

Appendix A Data Tables

Appendix A

Data Tables

List of Tables

Table A2.1—Local food stamp outreach	A-1
Table A2.2—Availability of Food Stamp Program informational materials in the local offices.....	A-3
Table A2.3—Office practices regarding legal immigrants	A-5
Table A2.4—Caseworkers’ practices regarding food stamps and immigrants	A-8
Table A2.5—Availability of food stamp applications.....	A-11
Table A2.6—Extended or limited office hours	A-13
Table A2.7—Transportation issues	A-15
Table A2.8—Physical accessibility of food stamp offices.....	A-18
Table A2.9—Observations of crowding and lines in reception area.....	A-20
Table A2.10—Requests or inquiries that can be made by telephone	A-21
Table A2.11—Special accommodations for persons with hardships	A-22
Table A2.12—Availability of interpretation services for non-English-speaking-clientele.....	A-24
Table A2.13—Special office practices for food stamp clients with children.....	A-26
Table A2.14—Recommendations for changes in local office practices to increase number of food stamp applicants.....	A-28
Table A3.1—Eligibility interview appointments	A-29
Table A3.2—Total number of visits required to complete the food stamp application process (and changes since welfare reform).....	A-31
Table A3.3—Required steps in the food stamp application process before the food stamp eligibility interview (and changes since welfare reform)	A-33
Table A3.4—TANF up-front job search requirements for TANF/food stamp applicants	A-37
Table A3.5—Lump sum cash payments or expense vouchers offered to TANF clients in lieu of applying for TANF.....	A-41
Table A3.6—Requirements that TANF clients explore alternative resources before applying for TANF.....	A-44
Table A3.7—Food stamp applicant job search requirement	A-47
Table A3.8—Excess medical expense deduction (for the elderly and disabled).....	A-49
Table A3.9—Verification requirements (involvement of third-party contacts).....	A-52
Table A3.10—Information and assistance provided to applicants with regard to meeting verification requirements.....	A-55

Table A3.11—Caseworkers’ recommendations for changes in office verification procedures that could improve food stamp application rate by eligible households	A-56
Table A3.12—Home visits for front-end fraud investigations.....	A-57
Table A3.13—Fingerprinting and finger imaging of food stamp applicants	A-59
Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years	A-60
Table A3.15—Supervisor recommendations for changes in office practices and policies to increase the number of eligible households who complete the food stamp application process.....	A-66
Table A3.16— Caseworker recommendations for changes in office practices and policies to increase the number of eligible households who complete the food stamp application process.....	A-67
Table A4.1—Usual length of food stamp certification periods by type of case	A-69
Table A4.2—How often clients must visit an office to complete a recertification	A-70
Table A4.3—Food stamp recertification appointments	A-71
Table A4.4—Availability of telephone or at-home recertification interviews for persons with hardships.....	A-75
Table A4.5—Caseworker recommendations for changes in office procedures to decrease the number of eligible individuals who leave the FSP because they do not complete recertification.....	A-76
Table A4.6—Systems used for reporting of food stamp household changes.....	A-78
Table A4.7—Periodic reporting requirements by type of food stamