be developed by States with universal rather than selective reporting, States with higher levels of automation, and States with relatively complex monthly report forms. Given the small number of responding States, however, these data must be interpreted with considerable caution.

B. ONGOING OPERATIONS COSTS

The estimated cost of operating the monthly reporting system on an ongoing basis ranges from $1 to $16 per case month. The median estimate was $8 per case month, and most of the estimates fell in the range between $6 and $10. In all, 26 States provided estimates; 10 were based on actual State analyses, while the other 16 were professional estimates (Appendix A, Table A.21).

Another source of information on States' operating costs for monthly reporting is the waiver requests that they have submitted to FNS (to justify excluding categories of cases from

monthly reporting, States must show that the cost is greater than the expected saving). Although the figures for individual States differ, sometimes dramatically, from the census responses, the overall pattern of the estimates is very similar. The median figure is $7, and about half lie in the range from $6 to $8.

Eligibility workers typically accounted for the largest component of the cost estimates given in the survey, with a median estimate of about $3 per case month. (No comparable data were available from the waiver requests.) Data entry labor, data processing, and mailing/postage were the other significant cost components mentioned.

Offsets to Monthly Reporting Costs

Although monthly reporting entails administrative costs, these costs may be partially offset by savings in other activities (e.g., reduced recertification frequency). The respondents were divided on the existence of offsetting savings: 16 believed offsets exist in their States, but 22 did not. Those who saw offsetting savings were asked to estimate the value of the offset, but only a handful responded and their estimates vary too widely to form an interpretable pattern.

States with a larger number of automated monthly report functions tended to report higher operating costs than less automated States. No other relationships were found between reported costs per case month and monthly reporting policies or system characteristics. Both the presence and the absence of relationships in this analysis should be treated with great caution, however, because of the small number of States providing cost estimates and the likelihood that the estimates contain substantial measurement error.

C. WORKER TIME FOR MONTHLY REPORTS

As a baseline measure of work involved in handling monthly reports, interviewers asked States to estimate the amount of time workers spend on a monthly report that is filed on time, is complete, and indicates no change from the household's previously recorded circumstances. Time estimates were requested for four kinds of workers: eligibility workers, clerks, data entry persons, and supervisors. (Appendix A, Table A.22 shows the results.)

Total Staff Time

In 33 States providing figures for all staff categories, the total estimated staff time required to handle a monthly report

Table of Contents

with no change in household circumstances ranges from a low of 3 minutes to a high of 40. About half of the estimates fall between 9 and 16 minutes, and the median is 12 minutes.

Eligibility Worker Time

Eligibility workers' time is the most consistent and substantial component, typically accounting for over half of the total. The median State indicates that an eligibility worker spends 10 minutes on the monthly report. Five States said that the eligibility worker spends no time at all on the on-time, no-change report. In all but two of the remaining states, the eligibility worker spends between 1 and 15 minutes.

Other Staff

Some of the variation in the eligibility worker's estimated time requirement reflects different resource allocation strategies. In three-quarters of the States, caseworkers and supervisors account for most of the total staff effort on the on-time, no-change monthly report. Clerical and data entry staff provide most of the effort in six States, however, and two States use roughly equal amounts of professional and support labor.

The estimated amount of eligibility worker time for the on-time, no-change case is somewhat less in the more highly automated States, as would be expected. The eligibility workers' share of total staff time is more closely related to automation, as the more automated systems use greater amounts of clerical and data entry staff. Neither of these relationships is very strong, however.

D. ELIGIBILITY WORKER TIME FOR DIFFERING KINDS OF REPORTS

The baseline measure of worker time concerned the easiest possible situation: the monthly report that is on time, complete, and involves no changes. More difficult situations are likely to involve more time, particularly from the eligibility worker.

To get a perspective on the importance of variations in the nature of the monthly report, we asked States to estimate the amount of eligibility worker time required in five additional situations:

Table of Contents

- a complete report, filed late;
- a report filed on time, but incomplete;
- a complete, on-time report containing information on a change in circumstances, but not requiring a benefit change;
- a complete, on-time report requiring a change in the allotment amount; and
- a complete, on-time report indicating that the household is no longer eligible.

State-by-state responses are presented in Appendix A, Table A.23. Table VI.1 summarizes the results.

Variations in Eligibility Worker Time

A report that is late, incomplete, or contains new information not requiring a benefit change requires a median of 15 minutes of eligibility worker time, compared to 10 minutes for the on-time, complete, no-change report. For a report leading to a change in eligibility or allotment, the median is 20 minutes. The increase is much more substantial in some States, however. Although no State estimated eligibility worker time in the baseline scenario at more than 30 minutes, around a quarter of the States gave estimates of 40 to 60 minutes for a report requiring an eligibility or benefit change.

The incremental time for more complicated actions is somewhat less in the more highly automated States than elsewhere. States with five or six automated monthly reporting functions report that an eligibility worker spends an average of 13 minutes more handling a report with a benefit change than the on-time, no-change report. States with one automated function or none at all report an average increment of 18 minutes.

Table of Contents

TABLE VI.1

ELIGIBILITY WORKER TIME IN MINUTES FOR DIFFERING MONTHLY REPORT SITUATIONS

Report Type	Median	10th Percentile	90 Percentile	(N)
On-time, complete no change	10	0	15	(37)
Late report	15	6	30	(34)
Incomplete report	15	6	45	(35)
Change in information not affecting benefit	15	7	40	(35)
Benefit change	20	10	45	(35)
No longer eligible	20	10	45	(35)

VII. EFFECTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

Monthly reporting was conceived and proposed as a way to reduce errors and save benefit dollars in the AFDC and Food Stamp Programs. Its proponents believed that monthly reporting would more quickly capture information about changes in household circumstances, and adjust or terminate benefits accordingly. Thus, monthly reporting should increase program accuracy and reduce error rates. Moreover, if unreported (or slowly reported) changes in the conventional reporting system often involved changes that would reduce or terminate benefits, monthly reporting should reduce government expenditures for benefits.

Evaluations of a series of demonstrations found no conclusive or consistent evidence of such effects.1/ However, the demonstrations had three key characteristics that limit their generalizability to the Food Stamp Program. First, most of them only examined monthly reporting in AFDC, and the one examination of monthly reporting in the Food Stamp Program was limited to the PA caseload. Second, all of the demonstrations applied monthly reporting to the full caseload. Third, they generally combined monthly reporting with infrequent eligibility redeterminations, typically using 12-month intervals.

In contrast, as previous sections have indicated, monthly reporting in the Food Stamp Program is applied to the NPA as well as the PA caseload, is more often applied to selected portions of the caseload than applied universally, and is frequently combined with 6-month certification periods.

Accordingly, the survey asked States for their own estimates of monthly reporting's effects. Most States have not conducted formal studies: six reported having conducted some analysis of monthly reporting's effects on error rates, and only two have analyzed the effect on benefit outlays. Nonetheless, most respondents had some perception of whether monthly reporting had increased or reduced errors and outlays, and some were able to provide professional estimates of the level of the effect.

1/ See Hamilton, op. cit.

Table of Contents

These responses, together with the respondents' overall evaluations of monthly reporting, are presented below.

A. IMPACT ON ERROR RATES

Opinion was quite divided about how monthly reporting has affected error rates. Respondents in 19 States said it has reduced errors, while 18 respondents said monthly reporting increased errors in their States. No effect was reported in 12 States, and 4 respondents were uncertain. State-by-state responses appear in Appendix A, Table A.24.

The 6 States that have analyzed monthly reporting effects were also divided, although in a somewhat more negative pattern. Arkansas and New Mexico found that monthly reporting reduced errors. The other four--Illinois, Maine, Utah, and West Virginia--said monthly reporting led to higher error rates.

Arkansas and New Mexico reported that monthly reporting reduced error rates (for that portion of the caseload subject to monthly reporting) by 5 and 4 percentage points, respectively. Estimated reductions in eleven other States range from 1 to 15 percentage points, with a median of 3 points.

Among the four States whose analysis had found monthly reporting causing higher rates, three estimated the increases at 2 percentage points. Seven other States estimated increases ranging from 1 to 12 points in error rates for monthly reporters, with an overall median of 2 percentage points.

Sixteen States provided separate estimates for monthly reporting's effects on NPA and PA cases. They divided almost equally into three groups, with some seeing larger effects for NPA cases, some for PA cases, and some reporting equal effects. Error reductions were more often seen as larger in the NPA than the PA caseload, while the reverse was true for error increases.

Factors Related to Reported Effects

One of the major concerns about the applicability of earlier research was the demonstrations' nonselective application of monthly reporting: if monthly reporting is mainly effective when applied to particular types of cases, the effect might not have been visible in the demonstrations. The States responses offer no support for such a hypothesis. In fact, more of the states with universal monthly reporting said it reduces errors than did States with selective policies (58 percent versus 37

percent). This may simply mean, however, that States believing that monthly reporting reduces errors tend to apply it to their full caseload, while other States try to limit the policy.

The reported effect on errors was examined in conjunction with several other characteristics of the monthly reporting system (Table VII.1) States with more complex monthly report forms were somewhat more likely to perceive error reduction, as were States that limited the eligibility worker's role in monthly report processing. The level of automation and operating cost were apparently not related to perceived error reduction, however.

Sources of MR Effects

Survey respondents who said that monthly reporting reduces or increases errors were asked how it does so. Most of those who saw error reductions attributed them to the more up-to-date information available through monthly reporting. A number of other factors were mentioned, however, including:

- monthly reporting improves recipients' understanding of what they have to report and prompts them to do it;
- verification of income and deductions is more thorough with monthly reporting; and
- with monthly reporting, the information used to determine eligibility and benefits is more like the information that Quality Control reviewers obtain to assess errors.

Those who felt that monthly reporting increased errors generally focused on caseworker difficulties. Several mentioned increased workloads, and others faulted complex regulations (particularly the problems of budgeting some cases prospectively and others retrospectively). In addition, some respondents noted that the monthly reporting requirement itself introduces a potential source of error, and some mentioned recipient confusion about reporting requirements.

B. EFFECT ON BENEFIT PAYMENTS

Only a quarter of the respondents believed monthly reporting affects benefit payments, but those few generally said it reduces payments. Fourteen respondents said monthly reporting reduced benefit payments in their States, while only one said monthly reporting increased payments. Most States (28) saw no effect, and 10 were uncertain. (Appendix A, Table A.25 has details.)

Table of Contents

TABLE VII.1

EFFECT OF MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEM
CHARACTERISTICS ON PERCEIVED ERROR REDUCTIONS

	Percent of states saying that monthly reporting:		
	Reduces errors	Increases or no effect	(N)
Reporting requirement for NPA cases			
Universal	58%	42%	(12)
Selective	37	63	(30)
No. of entries on form for no-change case			
15-36	23%	77%	(13)
37-55	39	61	(13)
56-141	57	43	(14)
Eligibility worker responsibility for report processing			
All functions	27%	73%	(22)
Some or none	50	50	(24)
No. of automated monthly reporting functions			
0-1	50%	50%	(6)
2-4	29	71	(17)
5-6	50	50	(14)
Estimated operating cost per case month			
<7	40%	60%	(10)
≥7	36	64	(14)

Table of Contents

Interestingly, the State saying that monthly reporting increased benefit outlays was Florida--one of the two States that have conducted an analysis. Florida's research indicated a 9-percent increase in payments. The other State reporting study results was New Mexico, which found a 1-percent reduction in payments.

Eight other respondents who felt monthly reporting reduced benefit payments provided estimates. Most estimated reductions of between 2 and 5 percent, but one State indicated a 15-percent reduction. The median estimate is a 4.5-percent reduction. Respondents were divided as to whether the reductions were larger in the PA or the NPA caseload.

Sources of MR Effects

Respondents who thought monthly reporting reduces payments cited three main ways it does so. Most commonly mentioned was monthly reporting's ability to capture information quickly on increases in income. Some respondents felt that monthly reporting reduces the food stamp caseload, either because of automatic closures for failure to file or because the difficulty of filing discourages some households from participating.

The reported impact of monthly reporting on benefit payments was not related to any other monthly reporting characteristics. Most of the States indicating a monthly reporting effect on benefit payments, however, also said monthly reporting reduces error rates.

C. EFFECT ON PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Although monthly reporting was conceived as a mechanism for controlling errors and benefit payments, some of the early research suggested that it also offered the benefit of generally tighter program management. Accordingly, respondents were asked whether they believed monthly reporting has a positive or negative effect on management of the Food Stamp Program in their States.

Opinion was divided, but negative responses outnumbered positive ones by nearly a 2-to-1 margin. Out of 52 responses, 33 States reported a negative and 17 reported a positive impact. Two respondents felt monthly reporting had no effect on program management, and one was uncertain.

Respondents who saw positive management effects generally mentioned either an improved level of worker control over the

Table of Contents

caseload, or greater structure and predictability of the eligibility worker's job. On the negative side, respondents most often cited the increased workload, particularly paperwork, with monthly reporting. Some said the procedures were complicated and difficult to administer, usually with reference to the application of differing reporting or budgeting policies to different parts of the caseload.

Opinions about monthly reporting's effect on program management were closely related to policies about what cases must report. Eleven of the 12 States with universal reporting for NPA cases believed monthly reporting improves program management. Of the 12 with no more than 10 percent of the NPA caseload required to report monthly, all but one believed monthly reporting has a negative effect.

None of the other monthly reporting policy characteristics or State characteristics showed strong relationships to the perceived impact of monthly reporting on program management.

D. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF MONTHLY REPORTING

As a summary measure of monthly reporting's effects, respondents were asked whether they believed that the benefits of monthly reporting exceed the costs in their State. The responses closely parallel the perceptions of monthly reporting effects on program management: 18 States said the benefits exceed the costs, but 32 States disagreed. Two respondents were uncertain.

Asked what they saw as the primary and secondary benefits of monthly reporting, States gave the following responses:

Table of Contents

Benefit	No. of States Citing as: Primary	Secondary
More up-to-date case information	26	13
Reduced error rates	9	12
Tighter management of caseload	6	18
Reduced benefit payments	2	2
Tighter management of workers	0	4
Reduced administrative costs	0	0
Other	3	7

Clearly, most States perceive up-to-date information as the main benefit of monthly reporting. Such information is closely related to monthly reporting's ability to control errors, but many States do not believe the improved information actually does reduce error rates. Caseload management is the other widely perceived benefit, though most often mentioned as a secondary benefit.

The survey also asked what drawbacks the respondents saw in monthly reporting, with results summarized below:

Drawbacks	No. of States Citing as: Primary	Secondary
Higher administrative costs	14	18
Paper flow without new information	14	18
Confusion in managing caseload	7	18
Higher error rates	6	7
Confusion in managing workers	0	10
Increased benefit payments	0	1
Other	10	17

Administrative cost is the issue most often cited: many of the "other" responses refer to increased workloads or to other specific kinds of costs (e.g., postage, data processing). The other major themes are that monthly reporting involves wasted effort (to handle reports that contain no important information) and confusion. States were allowed to name as many secondary factors as they wished, and it is noteworthy that the total number of secondary comments on drawbacks far exceeds the equivalent total for benefits (89 versus 56).

As would be expected from previous analyses, respondents' overall assessment is closely related to the State policies on universal or selective reporting (Table VII.2). Nine of the 12 respondents in universal reporting States believe monthly

Table of Contents

TABLE VII.2

EFFECT OF MONTHLY REPORTING SYSTEM
CHARACTERISTICS ON PERCEIVED BENEFIT/COST RATIO

	Percent of states saying:			
	Benefits exceed costs	Cost exceed benefits	Total	(N)
Reporting requirement for NPA cases				
Universal	75%	25%	100%	(12)
Selective	26	74	100	(31)
No. of entries on form for no-change case				
15-36	14%	86%	100%	(14)
37-55	48	58	100	(12)
56-141	50	50	100	(14)
Eligibility worker responsibility for report processing				
All functions	26%	74%	100%	(23)
Some or none	48	52	100	(23)
No. of automated monthly reporting functions				
0-1	33%	67%	100%	(6)
2-4	35	65	100	(17)
5-6	40	60	100	(15)
Estimated operating cost per case month				
<7	10%	90%	100%	(10)
≥7	50	50	100	(16)

reporting's benefits exceed the costs, while only a quarter of the selective reporting States gave this response. States with more complex monthly report forms and more highly automated systems tended to make more positive assessments of monthly reporting. Finally, and somewhat surprisingly, States that gave higher estimates of operating cost for their systems were more likely to feel the benefits exceeded the costs than States with low operating costs.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A

Table of Contents

TABLE A.1

NPA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

	Q101: All but Statutory	Q102.1 : Current Earnings	Q102.2 : Recent Earnings	Q102.3 : Unearned Income	Q102.4 : Irregular Unearned	Q102.7 : More than (n) People	Q102: Other	Q103: Percent of Cases Required to Report
Alabama		2				2	2	12
Alaska	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Arizona		1	1	2			2	7
Arkansas		2					1	27
California	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado		1					1	35
Connecticut		2					1	3
Delaware		1			1		.	36
Dist. of Columbia							1	3
Florida		2				2	2	10
Georgia		2					2	18
Hawaii		1			1		1	60
Idaho	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1	1	2			2	27
Indiana		1			1		2	.
Iowa		2	1		2		2	.
Kansas	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kentucky		2				2	2	7
Louisiana						2	2	14
Maine		2		2			2	50
Maryland						1	1	10
Massachusetts						2	2	7
Michigan	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Minnesota	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi		2		2			2	33
Missouri						1	1	9
Montana	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nebraska						1	1	15
Nevada	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
New Hampshire							1	9

"1" indicates "Required to Report"
"2" indicates "Conditional Requirement"
"." indicates Missing Data or Not Applicable

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.1

NPA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

	Q101: All but Statutory	Q102.1 : Current Earnings	Q102.2 : Recent Earnings	Q102.3 : Unearned Income	Q102.4 : Irregular Unearned	Q102.7 : More than (n) People	Q102: Other	Q103: Percent of Cases Required to Report
New Jersey		1					2	13
New Mexico	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
New York		2				2	2	15
North Carolina						1	1	9
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio		1	1				2	29
Oklahoma							1	31
Oregon	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania		1					2	23
Rhode Island					1		2	40
South Carolina		2				2	2	7
South Dakota	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tennessee		2				2	2	4
Texas					1		1	.
Utah		1	1				2	51
Vermont						2	2	16
Virginia		2		2			2	20
Washington		1					2	34
West Virginia		1					2	30
Wisconsin		1	2				1	.
Wyoming	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands		2		2	1		2	25

"1" indicates "Required to Report"
"2" indicates "Conditional Requirement"
"." indicates Missing Data or Not Applicable

Table of Contents

TABLE A.2

PA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

Q105.1: All but Statutory	Q106.1A: AFDC/MR Cases	Q106.2: GA Cases	Q106.3: Current Earnings	Q106.4: Recent Earnings	Q106.5: Unearned Income	Q106.6: Irregular Income	Q107: Percent of Cases Required to Report

Table of Contents

TABLE A.2

PA CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

	Q105.1: All but Statutory	Q106.1A: AFDC/MR Cases	Q106.2: GA Cases	Q106.3: Current Earnings	Q106.4: Recent Earnings	Q106.5: Unearned Income	Q106.6: Irregular Income	Q107: Percent of Cases Required to Report
New Jersey		1		1		.	2	19
New Mexico		1	2	2	2	2		28
New York		1		2	2			.
North Carolina		1		2	2	2	2	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio				1	1			11
Oklahoma		1		2	2			4
Oregon	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania		1		1	2			7
Rhode Island		1		2		.		25
South Carolina		1		1		.	2	23
South Dakota	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tennessee		1		2	2		2	8
Texas						.		9
Utah				1	1			43
Vermont		1		2	2			20
Virginia		1		2	2	2		35
Washington		1		2	2	.		18
West Virginia				1	1			12
Wisconsin				1	2			.
Wyoming	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates "Required to Report
"2" indicates "Conditional Requirement"
"." indicates Missing Data or Not Applicable

Table of Contents

TABLE A.3

EARNED INCOME ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Report If No Change	Separately By Earner	Verification	Info By Month	Info By Week, Paycheck
Alabama	1	1	1		1
Alaska	1	1	1	1	
Arizona	1	1	1	1	
Arkansas	1	1	1		1
California	1	1	1		1
Colorado	.	.	.	.	.
Connecticut	.	.	.	.	.
Delaware	1	1	1	1	
Dist. of Columbia	1	1	1	1	
Florida	1	1	1		1
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	1	1	1	1	
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	1		1	1	
Indiana	1	1	1		1
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.
Kansas	1	1	1	1	
Kentucky	1	1		1	
Louisiana	1	1	1	1	
Maine	1	1	1		1
Maryland	1	1	1		1
Massachusetts	1	1	1		1
Michigan	1	1	1		1
Minnesota	1	1	1		1
Mississippi	1	1	1		1
Missouri	1	1	1		1
Montana	1	1	1		1
Nebraska	1	1	1		1
Nevada	1	1	1	1	
New Hampshire	1	1	1	1	

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.3

EARNED INCOME ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Report If No Change	Separately By Earner	Verification	Info By Month	Info By Week, Paycheck
New Jersey	1	1	1		1
New Mexico	1	1	1		1
New York	1	1	1	1	
North Carolina	1	1	1		1
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	1	1	1		1
Oklahoma	1	1	1	1	
Oregon	1	1	1	1	
Pennsylvania	1	1	1	1	
Rhode Island	1	1	1	1	
South Carolina	1	1	1		1
South Dakota	1	1	1	1	
Tennessee	1	1	1	1	
Texas	.	.	.	.	.
Utah	1	1	1	1	
Vermont	1	1	1		1
Virginia	1	1	1	1	
Washington	1	1	1	1	
West Virginia	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	.	.	.	.	.
Wyoming	1	1	1	1	
Guam	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.4

UNEARNED INCOME ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Required For:		Inquiry Is:		Totals By:		Verification For:		
	All Households	Households with Change	General	Specific by Type	Household	Recipient	All	Change Only	Not Specified
Alabama	1			1		1		1	
Alaska		1		1		1		1	
Arizona	1			1		1		1	
Arkansas	1			1		1	1		
California	1			1		1	1		
Colorado	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Connecticut	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Delaware	1			1		1	1		
Dist. of Columbia	1			1		1	1		
Florida	1		1			1	1		
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii		1	1			1		1	
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	1		1		1		1		
Indiana	1			1		1	1		
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kansas	1			1		1			1
Kentucky	1			1		1			1
Louisiana	1			1		1	1		
Maine	1			1		1			1
Maryland	1		1			1	1		
Massachusetts	1			1		1		1	
Michigan		1		1		1	1		
Minnesota	1			1		1		1	
Mississippi	1			1		1		1	
Missouri	1			1		1		1	
Montana	1			1		1			1
Nebraska	1			1		1		1	
Nevada	1			1		1	1		
New Hampshire	1			1		1		1	

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.4

UNEARNED INCOME ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Required For:		Inquiry Is:		Totals By:		Verification For:		
	All Households	Households with Change	General	Specific by Type	Household	Recipient	All	Change Only	Not Specified
New Jersey	1			1		1		1	
New Mexico		1	1			1		1	
New York	1			1		1	1		
North Carolina	1			1		1			1
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio		1	1		1			1	
Oklahoma	1			1		1	1		
Oregon	1			1		1	1		
Pennsylvania	1			1		1		1	
Rhode Island	1			1		1			1
South Carolina	1			1		1			1
South Dakota	1			1		1			1
Tennessee	1			1		1		1	
Texas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Utah	1			1	1				1
Vermont	1			1		1			1
Virginia	1			1		1		1	
Washington		1	1		1			1	
West Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wyoming	1			1	1			1	
Guam	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.5

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Required For:		Verification For:	
	All Households	Households With Change	Change Only	Not Specified
Alabama		1		1
Alaska	1			1
Arizona		1		1
Arkansas	.	.	.	.
California		1		1
Colorado	.	.	.	.
Connecticut	.	.	.	.
Delaware		1		1
Dist. of Columbia		1		1
Florida		1		1
Georgia	.	.	.	.
Hawaii		1		1
Idaho	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1		1
Indiana		1		1
Iowa	.	.	.	.
Kansas		1		1
Kentucky		1		1
Louisiana		1		1
Maine		1		1
Maryland		1		1
Massachusetts	1			1
Michigan		1		1
Minnesota		1		1
Mississippi		1	1	
Missouri		1		1
Montana	1			1
Nebraska		1		1
Nevada		1		1
New Hampshire		1		1

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.5

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Required For:		Verification For:	
	All Households	Households With Change	Change Only	Not Specified
New Jersey		1		1
New Mexico	1			1
New York		1	1	
North Carolina		1		1
North Dakota	.	.	.	.
Ohio		1		1
Oklahoma		1		1
Oregon		1		1
Pennsylvania		1		1
Rhode Island		1		1
South Carolina		1		1
South Dakota		1		1
Tennessee		1		1
Texas	.	.	.	.
Utah	1			1
Vermont		1	1	
Virginia	1			1
Washington		1		1
West Virginia	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	.	.	.	.
Wyoming	1			1
Guam	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.6

RESOURCES ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Topic Not Covered on Form	Required For:		Inquiry Is:		Verification For:	
		All Households	Households With Change	General	Specific By Type	Change Only	Not Specified
Alabama			1	1		1	
Alaska		1			1	1	
Arizona			1		1		1
Arkansas	1	.	.	.	.	.	.
California			1		1		1
Colorado	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Connecticut	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Delaware			1	1			1
Dist. of Columbia	1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Florida			1	1			1
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii			1		1	1	
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois			1	1		1	
Indiana			1	1		1	
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kansas			1	1			1
Kentucky			1		1		1
Louisiana			1		1		1
Maine			1	1			1
Maryland	1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Massachusetts		1		1			1
Michigan			1		1		1
Minnesota			1	1		1	
Mississippi			1		1		1
Missouri		1			1		1
Montana			1		1	1	
Nebraska			1		1	1	
Nevada		1			1	1	
New Hampshire			1		1	1	

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.6

RESOURCES ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Topic Not Covered on Form	Required For:		Inquiry Is:		Verification For:	
		All Households	Households With Change	General	Specific By Type	Change Only	Not Specified
New Jersey			1		1		1
New Mexico			1	1		1	
New York			1	1		1	
North Carolina			1	1			1
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio			1	1			1
Oklahoma		1			1		1
Oregon		1			1		1
Pennsylvania			1	1			1
Rhode Island	1	.	.	.	.	.	.
South Carolina			1		1		1
South Dakota			1	1		1	
Tennessee			1		1	1	
Texas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Utah			1		1		1
Vermont		1			1		1
Virginia		1			1		1
Washington			1	1		1	
West Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wyoming			1		1	1	
Guam	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.7

EXPENSES ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Topic Not Covered on Form	Expenses Covered:				Required For:		Verification For:		
		Medical Care	Dependent Care	Shelter	Other	All Households	Households With Change	All	Change Only	Not Specified
Alabama	.	.	.	.	.		1		1	
Alaska	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Arizona	.	1	1	.	.	1			1	
Arkansas	.	1	1	1	1	1		1		
California	.	1	1	1	1	1		1		
Colorado	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Connecticut	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Delaware	.	1	1	1	.		1		1	
Dist. of Columbia	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Florida	.	1	1	1	.	1				1
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	.	1	1	1	1		1		1	
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	.	1	1	1	.	1			1	
Indiana	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kansas	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Kentucky	.	.	1	.	.	1				1
Louisiana	.	.	1	1	1	1		1		
Maine	.	.	1	1	.	1		.	.	.
Maryland	.	.	1	1	.	1		1		
Massachusetts	.	1	1	1	1		1	1		
Michigan	.	1	1	1	.		1	1		
Minnesota	.	.	1	.	.	1				1
Mississippi	.	.	1	.	.	1		1		
Missouri	.	1	1	1	1	1		1		
Montana	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Nebraska	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nevada	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
New Hampshire	.	.	1	1	.		1		1	

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.7

EXPENSES ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Topic Not Covered on Form	Expenses Covered:				Required For:		Verification For:		
		Medical Care	Dependent Care	Shelter	Other	All Households	Households With Change	All	Change Only	Not Specified
New Jersey	.	1	1	1	.	1			1	
New Mexico	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
New York	.	1	1	1	1		1		1	
North Carolina	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	.	1	1	1	.		1			1
Oklahoma	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Oregon	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	.	1	.	.	1		1		
Rhode Island	.	.	1	.	.	1		1		
South Carolina	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
South Dakota	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Tennessee	.	1	1	1	1		1		1	
Texas	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Utah	.	1	1	1	1	1		1		
Vermont	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Virginia	.	1	.	1	.	1			1	
Washington	.	.	.	1	.		1		1	
West Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wyoming	.	1	1	1	.	1		1		
Guam	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.8

ENTRIES REQUIRED ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Baseline Case (Case 1)	Case With Changes (Case 2)
Alabama	44	83
Alaska	68	99
Arizona	46	78
Arkansas	59	87
California	55	71
Colorado	.	.
Connecticut	.	.
Delaware	18	37
Dist. of Columbia	42	78
Florida	71	97
Georgia	.	.
Hawaii	57	71
Idaho	.	.
Illinois	27	32
Indiana	69	114
Iowa	.	.
Kansas	34	53
Kentucky	30	43
Louisiana	34	56
Maine	24	55
Maryland	27	43
Massachusetts	36	62
Michigan	62	99
Minnesota	120	173
Mississippi	57	96
Missouri	141	185
Montana	71	119
Nebraska	42	62
Nevada	49	76
New Hampshire	27	41
New Jersey	61	92
New Mexico	43	60
New York	15	24
North Carolina	47	77
North Dakota	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.8

ENTRIES REQUIRED ON THE MONTHLY REPORT FORM

	Baseline Case (Case 1)	Case With Changes (Case 2)
Ohio	46	70
Oklahoma	38	51
Oregon	17	31
Pennsylvania	24	34
Rhode Island	37	61
South Carolina	58	107
South Dakota	58	87
Tennessee	37	49
Texas	.	.
Utah	55	73
Vermont	88	113
Virginia	34	50
Washington	17	23
West Virginia	.	.
Wisconsin	.	.
Wyoming	38	60
Guam	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.9

WHO DETERMINES WHETHER A CASE IS SUBJECT TO MONTHLY REPORTING REQUIREMENT

	Q110.MC: At Certification		Q112.MC: Changing Non-MR to MR		Q114.MC: Changing MR to Non-MR		Q116: Percent Changing Each Month
	Automated Decision	Elig. Worker	Automated Decision	Elig. Worker	Automated Decision	Elig. Worker	
Alabama		1		1		1	5
Alaska	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Arizona		1	1		1		46
Arkansas	1		1		1		.
California	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado		1		1		1	4
Connecticut		1		1		1	33
Delaware		1		1		1	3
Dist. of Columbia	1		1		1		10
Florida	1		1		1		.
Georgia	1		1		1		.
Hawaii		1		1		1	.
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1		1		1	.
Indiana		1		1		1	.
Iowa		1		1		1	.
Kansas		1		1		1	1
Kentucky		1		1		1	.
Louisiana		1	1		1		.
Maine		1		1		1	.
Maryland	1		1		1		1
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	1		1		1		5
Minnesota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi		1		1		1	5
Missouri	1		1		1		.
Montana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nebraska	1			1	1		5
Nevada	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
New Hampshire		1		1		1	4

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.9

WHO DETERMINES WHETHER A CASE IS SUBJECT TO MONTHLY REPORTING REQUIREMENT

	Q110.MC: At Certification		Q112.MC: Changing Non-MR to MR		Q114.MC: Changing MR to Non-MR		Q116: Percent Changing Each Month
	Automated Decision	Elig. Worker	Automated Decision	Elig. Worker	Automated Decision	Elig. Worker	
New Jersey	1		1		1		.
New Mexico		1		1		1	3
New York	1		1		1		.
North Carolina	1			1		1	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio		1		1		1	.
Oklahoma	1		1		1		.
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania		1	1		1		.
Rhode Island		1		1		1	2
South Carolina	1		1		1		.
South Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tennessee		1		1	1		.
Texas		1		1		1	10
Utah		1	1		1		.
Vermont		1		1		1	.
Virginia		1		1		1	.
Washington		1		1		1	.
West Virginia	1		1		1		10
Wisconsin	1		1		1		.
Wyoming	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands		1		1		1	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.10

WHEN A CASE CHANGES ITS MONTHLY REPORTING STATUS,
HOW SOON AFTER INFORMATION IS RECEIVED DOES CHANGE TAKE EFFECT

	Q111: Changing from Non-MR to MR			Q113: Changing from MR to Non-MR			
	Immediate	With 1-2 month lag	Other	Immediate	With 1-2 month lag	At next cert.	Other
Alabama		1			1		
Alaska	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Arizona	1					1	
Arkansas	1					1	
California	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado	1						1
Connecticut	1						1
Delaware	1			1			
Dist. of Columbia	1			1			
Florida		1			1		
Georgia	1			1			
Hawaii	1			1			
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	1			1			
Indiana	1					1	
Iowa	1			1			
Kansas			1				1
Kentucky	1			1			
Louisiana	1			1			
Maine	1			1			
Maryland	1			1			
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	1			1			
Minnesota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi	1			1			
Missouri						1	
Montana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nebraska	1			1			
Nevada	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
New Hampshire	1				1		

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.10

WHEN A CASE CHANGES ITS MONTHLY REPORTING STATUS,
HOW SOON AFTER INFORMATION IS RECEIVED DOES CHANGE TAKE EFFECT

	Q111: Changing from Non-MR to MR			Q113: Changing from MR to Non-MR			
	Immediate	With 1-2 month lag	Other	Immediate	With 1-2 month lag	At next cert.	Other
New Jersey	1			1			
New Mexico		1			1		
New York	1			1			
North Carolina		1			1		
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	1			1			
Oklahoma	1			1			
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	1			1			
Rhode Island	1			1			
South Carolina	1			1			
South Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tennessee	1			1			
Texas	1			1			
Utah	1			1			
Vermont	1			1			
Virginia	1			1			
Washington	1			1			
West Virginia	1			1			
Wisconsin	1				1		
Wyoming	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	1			1			

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.11

MAILING THE MONTHLY REPORTING FORMS

	Q200: MR Form Sent From			Q201: MR Form Mailed		Q208: Return Envelope		Q207: Postage Paid By	
	State	Local Office	Region or Other	With Benefits	Separate	Not Provided	Provided or Not Needed	Agency	Recepient
Alabama	1				1		1	1	
Alaska	1				1		1	1	
Arizona	1				1		1	1	
Arkansas	1				1		1	1	
California		1			1		1	1	
Colorado		1			1	1			1
Connecticut	1				1		1	1	
Delaware	1				1		1	1	
Dist. of Columbia	1				1		1	1	
Florida	1				1		1	1	
Georgia	1				1		1	1	
Hawaii	1				1	1			1
Idaho	1				1		1	1	
Illinois	1				1		1	1	
Indiana		1			1	1			1
Iowa	1				1		1	1	
Kansas	1				1		1	1	
Kentucky	1				1		1	1	
Louisiana	1			1		1			1
Maine	1				1		1	1	
Maryland		1			1		1	1	
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	1				1		1	1	
Minnesota			1		1		1	1	
Mississippi	1				1		1	1	
Missouri	1			1			1	1	
Montana			1	.	.		1	1	
Nebraska	1				1		1	1	
Nevada	1				1	1			1
New Hampshire	1				1		1	1	

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.11

MAILING THE MONTHLY REPORTING FORMS

	Q200: MR Form Sent From			Q201: MR Form Mailed		Q208: Return Envelope		Q207: Postage Paid By	
	State	Local Office	Region or Other	With Benefits	Separate	Not Provided	Provided or Not Needed	Agency	Recepient
New Jersey		1		1			1	1	
New Mexico	1				1		1	1	
New York	1				1		1	1	
North Carolina	1				1		1	1	
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio		1			1		1		
Oklahoma	1				1	1			1
Oregon	.	.	.		1		1	1	
Pennsylvania	1				1		1		
Rhode Island		1			1		1	1	
South Carolina	1				1		1	1	
South Dakota	1				1	1			1
Tennessee	1				1		1	1	
Texas	1				1		1	1	
Utah	1				1		1	1	
Vermont	1				1	1			1
Virginia		1			1		1	1	
Washington	1				1		1	1	
West Virginia	1				1	1			1
Wisconsin	1				1		1	1	
Wyoming	1				1		1	1	
Guam	1				1	1			1
Virgin Islands		1			1	1			1

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.12

THE MONTHLY REPORTING CYCLE

	Q204: No. of Mail-Out Dates	Q205: No. of Filing Schedules	Q206A: Days From Mail-Out to Initial Deadline	Q206B: Days From Mail-Out to Warning Notice	Q206C: Days From Mail-Out to Final Deadline	Q206D: Days From Mail-Out to Final Notice	Q206G: Days From Mail-Out to Issuance	Q216: Reinstatement Without Loss *
Alabama	1	1	18	18	18	32	46	1
Alaska	2	1	18	26	26	23	44	
Arizona	2	1	13	15	43	28	43	1
Arkansas	2	1	10	11	11	31	48	
California	1	1	13	19	19	34	37	
Colorado	1	1	11	16	24	26	37	1
Connecticut	1	1	10	20	35	29	36	1
Delaware	1	1	5	10	20	20	37	
Dist. of Columbia	1	1	11	11	31	31	32	1
Florida	1	1	7	12	22	27	37	1
Georgia	1	1	9	15	32	25	35	
Hawaii	1	1	8	13	14	19	35	1
Idaho	1	1	5	8	8	20	36	1
Illinois	12	12	11	16	16	35	37	1
Indiana	1	1	7	10	22	7	48	
Iowa	1	1	8	12	12	32	40	
Kansas	1	1	10	12	18	20	36	1
Kentucky	1	1	12	15	15	22	38	
Louisiana	11	1	32	35	50	47	53	1
Maine	1	1	23	15	23	23	38	1
Maryland	1	1	8	9	33	31	32	
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	10	1	15	17	17	31	39	1
Minnesota	1	1	10	17	17	26	37	
Mississippi	1	1	6	7	7	6	42	1
Missouri	2	2	8	10	10	22	40	1
Montana	1	1	9	10	20	19	33	
Nebraska	1	1	10	12	22	22	34	1
Nevada	22	22	5	16	30	26	35	1
New Hampshire	1	1	10	11	23	20	45	1

"." indicates Missing Data
* "1" indicates condition applies

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.12

THE MONTHLY REPORTING CYCLE

	Q204: No. of Mail-Out Dates	Q205: No. of Filing Schedules	Q206A: Days From Mail-Out to Initial Deadline	Q206B: Days From Mail-Out to Warning Notice	Q206C: Days From Mail-Out to Final Deadline	Q206D: Days From Mail-Out to Final Notice	Q206G: Days From Mail-Out to Issuance	Q216: Reinstatement Without Loss *
New Jersey	1	1	9	9	.	19	30	1
New Mexico	1	1	7	16	16	7	43	
New York	1	1	8	12	.	21	34	1
North Carolina	1	1	8	12	30	26	32	1
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	1	1	9	12	12	9	35	1
Oklahoma	2	1	14	16	16	34	42	1
Oregon	1	1	20	20	41	41	27	
Pennsylvania	10	10	10	20	20	32	32	1
Rhode Island	1	1	10	15	15	35	66	
South Carolina	1	1	10	11	11	25	36	1
South Dakota	1	6	7	14	14	9	29	1
Tennessee	1	1	7	12	12	21	37	
Texas	1	1	10	12	25	25	35	1
Utah	1	1	13	25	25	23	48	
Vermont	1	1	6	7	17	31	20	1
Virginia	1	1	8	11	17	34	35	
Washington	1	1	10	15	15	25	36	
West Virginia	1	1	7	13	13	13	30	
Wisconsin	1	1	15	27	27	27	42	1
Wyoming	2	2	7	8	22	10	39	1
Guam	1	1	6	8	30	6	30	
Virgin Islands	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	

"." indicates Missing Data
* "1" indicates condition applies

Table of Contents

TABLE A.13

STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES IN MONTHLY REPORT PROCESSING

	Q209: Initial Completeness Review		Q210: "Action Required" Decision for Complete Forms			Q214: Handling Incomplete Reports	
	Elig. Worker	Clerk, DP, Other	Automated	Elig. Worker	Clerk, DP, Other	Elig. Worker	Clerk, DP, Other
Alabama	1			1		1	
Alaska		1		1		1	
Arizona		1			1		1
Arkansas		1		1		1	
California		1		1		1	
Colorado	1			1		1	
Connecticut	1			1		1	
Delaware		1		1		1	
Dist. of Columbia	1			1		1	
Florida	1			1		1	
Georgia	1			1		1	
Hawaii	1			1		1	
Idaho	1			1		1	
Illinois	1			1		1	
Indiana	1			1		1	
Iowa	1			1		1	
Kansas		1			1	1	
Kentucky	1			1		1	
Louisiana	1			1		1	
Maine	1			1		1	
Maryland		1			1	1	
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan		1		1			1
Minnesota	1			1		1	
Mississippi	1			1		1	
Missouri	1			1		1	
Montana	1			1		1	
Nebraska	1			1		1	
Nevada	1			1		1	
New Hampshire		1		1			1

"1" indicates condition applies

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.13

STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES IN MONTHLY REPORT PROCESSING

	Q209: Initial Completeness Review		Q210: "Action Required" Decision for Complete Forms			Q214: Handling Incomplete Reports	
	Elig. Worker	Clerk, DP, Other	Automated	Elig. Worker	Clerk, DP, Other	Elig. Worker	Clerk, DP, Other
New Jersey		1		1		1	
New Mexico		1			1	1	
New York	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Carolina	1			1		1	
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio		1		1			1
Oklahoma		1		1		1	
Oregon	1			1		1	
Pennsylvania	.	.	.	.	.	1	
Rhode Island	1			1		1	
South Carolina	1			1		1	
South Dakota	1			1		1	
Tennessee	1			1		1	
Texas		1			1	1	
Utah	1			1		1	
Vermont		1			1	1	
Virginia	1			1		1	
Washington	1			1		1	
West Virginia	1			1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1			1	
Wyoming	1			1		1	
Guam	1			1		1	
Virgin Islands	1			1		1	

"1" indicates condition applies

Table of Contents

TABLE A.14

ELIGIBILITY WORKER ROLE IN MONTHLY REPORT PROCESSING

	Q221: Specialization For MR Cases			Q211: EW Role in No-Change Report			Q212: EW Role in Report with Change		
	Separate Units	Separate Workers	No Separation	Always Involved	Usually Involved	Sometimes or Rarely	Always Involved	Usually Involved	Sometimes or Rarely
Alabama		1		1			1		
Alaska			1	1			1		
Arizona	.	.	.			1		1	
Arkansas		1		1			1		
California			1		1		1		
Colorado			1		1		1		
Connecticut	1			1			1		
Delaware			1	1			1		
Dist. of Columbia	1			1			1		
Florida		1				1	1		
Georgia			1	1			1		
Hawaii			1	1			1		
Idaho			1	1			1		
Illinois	.	.	.	1			1		
Indiana			1	1			1		
Iowa			1		1		1		
Kansas			1			1	1		
Kentucky			1	1			1		
Louisiana			1	1			1		
Maine			1	1			1		
Maryland		1				1	1		
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan			1			1	1		
Minnesota			1		1		1		
Mississippi			1	1			1		
Missouri			1	1			1		
Montana			1	1			1		
Nebraska			1		1		1		
Nevada			1	1			1		
New Hampshire			1	1			1		

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.14

ELIGIBILITY WORKER ROLE IN MONTHLY REPORT PROCESSING

	Q221: Specialization For MR Cases			Q211: EW Role in No-Change Report			Q212: EW Role in Report with Change		
	Separate Units	Separate Workers	No Separation	Always Involved	Usually Involved	Sometimes or Rarely	Always Involved	Usually Involved	Sometimes or Rarely
New Jersey			1	1			1		
New Mexico			1			1	1		
New York	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Carolina		1		1			1		
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	.	.	.		1		1		
Oklahoma		1				1	1		
Oregon			1	1			1		
Pennsylvania			1	1			1		
Rhode Island			1	1			1		
South Carolina		1		1			1		
South Dakota				1			1		
Tennessee		1		1			1		
Texas			1			1	1		
Utah		1		1			1		
Vermont			1			1		1	
Virginia			1		1		1		
Washington			1	1			1		
West Virginia			1		1		1		
Wisconsin			1		1		1		
Wyoming			1	1			1		
Guam			1	1			1		
Virgin Islands		1			1		1		

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.15

AUTOMATED MONTHLY REPORTING FUNCTIONS
(BASED ON FNS SURVEY)

	Determining or Verifying MR Status	Generating Monthly Reports	Tracking Receipt of Forms	Generating Warning Notice	Generating Adverse Action Notice	Automatic Termination
Alabama		1	1	1	1	1
Alaska	1	1	1	1	1	1
Arizona		1	1			1
Arkansas	1	1	1	1	1	1
California		1	1	1		
Colorado	1	1	1	1	1	
Connecticut		1	1	1	1	1
Delaware	.	.	.	.	.	.
Dist. of Columbia	1	1	1	1	1	1
Florida	1	1				
Georgia		1	1	1		1
Hawaii	.	.	.	.	.	.
Idaho		1				
Illinois		1				
Indiana	.	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa		1	1	1	1	1
Kansas		1				
Kentucky		1	1		1	1
Louisiana	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maine	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maryland	.	.	.	.	.	.
Massachusetts	1			1		
Michigan	1	1	1		1	1
Minnesota	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi	.	.	.	.	.	.
Missouri	.	.	.	.	.	.
Montana	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nebraska	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nevada		1	1	1		1
New Hampshire	1					

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.15

AUTOMATED MONTHLY REPORTING FUNCTIONS
(BASED ON FNS SURVEY)

	Determining or Verifying MR Status	Generating Monthly Reports	Tracking Receipt of Forms	Generating Warning Notice	Generating Adverse Action Notice	Automatic Termination
New Jersey		1				
New Mexico		1			1	1
New York		1	1			
North Carolina	1	1	1			1
North Dakota		1	1			
Ohio	.	.	.	.	.	.
Oklahoma	1	1			1	1
Oregon		1				1
Pennsylvania		1		1		
Rhode Island	1			1		1
South Carolina	1	1	1	1	1	
South Dakota	1	1	1			
Tennessee		1				
Texas		1	1	1	1	1
Utah	1	1	1	1	1	1
Vermont	1	1	1	1	1	1
Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.
Washington		1				
West Virginia	1	1				
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wyoming	1	1				
Guam		1				1
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.16

PERCENT OF MONTHLY REPORTING AND NON-MONTHLY REPORTING (NPA) CASES CERTIFIED FOR VARIOUS CERTIFICATION PERIODS

	Q300: NPA MR Cases < 6 mo	Q300: NPA MR Cases 6 mo	Q300: NPA MR Cases > 6 mo	Q301: NPA Non-MR Cases < 6 mo	Q301: NPA Non-MR Cases 6 mo	Q301: NPA Non-MR Cases > 6 mo
Alabama		5	95	.	.	.
Alaska	.	.	.			100
Arizona	12	78	9	18	47	36
Arkansas		50	50	39	29	32
California			100		50	50
Colorado	10	80	10	8	20	72
Connecticut			100	60		40
Delaware	10	70	20	5	15	80
Dist. of Columbia		100		40	20	40
Florida		90	10	63	22	15
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	6		94	6		94
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois			100	.	.	.
Indiana	.	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa		33	67	.	.	.
Kansas	6	10	84		5	95
Kentucky		95	5	79	7	14
Louisiana		.	.	.	.	.
Maine		50	50	50		50
Maryland	.	.	.	.	.	.
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	.	.	.	.	.	.
Minnesota		40	60	10		90
Mississippi		1	99	26	48	18
Missouri		98	2	70	5	25
Montana		75				100
Nebraska		90	5	30	30	30
Nevada	.	.	.	.	.	.
New Hampshire	100			75		25

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.16

PERCENT OF MONTHLY REPORTING AND NON-MONTHLY REPORTING (NPA) CASES
CERTIFIED FOR VARIOUS CERTIFICATION PERIODS

	Q300: NPA MR Cases < 6 mo	Q300: NPA MR Cases 6 mo	Q300: NPA MR Cases > 6 mo	Q301: NPA Non-MR Cases < 6 mo	Q301: NPA Non-MR Cases 6 mo	Q301: NPA Non-MR Cases > 6 mo
New Jersey		10	90	40	30	30
New Mexico		25	75	.	.	90
New York		.	.	.	.	.
North Carolina	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	.	.	.	.	.	.
Oklahoma		99	1		70	30
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	3	2	95	.	.	95
Rhode Island		100		16	40	45
South Carolina		90	10	45	40	20
South Dakota			100			100
Tennessee			100	.	.	.
Texas		5	95	3	60	35
Utah	.	15	80	.	.	.
Vermont		100		.	.	.
Virginia		33	67	.	.	.
Washington		100			100	
West Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	20	70	10		80	20
Wyoming	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam			100			100
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.17

PERCENT OF MONTHLY REPORTING AND NON-MONTHLY REPORTING (PA) CASES
CERTIFIED FOR VARIOUS CERTIFICATION PERIODS

	Q302: PA MR Cases < 6 mo	Q302: PA MR Cases 6 mo	Q302: PA MR Cases > 6 mo	Q303: PA Non-MR Cases < 6 mo	Q303: PA Non-MR Cases 6mo	Q303: PA Non-MR Cases > 6 mo
Alabama	.	.	.	.	.	.
Alaska	.	.	.			100
Arizona	11	79	9	8	58	33
Arkansas		100			100	
California			100	.	.	.
Colorado		95	5			100
Connecticut			100		100	
Delaware	10	30	60		10	90
Dist. of Columbia			100			100
Florida		75	25		75	25
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	6		94	6		94
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois			100			100
Indiana	.	.		.	.	
Iowa		33	67	75	25	
Kansas		5	95			
Kentucky		95	5	79	7	14
Louisiana		100			100	
Maine			100	5	95	
Maryland	.	.	.	.	.	.
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan			100			100
Minnesota		20	80		20	80
Mississippi	2	98		2	98	
Missouri		98	2		5	95
Montana	6	90	4			100
Nebraska	.	5	90	.	95	5
Nevada	.	.	.	.	.	.
New Hampshire	5	95		5	95	

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.17

PERCENT OF MONTHLY REPORTING AND NON-MONTHLY REPORTING (PA) CASES
CERTIFIED FOR VARIOUS CERTIFICATION PERIODS

	Q302: PA MR Cases < 6 mo	Q302: PA MR Cases 6 mo	Q302: PA MR Cases > 6 mo	Q303: PA Non-MR Cases < 6 mo	Q303: PA Non-MR Cases 6mo	Q303: PA Non-MR Cases > 6 mo
New Jersey		15	85		100	
New Mexico		90	10		98	2
New York	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Carolina	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	.	.	.			100
Oklahoma			100			100
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	95	.	.	95	.
Rhode Island		100			100	
South Carolina		5	95		5	95
South Dakota		25	75	.	.	.
Tennessee			100		100	
Texas		95	5		95	5
Utah	5	95		5	95	
Vermont			100			100
Virginia		33	67	49	17	34
Washington		100			100	
West Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin		100			100	
Wyoming	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam	2	90	8	2	90	8
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.18

RECIPIENTS MONTHLY REPORT FILING PATTERNS

	Q400A: Percent of Monthly Reporters Filing on Time	Q402A: Percent Filed Incomplete But Later Completed	Q406A: Percent of Monthly Reporters With Delayed BenefitsFrom Late Filing	Q401A: Percent of Monthly Reporters Closed For Failure To File	Q403A: Percent of Monthly Reporters Closed For Failure To Complete	Q404A: Percent of Closures Reinstated Without Loss of Benefits	Q405A: Percent of Closures Re-approved After 1-2 Months
Alabama	53	5	.	31	10	11	.
Alaska	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Arizona	55	.	1	14	.	19	.
Arkansas	75	10	5	3	1	.	40
California	75	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado	60	10	2	20	10	10	5
Connecticut	75	5	.	.	3	.	20
Delaware	60	9	4	12	1	.	10
Dist. of Columbia	65	30	1	5	1	2	
Florida	75	25		2		.	.
Georgia	93	6	.	1	.	.	.
Hawaii	80	16	5	3	1	75	22
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Indiana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kansas	50	10	10	7	5	75	5
Kentucky	79	.	10	1	.	.	.
Louisiana	87	4	.	5	2	.	.
Maine	80	10		10	3	50	.
Maryland	85	10	9	4	1	.	10
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	82	2	.	6	4	50	.
Minnesota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi	75	20	24	5	1	99	1
Missouri	68	29	.	4	1	.	20
Montana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nebraska	50	10	.	4	5	95	3
Nevada	66	10	1	7	7	1	.
New Hampshire	95	70		5	3	30	5

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.18

RECIPIENTS MONTHLY REPORT FILING PATTERNS

	Q400A: Percent of Monthly Reporters Filing on Time	Q402A: Percent Filed Incomplete But Later Completed	Q406A: Percent of Monthly Reporters With Delayed BenefitsFrom Late Filing	Q401A: Percent of Monthly Reporters Closed For Failure To File	Q403A: Percent of Monthly Reporters Closed For Failure To Complete	Q404A: Percent of Closures Reinstated Without Loss of Benefits	Q405A: Percent of Closures Re-approved After 1-2 Months
New Jersey	40	5	3	5	5	40	5
New Mexico	70	.	24	7	9	.	.
New York	54	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Carolina	68	23	.	5	5	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	66	17	.	7	.	17	.
Oklahoma	76	10	2	13	2	8	1
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rhode Island	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
South Carolina	33	.		.	15	.	10
South Dakota	80	80	20	20	.	80	2
Tennessee	90	12		4	2	.	.
Texas	63	.	.	8	.	75	.
Utah	74	.	5	5	.	.	.
Vermont	50	45	.	5	1	.	.
Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Washington	78	14	.	22	5	.	.
West Virginia	90	2	1	5	3	.	2
Wisconsin	65	35	1	3	1	1	5
Wyoming	80	10	.	5	5	.	.
Guam	50	5	20	10	1	.	20
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.19

EFFECTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING ON BENEFIT CHANGES AND TERMINATIONS

	Q612: Effect on Benefit Changes			Q613: Percent Changing with MR	Q613: Percent Changing without MR	Q614: Effect on Termination			Q615: Percent Terms with MR	Q615: Percent Terms without MR
	Fewer Changes	More Changes	No Effect			Fewer Terms	More Terms	No Effect		
Alabama		1		93	10			1	.	.
Alaska		1		.	.		1		.	.
Arizona		1		.	.		1		.	.
Arkansas		1		85	35		1		3	1
California		1		.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado		1		75	15			1	.	.
Connecticut		1		.	.	1			.	.
Delaware		1		80	12		1		.	.
Dist. of Columbia		1		60	20			1	.	.
Florida		1		60	8		1		10	1
Georgia		1		45	35			1	.	.
Hawaii		1		75	10			1	.	.
Idaho		1		.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1		80	.			1	.	.
Indiana		1		.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa		1		.	.		1		.	.
Kansas		1		50	10		1		10	5
Kentucky		1		.	.		1		.	.
Louisiana		1		.	.			1	.	.
Maine		1		70	25			1	.	.
Maryland			1	.	.		1		3	2
Massachusetts			1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan		1		40	.		1		6	.
Minnesota		1		50	10		1		.	.
Mississippi		1		85	40			1	.	.
Missouri		1		28	10	1			6	5
Montana		1		50	5		1		.	.
Nebraska		1		35	22		1		.	.
Nevada		1		90	5		1		18	7
New Hampshire		1		40	20		1		21	19

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.19

EFFECTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING ON BENEFIT CHANGES AND TERMINATIONS

	Q612: Effect on Benefit Changes			Q613: Percent Changing with MR	Q613: Percent Changing without MR	Q614: Effect on Termination			Q615: Percent Terms with MR	Q615: Percent Terms without MR
	Fewer Changes	More Changes	No Effect			Fewer Terms	More Terms	No Effect		
New Jersey		1		25	18		1		7	4
New Mexico		1		72	20		1		8	6
New York	.	.	.	.	.			1	.	.
North Carolina		1		.	.			1	.	.
North Dakota		1		.	.			1	.	.
Ohio	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Oklahoma		1		20	10			1	.	.
Oregon		1		.	.			1	.	.
Pennsylvania		1		.	.		1		.	.
Rhode Island	.	.	.	.	.		1		10	8
South Carolina		1		.	.			1	.	.
South Dakota		1		50	10		1		20	5
Tennessee		1		90	20			1	.	.
Texas		1		20	15			1	.	.
Utah		1		.	.		1		.	.
Vermont		1		.	.		1		.	.
Virginia		1		.	.		1		.	.
Washington			1	.	.			1	.	.
West Virginia		1		5	10			1	.	.
Wisconsin		1		40	20		1		8	5
Wyoming		1		80	20		1		10	5
Guam		1		.	.		1		10	2
Virgin Islands		1		.	.		1		.	.

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.20

MONTHLY REPORTING DEVELOPMENT COSTS

	Q500: Total Development Cost	Q500: Cost of Policies, Procedures	Q500: Cost of Automated Systems
Alabama	$146,250	$138,038	$8,212
Alaska	.	.	.
Arizona	.	.	.
Arkansas	$150,000	$100,000	$50,000
California	.	.	.
Colorado	$1,542,239	$450,000	$1,092,239
Connecticut	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
Delaware	.	.	.
Dist. of Columbia	$50,000	$50,000	.
Florida	$400,000	$300,000	$100,000
Georgia	.	.	.
Hawaii	$150,000	$50,000	$100,000
Idaho	.	.	.
Illinois	.	.	.
Indiana	.	.	.
Iowa	.	.	.
Kansas	$450,000	$350,000	$100,000
Kentucky	.	.	.
Louisiana	.	.	.
Maine	$100,000	$50,000	$50,000
Maryland	$300,000	$250,000	$50,000
Massachusetts	.	.	.
Michigan	$607,448	.	.
Minnesota	.	.	.
Mississippi	.	.	.
Missouri	$95,388	.	$95,388
Montana	$50,000	$50,000	.
Nebraska	.	.	$12,000
Nevada	$250,000	$150,000	$100,000
New Hampshire	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
New Jersey	$2,100,000	.	.
New Mexico	.	.	.
New York	.	.	.
North Carolina	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.20

MONTHLY REPORTING DEVELOPMENT COSTS

	Q500: Total Development Cost	Q500: Cost of Policies, Procedures	Q500: Cost of Automated Systems
Ohio	.	.	.
Oklahoma	.	.	.
Oregon	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	$300,000	.
Rhode Island	.	.	.
South Carolina	.	.	.
South Dakota	$1,450,000	$200,000	$1,250,000
Tennessee	.	.	.
Texas	$50,000	.	.
Utah	$180,000	$80,000	$100,000
Vermont	.	.	.
Virginia	.	.	.
Washington	$100,000	$50,000	$50,000
West Virginia	.	.	.
Wisconsin	$1,250,000	$450,000	$800,000
Wyoming	.	.	.
Guam	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.21

MONTHLY REPORTING OPERATING COSTS

	Q501: Total Operating Cost / FS Monthly Reporting Case / Month	Total Operating Cost Includes:						
		Elig. Worker	Clerk/DP	Other Personnel	Data Processing	Postage	Other Non-Personnel	Indirect
Alabama	$16	1	1			1	1	
Alaska	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Arizona	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Arkansas	$6	1	1		1	1	1	
California	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado	$13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Connecticut	$16							
Delaware	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Dist. of Columbia	$3	1		1	1	1		1
Florida	$6							
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	$14	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Indiana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa	$9				1	1	1	
Kansas	$7							
Kentucky	$1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Louisiana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Maine	$8	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Maryland	$11							
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Minnesota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Missouri	$5	1		1	1	1	1	
Montana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nebraska	$10	1						
Nevada	$9				1	1	1	
New Hampshire	$6							

"." indicates Missing Data
"1" indicates condition applies

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.21

MONTHLY REPORTING OPERATING COSTS

	Q501: Total Operating Cost / FS Monthly Reporting Case / Month	Total Operating Cost Includes:						
		Elig. Worker	Clerk/DP	Other Personnel	Data Processing	Postage	Other Non-Personnel	Indirect
New Jersey	$1				1	1		
New Mexico	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
New York	$7							
North Carolina	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Oklahoma	$6							
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	$13	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Rhode Island	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
South Carolina	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
South Dakota	$5	1			1	1		
Tennessee	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Texas	$8	1	1	1		1	1	1
Utah	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Vermont	$10	1	1	1		1	1	
Virginia	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Washington	$3	1	1	1		1		
West Virginia	$12	1		1	1	1		
Wisconsin	$10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wyoming	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guam	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data
"1" indicates condition applies

Table of Contents

TABLE A.22

WORKER TIME TO HANDLE A MONTHLY REPORT (IN MINUTES)

	EW Time: No Change Case	Clerk Time: No Change Case	Data Entry Time: No Change Case	Supervisor Time: No Change Case
Alabama	5	10	1	
Alaska	10	5		
Arizona	9	13		
Arkansas	3		1	
California	.	.	.	.
Colorado	10	5		10
Connecticut	10	1		
Delaware	.	3	1	
Dist. of Columbia	20	5		5
Florida	15	3		
Georgia	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	15	1		
Idaho	.	.	.	.
Illinois	.	.	.	.
Indiana	.	.	.	.
Iowa	.	3	1	
Kansas		10		
Kentucky	10	1	3	10
Louisiana	.	.	.	.
Maine	.		10	5
Maryland		3		
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.
Michigan	.	.	.	.
Minnesota	.	.	.	.
Mississippi	10	1		
Missouri	9		1	
Montana	15			
Nebraska	15	10	10	5
Nevada	15	6	1	15
New Hampshire	5	1	3	
New Jersey	3	1		1
New Mexico	10	7	1	10
New York	.	.	.	.
North Carolina	.	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.22

WORKER TIME TO HANDLE A MONTHLY REPORT (IN MINUTES)

	EW Time: No Change Case	Clerk Time: No Change Case	Data Entry Time: No Change Case	Supervisor Time: No Change Case
Ohio	1	.	2	1
Oklahoma		3	3	
Oregon	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	8	.	
Rhode Island	15			
South Carolina	15		10	
South Dakota	10			15
Tennessee	15			
Texas		10		
Utah	10		1	2
Vermont	15	20		5
Virginia	10			
Washington	6	3		
West Virginia	5	3		
Wisconsin	2		1	
Wyoming	5			
Guam	5	2	3	
Virgin Islands	30	.	.	.

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.23

ELIGIBILITY WORKER TIME TO HANDLE VARIOUS KINDS OF CASES

	EW Time: Late Report	EW Time: Incomplete Report	EW Time: Report With New Info	EW Time: Report Indicating Change	EW Time: Report Indicating Inelig.
Alabama	5	6	8	12	6
Alaska	15	15	10	20	20
Arizona	9	15	15	15	21
Arkansas	3	3	18	18	18
California	.	.	.	.	.
Colorado	7	20	6	20	15
Connecticut	10	10	12	10	15
Delaware	.	.	.	.	.
Dist. of Columbia	20	60	60	60	60
Florida	15	25	15	45	45
Georgia	.	.	.	.	.
Hawaii	30	20	45	45	30
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois	.	.	.	.	.
Indiana	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.
Kansas	10	10	5	15	15
Kentucky	25	25	23	30	23
Louisiana	.	.	.	.	.
Maine	.	.	.	.	.
Maryland	7	15	40	25	25
Massachusetts	.	.	.	.	.
Michigan	.	.	.	.	.
Minnesota	.	.	.	.	.
Mississippi	45	10	15	20	20
Missouri	20	15	31	31	15
Montana	15	45	30	45	45
Nebraska	90	90	30	60	60
Nevada	15	30	20	25	25
New Hampshire	10	20	25	25	10

"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.23

ELIGIBILITY WORKER TIME TO HANDLE VARIOUS KINDS OF CASES

	EW Time: Late Report	EW Time: Incomplete Report	EW Time: Report With New Info	EW Time: Report Indicating Change	EW Time: Report Indicating Inelig.
New Jersey	10	15	7	10	10
New Mexico	10	10	10	10	10
New York	.	.	.	.	.
North Carolina	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota	.	.	.	.	.
Ohio	.	5	10	10	10
Oklahoma	15	10	12	15	15
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	.	.	.	.
Rhode Island	20	30	30	15	20
South Carolina	15	20	15	40	40
South Dakota	15	15	15	15	15
Tennessee	23	23	35	40	40
Texas	20	30	20	30	30
Utah	10	15	15	15	15
Vermont	.	.	.	.	.
Virginia	15	10	25	25	25
Washington	6	6	6	6	6
West Virginia	15	15	10	20	20
Wisconsin	2	5	10	6	10
Wyoming	30	60	10	45	60
Guam	20	15	20	25	20
Virgin Islands	30	30	45	45	45

"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.24

MONTHLY REPORTING EFFECTS ON QUALITY CONTROL ERROR RATES (FOR MR CASES)

	Q600: Error Effect			Q601: Error Effect All MR Cases	Q603: Error Effect NPA MR Cases	Q602: Error Effect PA MR Cases
	Reduced Errors *	Increased Errors *	No Effect *			
Alabama	1			2	2	.
Alaska	1			.	.	.
Arizona			1	.	.	.
Arkansas	1			5	5	.
California	1			.	.	.
Colorado	1			2	3	1
Connecticut	.	.	.	.	.	.
Delaware	1			.	.	.
Dist. of Columbia			1	.	.	.
Florida		1		10	10	10
Georgia			1	.	.	.
Hawaii		1		1	1	1
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1		1	.	.
Indiana		1		.	.	.
Iowa			1	.	.	.
Kansas	1			3	4	2
Kentucky			1	.	.	.
Louisiana		1		.	.	.
Maine		1		2	2	2
Maryland		1		2	2	2
Massachusetts	1			1	.	1
Michigan	1			15	20	10
Minnesota		1		3	.	.
Mississippi	1			.	.	.
Missouri	1			1	1	.
Montana		1		12	.	.
Nebraska			1	.	.	.
Nevada		1		1	1	2
New Hampshire		1		1	.	2

* "1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.24

MONTHLY REPORTING EFFECTS ON QUALITY CONTROL ERROR RATES (FOR MR CASES)

	Q600: Error Effect			Q601: Error Effect All MR Cases	Q603: Error Effect NPA MR Cases	Q602: Error Effect PA MR Cases
	Reduced Errors *	Increased Errors *	No Effect *			
New Jersey	1			.	.	.
New Mexico	1			4	.	.
New York			1	.	.	.
North Carolina			1	.	.	.
North Dakota			1	.	.	.
Ohio		1		.	.	.
Oklahoma			1	.	.	.
Oregon		1		.	.	.
Pennsylvania	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rhode Island	.	.	.	.	.	.
South Carolina		1		.	.	.
South Dakota	1			3	.	.
Tennessee	1			6	.	.
Texas			1	.	.	.
Utah		1		2	.	.
Vermont	1			1	1	2
Virginia		1		.	.	.
Washington		1		.	.	.
West Virginia		1		2	.	2
Wisconsin	1			.	.	.
Wyoming	1			5	.	.
Guam			1	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	1			.	.	.

* "1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.25

MONTHLY REPORTING EFFECTS ON FOOD STAMP BENEFIT OUTLAYS
AND OVERALL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

	Q606: Benefit Effect			Percent Benefit Effect: All MR Cases	Percent Benefit Effect: NPA MR Cases	Percent Benefit Effect: PA MR Cases	Q616: Effect on Mgmt.		
	Reduced Benefits*	Increased Benefits*	No Effect *				Pos. *	Neg. *	None *
Alabama	.	.	.	.	.	.		1	
Alaska	1			.	.	.	1		
Arizona			1	.	.	.		1	
Arkansas	1			5	5	.	1		
California	.	.	.	.	.	.	1		
Colorado	1			2	1	1		1	
Connecticut	.	.	.	.	.	.		1	
Delaware	1			.	.	.	1		
Dist. of Columbia	1			1	1	4			1
Florida		1		9	.	.		1	
Georgia			1	.	.	.		1	
Hawaii			1	.	.	.			1
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois			1	.	.	.		1	
Indiana			1	.	.	.		1	
Iowa	.	.	.	.	.	.		1	
Kansas			1	.	.	.	1		
Kentucky	1			1	1	1		1	
Louisiana			1	.	.	.		1	
Maine			1	.	.	.		1	
Maryland			1	.	.	.		1	
Massachusetts	1			5	.	10		1	
Michigan	1			3	1	11	1		
Minnesota			1	.	.	.	1		
Mississippi	1			.	.	.	1		
Missouri			1	.	.	.		1	
Montana	.	.	.	.	.	.		1	
Nebraska			1	.	.	.		1	
Nevada			1	.	.	.	1		
New Hampshire	1			5	8	2		1	

* "1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.25

MONTHLY REPORTING EFFECTS ON FOOD STAMP BENEFIT OUTLAYS
AND OVERALL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

	Q606: Benefit Effect			Percent Benefit Effect: All MR Cases	Percent Benefit Effect: NPA MR Cases	Percent Benefit Effect: PA MR Cases	Q616: Effect on Mgmt.		
	Reduced Benefits*	Increased Benefits*	No Effect *				Pos. *	Neg. *	None *
New Jersey			1	.	.	.	.	.	.
New Mexico	1			1	.	.	1		
New York			1	.	.	.		1	
North Carolina			1	.	.	.		1	
North Dakota			1	.	.	.		1	
Ohio	.	.	.	.	.	.		1	
Oklahoma			1	.	.	.		1	
Oregon	.	.	.	.	.	.	1		
Pennsylvania			1	.	.	.	1		
Rhode Island	.	.	.	.	.	.		1	
South Carolina			1	.	.	.		1	
South Dakota			1	.	.	.	1		
Tennessee			1	.	.	.		1	
Texas	1			15	20	10		1	
Utah			1	.	.	.		1	
Vermont	1			.	.	.	1		
Virginia			1	.	.	.		1	
Washington			1	.	.	.		1	
West Virginia			1	.	.	.		1	
Wisconsin	.	.	.	.	.	.	1		
Wyoming			1	.	.	.	1		
Guam			1	.	.	.	1		
Virgin Islands	1			.	.	.		1	

* "1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.26

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

	Q700: Do Benefits Exceed Costs		Q701: Most Important Benefits					
	Yes	No	Reduced Errors	Reduced Benefit Outlays	Up-to-date Case Info	Reduced Admin. Cost	Tighter Caseload Mgmt.	Tighter Mgmt. of Workers
Alabama	1				1			
Alaska	1				1			
Arizona	.	.			1			
Arkansas		1	1					
California	1				1			
Colorado	1						1	
Connecticut		1			1			
Delaware		1	1					
Dist. of Columbia		1			1			
Florida		1						
Georgia		1			1			
Hawaii	1				1			
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1			1			
Indiana		1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Iowa		1					1	
Kansas	1		1					
Kentucky		1			1			
Louisiana		1						
Maine		1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Maryland		1			1			
Massachusetts		1	1					
Michigan	1		1					
Minnesota	1						1	
Mississippi	1		1					
Missouri		1			1			
Montana		1					1	
Nebraska		1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nevada	1				1			
New Hampshire		1			1			

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.26

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

	Q700: Do Benefits Exceed Costs		Q701: Most Important Benefits					
	Yes	No	Reduced Errors	Reduced Benefit Outlays	Up-to-date Case Info	Reduced Admin. Cost	Tighter Caseload Mgmt.	Tighter Mgmt. of Workers
New Jersey	1				1			
New Mexico	1		1					
New York		1			1			
North Carolina	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota		1			1			
Ohio		1					1	
Oklahoma		1			1			
Oregon		1			1			
Pennsylvania	1							
Rhode Island		1			1			
South Carolina		1			1			
South Dakota		1	1					
Tennessee		1	1					
Texas		1			1			
Utah		1			1			
Vermont	1				1			
Virginia		1			1			
Washington		1	.	.	.	.	.	.
West Virginia		1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Wisconsin	1				1			
Wyoming	1						1	
Guam	1			1				
Virgin Islands	1			1				

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

TABLE A.27

PERCEIVED MONTHLY REPORTING DRAWBACKS

	Q700: Do Benefits Exceed Costs		Q702: Most Important Drawbacks					
	Yes	No	More Errors	Higher Benefit Outlays	Paper Without Info	Higher Admin. Cost	Confuses Caseload Mgmt.	Confuses Mgmt. of Workers
Alabama	1				1			
Alaska	1				1			
Arizona	.	.						
Arkansas		1				1		
California	1					1		
Colorado	1					1		
Connecticut		1				1		
Delaware		1			1			
Dist. of Columbia		1				1		
Florida		1						
Georgia		1				1		
Hawaii	1						1	
Idaho	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Illinois		1			1			
Indiana		1	1					
Iowa		1						
Kansas	1				1			
Kentucky		1					1	
Louisiana		1	1					
Maine		1						
Maryland		1			1			
Massachusetts		1	1					
Michigan	1							
Minnesota	1				1			
Mississippi	1							
Missouri		1					1	
Montana		1						
Nebraska		1				1		
Nevada	1				1			
New Hampshire		1				1		

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

(continued)

Table of Contents

TABLE A.27

PERCEIVED MONTHLY REPORTING DRAWBACKS

	Q700: Do Benefits Exceed Costs		Q702: Most Important Drawbacks					
	Yes	No	More Errors	Higher Benefit Outlays	Paper Without Info	Higher Admin. Cost	Confuses Caseload Mgmt.	Confuses Mgmt. of Workers
New Jersey	1				1			
New Mexico	1							
New York		1					1	
North Carolina	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
North Dakota		1			1			
Ohio		1					1	
Oklahoma		1					1	
Oregon		1						
Pennsylvania	1					1		
Rhode Island		1				1		
South Carolina		1	1					
South Dakota		1					1	
Tennessee		1				1		
Texas		1				1		
Utah		1	1					
Vermont	1				1			
Virginia		1	1					
Washington		1			1			
West Virginia		1			1			
Wisconsin	1					1		
Wyoming	1				1			
Guam	1					1		
Virgin Islands	1							

"1" indicates condition applies
"." indicates Missing Data

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

Table of Contents

ID # |__|__|__|__|__|__|

MONTHLY REPORTING
STATE CENSUS INSTRUMENT

MODULE 1: CATEGORIES OF CASES REQUIRED TO REPORT MONTHLY

(INTERVIEWER NOTE: QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION SHOULD BE INITIALLY ANSWERED BASED ON FNS' QUARTERLY MRRB REPORT. RESPONDENTS SHOULD BE ASKED TO CONFIRM THE INFORMATION OR TO PROVIDE CORRECT INFORMATION. THE QUESTIONS BELOW SHOULD BE ASKED AS WRITTEN ONLY IF THE MRRB REPORT PROVIDED NO INFORMATION.)

1.00 The first group of questions concerns those Non-Public Assistance food stamp cases which are required to file monthly reports in (STATE).

1.01 Are all NPA cases (except those exempted by law) required to report monthly or only some specified categories of cases?

ALL BUT STATUTORY EXCEPTIONS (GO TO 1.05).....2
SOME SPECIFIED CATEGORIES.....1
NO SUCH NPA CASES FILE MONTHLY...(GO TO 1.05)....0

1.02 As I read off possible categories, please tell me if these cases are specifically required to file monthly reports in (STATE).

1.02.1 Current earnings cases?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

NOTE: STATUTORY EXEMPTION CASES ARE MIGRANTS AND ELDERLY/DISABLED HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO EARNED INCOME.

Table of Contents

1.02.2 Recent earnings cases?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED...(GO TO 1.02.3).....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.2a What time period is defined as "recent" for this requirement?

NUMBER OF MONTHS.....|__|__|

OTHER DEFINITION:_____
_____|__|__|

1.02.3 Cases with any unearned income?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.4 Cases with irregular unearned income?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED...(GO TO 1.02.5)....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.4a How is "irregular" defined for this requirement?

INCOME FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN SOCIAL
SECURITY OR ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.....1
INCOME OBSERVED TO FLUCTUATE FROM
MONTH TO MONTH.....2
OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.02.5 Cases with no adults?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.6 Cases with two or more adults?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.7 Cases including more than a certain number of persons?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED..(GO TO 1.02.8)..2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.7a At least how many people must be in the household for it to be required to report monthly?

NUMBER OF PERSONS....|__|__|

1.02.8 Cases that have recently begun receiving FS benefits?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED...(GO TO 1.02.9)....2
REQUIRED IF.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.8a For how many months is a case considered to be "recent" for this requirement?

NUMBER OF MONTHS.....|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.02.9 Cases in which the youngest child is over 16 years old?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.02.10 Are any other categories of NPA cases required to report monthly? (SPECIFY THE CATEGORIES.)

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 1.03).....0

A. _____|__|__|

B. _____|__|__|

C. _____|__|__|

D. _____|__|__|

1.03 In total, what percentage of the NPA cases in (STATE) are required to file monthly reports?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.04 What were the main reasons for choosing the categories of cases that are required to report monthly? (INTERVIEWER: DO NOT READ LIST. CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED.)

THIS WAS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED BY FNS.....1

CATEGORIES WERE SELECTED TO PARALLEL CATEGORIES FOR PA CASES.....1

CATEGORIES WITH FREQUENT CHANGES OR HIGH TURNOVER WERE SELECTED.....1

CATEGORIES WERE SELECTED THROUGH ERROR-PRONE PROFILE ANALYSIS.....1

MONTHLY REPORTING WAS ESTIMATED TO PRODUCE MORE BENEFIT SAVINGS THAN ADMINISTRATIVE COST FOR THESE CATEGORIES.....1

OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

1.05 The next group of questions concerns which Public Assistance food stamp cases are required to file monthly reports in (STATE).

(INTERVIEWER: MONTHLY REPORTING "PA" POLICY MAY BE DEFINED IN TERMS OF SOME SUBSET OF THE FOOD STAMP CASES RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE. FOR EXAMPLE, POLICIES MAY CONCERN "PURE" CASES IN WHICH THE MEMBERS OF THE AFDC OR GA CASE ARE IDENTICAL TO THE MEMBERS OF THE FOOD STAMP CASE. IF THIS IS MENTIONED IN ASKING THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, RECORD HERE THE DEFINITION THE STATE USES.)

PA CASES:_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.05.1 Are all PA cases (except those exempted by law) required to report monthly or only some specified categories?

ALL BUT STATUTORY EXCEPTIONS....(GO TO 1.09).....2
SOME SPECIFIED CATEGORIES.....1
NO PA CASES FILE MONTHLY....(GO TO 1.09).....0

1.06 Please tell me if these following cases are specifically required to require monthly reports in (STATE).

1.06.1 All AFDC/food stamp cases?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.06.1a All AFDC/food stamp cases that are required to report monthly for AFDC?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.06.2 All GA/food stamp cases?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
REQUIRED IF:.....3

_____|__|__|

1.06.3 PA cases with current earnings?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.06.4 Recent earnings cases?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY
REQUIRED.....(GO TO 1.06.6).....2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.4a What time period is defined as "recent" for this requirement?

NUMBER OF MONTHS.....|__|__|

OTHER DEFINITION:_____|__|__|

_____

1.06.5 Cases with any unearned income?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.6 Cases with irregular unearned income?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED...(GO TO 1.06.8)...2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.6a How is "irregular" defined for this requirement?

INCOME FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN SOCIAL
SECURITY OR ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.....1
INCOME OBSERVED TO FLUCTUATE FROM
MONTH TO MONTH.....2
OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.06.7 Cases with no adults?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD STAMP
CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.8 Cases with two or more adults?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.9 Cases including more than a certain number of persons?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED...(GO TO 1.06.11)..2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.9a What is the maximum number of persons in the case before it must report monthly? At least how many people must be in the household for it to be required to report monthly?

NUMBER OF PERSONS.....|__|__|

1.06.10 Cases that have recently begun receiving FS benefits?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED...(GO TO 1.06.12)..2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.06.10a For how many months is a case considered to be "recent" for this requirement?

NUMBER OF MONTHS.....|__|__|

1.06.11 Cases in which the youngest child is over 16 years old?

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....1
NOT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED.....2
SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED FOR AFDC-FOOD
STAMP CASES BUT NOT OTHER PA CASES.....3
REQUIRED IF:.....4

_____|__|__|

1.06.12 Are any other categories of PA cases required to report monthly? (SPECIFY THE CATEGORIES.)

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 1.07).....0

a. _____|__|__|

b. _____|__|__|

c. _____|__|__|

d. _____|__|__|

1.07 In total, what percentage of the PA cases in (STATE) are required to file monthly reports?

PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

1.07a What percentage of AFDC/FS cases in (STATE) are required to file monthly reports?

PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.08 Which one of the following statements best describes the main reason for choosing most of the categories of PA cases required to report monthly? (INTERVIEWER: READ LIST, AND THEN ASK:) What reasons beyond the main one contributed to the selection of categories to report monthly?

	MAIN REASON (CIRCLE ONE)	SECONDARY REASONS (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
To be consistent with AFDC policy.....	1	1
Categories were frequent changes or high turnover were selected.....	2	1
Categories were selected through error-prone profile analysis.....	3	1
Monthly reporting was estimated to produce more benefit savings than administrative cost for these categories.....	4	1
Other.....	5	1

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.09 INTERVIEWER
CHECK ITEM

NO CASES REPORT MONTHLY.....(GO TO 2.00).....0
SOME CASES BUT NOT ALL REPORT
MONTHLY.....(CONTINUE).....1
ALL CASES BUT STATUTORY EXCEPTIONS
REPORT MONTHLY.....(GO TO 2.00).....2

1.10 When a case is initially certified, who determines whether it is required to file monthly reports? (INTERVIEWER: IF THIS VARIES, ASK FOR THE MOST COMMON MODE AND THEN FOR OTHER MODES. NOTE: THIS QUESTION SEQUENCE APPLIES BOTH TO PA AND NPA.)

	MOST COMMON (CIRLCE ONE)	OTHERS (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
AUTOMATED DECISION AFTER CASE DATA HAS BEEN ENTERED	1	1
ELIGIBILITY WORKER	2	1
CLERK	3	1
ELIGIBILITY SUPERVISOR	4	1
OTHER	5	1

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

1.11 If a case that does not have to report monthly experiences a change that would make it subject to monthly reporting (such as beginning to receive earned income), when will the case's reporting status be changed?

AS SOON AS THE NEW INFORMATION
IS RECEIVED.....1
AFTER THE NEXT REGULARLY
SCHEDULED CERTIFICATION.....2
OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

1.12 Who makes the decision that the case will now be required to report monthly? (INTERVIEWER: IF THIS VARIES, ASK FOR THE MOST COMMON MODE AND THEN FOR OTHER MODES.)

	MOST COMMON (CIRCLE ONE)	OTHERS (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
AUTOMATED DECISION AFTER CASE DATA HAS BEEN ENTERED	1	1
ELIGIBILITY WORKER	2	1
CLERK	3	1
ELIGIBILITY SUPERVISOR	4	1
OTHER	5	1
(SPECIFY)_____	|__|__|	

1.13 If a case that is required to report monthly has a change in circumstances that would exclude it from monthly reporting, when will the case's reporting status be changed?

AS SOON AS THE NEW INFORMATION IS RECEIVED.....1
AFTER THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED CERTIFICATION.....2
OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

1.14 Who makes the decision that the case will no longer have to report monthly? (INTERVIEWER: IF THIS VARIES, ASK FOR THE MOST COMMON MODE AND THEN FOR OTHER MODES.)

	MOST COMMON (CIRCLE ONE)	OTHERS (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
AUTOMATED DECISION AFTER CASE DATA HAS BEEN ENTERED	1	1
ELIGIBILITY WORKER	2	1
CLERK	3	1
ELIGIBILITY SUPERVISOR	4	1
OTHER	5	1
(SPECIFY)_____	|__|__|	

Table of Contents

1.15 How is the client notified of the change in reporting requirements? (INTERVIEWER: CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL METHODS

	YES	NO
A LETTER IS SENT EXPLAINING NEW REQUIREMENTS	1	0
NEW REQUIREMENTS ARE EXPLAINED IN TELEPHONE CALL	1	0
NEW REQUIREMENTS ARE EXPLAINED IN OFFICE VISIT	1	0
OTHER	1	0

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

1.16 About what percent of all on-going food stamp cases change their reporting status in a given month? That is, about what percent go from being monthly reporters to not being monthly reporters and vice versa?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

Table of Contents

MODULE 2: OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR MONTHLY REPORTING

2.00 Are monthly report forms normally sent out from a central state location, from local welfare offices, or from other locations?

CENTRAL STATE SOURCE.....1
LOCAL WELFARE OFFICES.....2
REGIONAL CENTERS.....3
OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

2.01 Are the report forms sent out together with a benefit mailing (for example, the ATP, coupons, AFDC check) or separately?

WITH BENEFITS.....1
SEPARATELY.....2

2.02 Is the monthly report form sent to all recipients at the same time in the month, or are there multiple mailing schedules?

ALL AT SAME TIME.....(ASK 2.03).....1
MULTIPLE SCHEDULES...(GO TO 2.04).....2

2.03 Approximately what day of the month are report forms sent out?

DAY OF MONTH...(GO TO 2.05).....|__|__|

2.04 How many different mailing dates are there in a month?

NUMBER OF MAILING DATES.....|__|__|

2.05 How many different filing deadlines are there in the month (not

Table of Contents

2.06 Approximately, how long after the mailout date is:
(SPECIFY EITHER DAYS OR RANGE, NOT BOTH)

	DAYS	RANGE
a. the recipient required to submit the report form (initial filing deadline)?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|
b. a warning notice sent to recipients who have not submitted their report form?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|
c. the final notice of adverse action sent (This may be the same as the warning notice)?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|
d. the last day for submitting a report form and still receiving benefits on time?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|
e. the cut-off date for entering changes?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|
f. the effective date of closure?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|
g. the date of issuance reflecting information received on the monthly report?.....	|__|__|	|__|__| to |__|__|

2.07 Does the recipient pay postage for mailing in the form or is it paid by the agency?

RECIPIENT.....1
AGENCY.....2

2.08 Does the recipient have to supply an envelope for mailing in the form, is a return envelope enclosed with the form, or is none necessary?

RECIPIENT SUPPLIES ENVELOPE.....1
RETURN ENVELOPE PROVIDED.....2
NO ENVELOPE NECESSARY.....3

Table of Contents

2.09 When a form is returned, how is the initial review for completeness conducted? (INTERVIEWER: IF THIS VARIES, ASK FOR THE MOST COMMON MODE AND THEN FOR OTHER MODES.)

	MOST COMMON	OTHERS YES	OTHERS NO
AUTOMATED DETERMINATION	1	1	0
ELIGIBILITY WORKER	2	1	0
DATA ENTRY WORKER	3	1	0
CLERK	4	1	0
OTHER	5	1	0

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

2.10 Who determines whether the returned form has any information that requires a case action? (INTERVIEWER: IF THIS VARIES, ASK FOR THE MOST COMMON MODE AND THEN FOR OTHER MODES.)

	MOST COMMON	OTHERS YES	OTHERS NO
AUTOMATED DETERMINATION	1	1	0
ELIGIBILITY WORKER	2	1	0
DATA ENTRY WORKER	3	1	0
CLERK	4	1	0
OTHER	5	1	0

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

2.11 If a returned form is determined not to have any changes, what is the pattern of eligibility workers' involvement in handling and responding to the form?

AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS ALWAYS OR NEARLY ALWAYS INVOLVED.....1
AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS USUALLY INVOLVED.....2
AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS SOMETIMES INVOLVED.....3
AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS RARELY OR NEVER INVOLVED.....4

2.12 If a returned form has one or more changes, what is the pattern of eligibility workers' involvement?

AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS ALWAYS OR NEARLY ALWAYS INVOLVED.....1
AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS USUALLY INVOLVED.....2
AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS SOMETIMES INVOLVED.....3
AN ELIGIBILITY WORKER IS RARELY OR NEVER INVOLVED.....4

2.13 If a recipient files an incomplete report, what action is most commonly taken?

REPORT IS RETURNED TO RECIPIENT FOR COMPLETION AND MAIL-IN.....1
LETTER IS SENT TO RECIPIENT ASKING FOR MISSING INFORMATION.....2
WORKER CALLS RECIPIENT TO OBTAIN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.....3
RECIPIENT IS ASKED TO COME TO OFFICE TO COMPLETE THE FORM.....4
OTHER.....5

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

2.14 Who is responsible for handling incomplete reports? (INTERVIEWER: IF THIS VARIES, ASK FOR THE MOST COMMON MODE AND THEN FOR OTHER MODES.)

	MOST COMMON	OTHERS YES	OTHERS NO
ELIGIBILITY WORKER	1	1	0
DATA ENTRY WORKER	2	1	0
CLERK	3	1	0
OTHER	4	1	0

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

2.15 If a recipient fails to provide the additional information for an incomplete report, how many days after the mailout is the effective date of closure?

NUMBER OF DAYS.....|__|__|

2.16 Suppose a recipient fails to submit a report or make corrections by the final deadline and the case is closed, but the recipient subsequently appears with all necessary information. Are there any circumstances in which the recipient can be reinstated without loss of benefits?

YES.....1
NO....(GO TO 2.18).....0

2.17 How soon after the effective date of closure must the recipient appear in order to be reinstated without loss of benefits?

NUMBER OF DAYS.....|__|__|

2.18 If the recipient appears within a specified interval, can the case be reopened without going through the full intake process--that is, with a "streamlined" intake procedure?

YES.....1
NO....(GO TO 2.21).....0

Table of Contents

2.19 How soon after the effective date of closure must the recipient appear in order to be reopened without full intake?

BEFORE END OF ISSUANCE MONTH.....1
BEFORE END OF PROCESSING MONTH.....2
OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

2.20 If a monthly report is received by the initial deadline and contains information about a change in the recipient's circumstances, how many days are normally required to complete processing of the form and have the recipient's central files fully updated?

NUMBER OF DAYS.....|__|__|

2.21 Are monthly reporting cases handled by separate worker units, by specialized workers in mixed units or are these cases mixed in with other caseloads?

SEPARATE UNIT.....1
SPECIALIZED WORKER IN MIXED UNIT.....2
NO SEPARATATION.....3
NOT APPLICABLE: ALL CASES
ON MONTHLY REPORTING.....4

Table of Contents

MODULE 3: CERTIFICATION POLICY

3.00 What is the approximate percentage of NPA cases subject to monthly reporting that are certified for each of the following intervals:

NOTE: IF PERCENTAGES DON'T ADD TO 100% ± 5%, PROBE TO CLARIFY.

1 MONTH.....|__|__|__|

2 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

3-5 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

6 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

7-11 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

12 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

100 PERCENT

3.01 What is the approximate percentage of NPA cases not subject to monthly reporting that are certified for each of the following intervals?

1 MONTH.....|__|__|__|

2 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

3-5 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

6 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

7-11 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

12 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

100 PERCENT

3.02 What is the approximate percentage of PA cases subject to monthly reporting that are certified for each of the following intervals?

1 MONTH.....|__|__|__|

2 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

3-5 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

6 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

7-11 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

12 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

100 PERCENT

Table of Contents

3.03 What is the approximate percentage of PA cases not subject to monthly reporting that are certified for each of the following intervals?

1 MONTH.....|__|__|__|

2 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

3-5 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

6 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

7-11 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

12 MONTHS.....|__|__|__|

100 PERCENT

3.04 For cases subject to monthly reporting, what percentage of cases use the following procedures at recertification?

a. a mail-in recertification form independent of the monthly report?....|__|__|__| PERCENT

b. a mail-in addendum to the monthly report?.....|__|__|__| PERCENT

c. signed statement at in-office interview?.....|__|__|__| PERCENT

3.05 For cases not subject to monthly reporting, what percentage of cases use the following procedures at recertification:

a. a mail-in recertification form.....|__|__|__| PERCENT

b. signed statement at in-office interview?.....|__|__|__| PERCENT

Table of Contents

MODULE 4: CLIENT REPORTING PATTERNS

The next series of questions asks about the percentage of monthly reporting cases which have various outcomes. If (State) has not measured these factors specifically, please provide your best estimate. In each case, please indicate whether the response is an estimate or has been specifically measured.

4.00 Approximately what percentage of monthly reporting cases file reports on time (that is, by the initial deadline) in a normal month?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.01 What percentage of monthly reporting cases fail to file (by extended deadline) and have their cases closed in a normal month?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.02 What percentage of monthly reporting cases file incomplete reports (by extended deadline) but subsequently complete them in a normal month?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.03 What percentage of monthly reporting cases file incomplete reports and are subsequently closed for failure to provide complete information?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

Table of Contents

4.04 What percentage of cases closed for failure to file or to provide corrections are subsequently reinstated without loss of benefits?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.05 What percentage of cases closed for failure to file or to provide corrections are certified within three months, but miss at least one month's benefits?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.06 What percentage of monthly reporting cases receive their benefits late because of late filing in a normal month?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.07 What percentage of monthly reports provide information about a change in circumstances that leads to case closure?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

4.08 What percentage of monthly reports provide information about a change in circumstances that leads to a change in the recipient's benefit amount?

a. PERCENTAGE.....|__|__|__|

b. MEASURED STATISTIC.....1
ESTIMATE.....2

5.01 The next series of questions concerns the ongoing [illegible] for operating the monthly reporting system. If y[illegible] summarized as "cost per case per month," please provide them in that way. Please provide separate cost figures for each of the following cost elements, and for each indicate whether the figure comes from a formal study or is a professional estimate. Remember that the figures should only include the costs of carrying out functions related to monthly reporting.

COST ELEMENT	COST/CASE /MONTH	OTHER COST METRIC: (SPECIFY BELOW)	FROM STUDY	PROF. ESTIMATE
PERSONNEL		$THOUSANDS		
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
DATA ENTRY WORKERS.....	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER WORKER:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER WORKER:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER WORKER:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
FRINGE BENEFITS	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER DIRECT				
DATA PROCESSING.....	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
MAILING/POSTAGE.....	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
OTHER NON-LABOR:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
INDIRECT				
INDIRECT COST:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
INDIRECT COST:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|. |__|__|__|	1	2
INDIRECT COST:_____ |__|__|	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2
TOTAL COST:	$|__|__|__|	$|__|, |__|__|__|	1	2

METRIC: COST/_____ \|__\|__\|

Table of Contents

5.02 In your state the extra cost of monthly reporting may be partially offset by reductions in other administrative costs. For example, monthly reporting may mean that workers have to spend less time on recertifications or on handling recipient telephone calls and visits. Do you believe that any such offsetting reductions exist in your state?

NO....(GO TO 5.06).....0
YES.....1
UNCERTAIN..(GO TO 5.06)....2

5.03 We would like to get an estimate of how big you think this offsetting reduction is. First, not counting the offsetting reduction, how many dollars do you think monthly reporting increases the cost per case per month?

DOLLARS PER MONTH.....|__|__|

5.04 Second, how many dollars per month per case do you think is offset by other reductions in administrative costs?

OFFSETTING DOLLARS.....|__|__|

5.05 What do you think are the most important offsets?

_____|__|__|

_____|__|__|

5.06 Eligibility workers often spend different amounts of time processing cases of differing complexity. Please estimate the number of minutes it takes an eligibility worker to process the following types of cases under monthly reporting. How many minutes will an eligibility worker spend processing:

a complete report, filed on time, with no change in benefit.....|__|__|__|

an incomplete report.....|__|__|__|

a late report.....|__|__|__|

a report indicating ineligibility.....|__|__|__|

a report indicating a benefit change.....|__|__|__|

a report with new information but no benefit change.....|__|__|__|

Table of Contents

5.07 Now, let's just talk about a report that is complete, filed on time, and has no benefit change. Approximately how many minutes does it take each of the following types of workers to process this simple case? Recall, you estimated that an eligibility worker would spend (FILL) minutes. First:

a data entry worker.....|__|__|__|

a clerk.....|__|__|__|

an eligibility suprevisor.....|__|__|__|

Table of Contents

MODULE 6: EFFECTS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

6.00 For cases subject to monthly reporting, do you believe that monthly reporting has reduced QC error rates in (STATE), increased error rates, or not affected error rates?

REDUCED.....1
INCREASED.....2
NOT AFFECTED.....(GO TO 6.06).....3

6.01 By how many percentage points do you believe monthly reporting has (reduced/increased) the percent of dollars in error for cases subject to monthly reporting?

PERCENTAGE POINTS REDUCED.....|__|__|__|

PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASED.....|__|__|__|

6.02 By how many percentage points do you believe monthly reporting has (reduced/increased) the percent of dollars in error for the PA food stamp cases subject to monthly reporting?

PERCENTAGE POINTS REDUCED.....|__|__|__|

PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASED.....|__|__|__|

6.03 By how many percentage points do you believe monthly reporting has (reduced/increased) the percent of dollars in error for the NPA food stamp cases subject to monthly reporting?

PERCENTAGE POINTS REDUCED.....|__|__|__|

PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASED.....|__|__|__|

6.04 Do figures given in the three questions above come from analyses the state has done, or are they professional estimates? If they come from analyses, could we obtain a copy?

	ANALYSIS COPY AVAILABLE	ANALYSIS NO COPY AVAILABLE	ESTIMATE
QUESTION 6.01	1	2	3
QUESTION 6.02	1	2	3
QUESTION 6.03	1	2	3

Table of Contents

6.05 What do you believe are the most important ways in which monthly reporting has reduced or increased QC errors?

HOW MONTHLY REPORTING HAS REDUCED ERRORS:

_____|__|__|

_____|__|__|

HOW MONTHLY REPORTING HAS INCREASED ERRORS:

_____|__|__|

_____|__|__|

6.06 Now, let's talk about food stamp benefit payments. For cases subject to monthly reporting, do you believe that monthly reporting has reduced food stamp benefit payments in (STATE), increased benefit payments, or not affected benefit payments?

REDUCED.....1
INCREASED.....2
NOT AFFECTED.....(GO TO 6.12).....3

6.07 What percentage (reduction/increase) in food stamp benefit payments do you believe monthly reporting has caused for those portions of the caseload subject to the reporting requirement?

PERCENTAGE POINTS REDUCED.....|__|__|__|

PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASED.....|__|__|__|

6.08 By how many percentage points do you believe monthly reporting has (reduced/increased) food stamp benefit payments for the PA food stamp cases subject to monthly reporting?

PERCENTAGE POINTS REDUCED.....|__|__|__|

PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASED.....|__|__|__|

6.09 By how many percentage points do you believe monthly reporting has (reduced/increased) benefit payments for the NPA food stamp cases subject to monthly reporting?

PERCENTAGE POINTS REDUCED.....|__|__|__|

PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASED.....|__|__|__|

Table of Contents

6.10 Do figures given in the three questions above come from analyses the state has done, or are they professional estimates? If they come from analyses, could we obtain a copy?

	ANALYSIS COPY AVAILABLE	ANALYSIS NO COPY AVAILABLE	ESTIMATE
QUESTION 6.07	1	2	3
QUESTION 6.08	1	2	3
QUESTION 6.09	1	2	3

6.11 What do you believe is the most important way in which monthly reporting has reduced or increased benefit payments?

HOW MONTHLY REPORTING HAS REDUCED PAYMENTS:

_____|__|__|

_____|__|__|

HOW MONTHLY REPORTING HAS INCREASED PAYMENTS:

_____|__|__|

_____|__|__|

6.12 Now, let's consider the frequency with which benefit changes are made. For cases subject to monthly reporting, do you believe that monthly reporting has increased, reduced or not affected the frequency with which benefit changes are made for food stamp cases? (NOTE: INCLUDE CHANGES DUE TO BOTH MONTHLY REPORTS AND RECERTIFICATIONS.)

REDUCED.....1
INCREASED.....2
NOT AFFECTED.....(GO TO 6.14).....3

6.13 What is your estimate of the percent of the cases with changes each month with and without monthly reporting?

PERCENT WITH CHANGES WITHOUT
MONTHLY REPORTING.....|__|__|__|
PERCENT WITH CHANGES WITH
MONTHLY REPORTING.....|__|__|__|

Table of Contents

6.14 Do you believe that monthly reporting has increased, reduced or not affected the proportion of cases terminated each month (excluding cases that reopen within two months)?

REDUCED.....1
INCREASED.....2
NOT AFFECTED.....(GO TO 6.16).....3

6.15 What is your estimate of the percent of the cases terminated each month with and without monthly reporting?

PERCENT TERMINATED WITHOUT
MONTHLY REPORTING.....|__|__|__|
PERCENT TERMINATED WITH
MONTHLY REPORTING.....|__|__|__|

6.16 Would you say that monthly reporting has a positive effect, negative effect, or no effect on the management of the Food Stamp Program in (STATE)?

POSITIVE EFFECT.....1
NEGATIVE EFFECT.....2
NO EFFECT.....(GO TO 7.00).....3

6.17 What are the main ways that monthly reporting has brought about this (positive/negative) effect?

MAIN POSITIVE EFFECTS:

(1) _____

_____|__|__|

(2) _____

_____|__|__|

MAIN NEGATIVE EFFECTS:

(1) _____

_____|__|__|

(2) _____

_____|__|__|

Table of Contents

MODULE 7: OPINIONS OF MONTHLY REPORTING

7.00 Overall, do you believe that the benefits of monthly reporting in the Food Stamp Program exceed the costs?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.01 What do you see as the most important benefit of monthly reporting? What secondary benefits do you see?

	MOST IMPORTANT (CIRCLE ONE.)	SECONDARY BENEFITS (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)
REDUCED ERROR RATES	1	1
REDUCED BENEFIT PAYMENTS	2	1
MORE UP-TO-DATE CASE INFORMATION	3	1
REDUCED ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	4	1
TIGHTER MANAGEMENT OF CASELOAD	5	1
TIGHTER MANAGEMENT OF WORKERS	6	1
OTHER	7	1
(SPECIFY)_____	|__|__|	

NOTE CLARIFICATIONS ON WHY BENEFITS WERE CLASSIFIED AS MOST IMPORTANT OR SECONDARY.

Table of Contents

7.02 What do you see as the most important cost or drawback of monthly reporting? What secondary drawbacks do you see?

	MOST IMPORTANT (CIRCLE ONE)	SECONDARY DRAWBACKS (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
HIGHER ERROR RATES	1	1
INCREASED BENEFIT PAYMENTS	2	1
PAPER FLOW WITHOUT NEW INFORMATION	3	1
HIGHER ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	4	1
CONFUSION IN MANAGING CASELOAD	5	1
CONFUSION IN MANAGING WORKERS	6	1
OTHER	7	1

(SPECIFY)_____|__|__|

7.03 Is (STATE) currently contemplating any significant expansion or reduction in the proportion of the caseload required to report monthly?

EXPANSION.....1
CONTRACTION.....2
NO CHANGE PLANNED.....(GO TO 7.04).....0

7.03a Is this being considered because of changes brought about by the Food Security Act of 1985?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.03b When do you expect the change to be implemented?

|__|__| |__|__|
MO YR

7.04 Are any other significant changes in the monthly reporting requirement being planned? If so, what kind of change?

YES.....1
NO.....(END).....0

Table of Contents

7.05 What kind of change is being planned?

(1) _____

_____|__|__|

(2) _____

_____|__|__|

7.05.a Is this being considered because of changes brought about by the Food Security Act of 1985?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.05b When do you expect the change to be implemented?

|__|__| |__|__|
MO YR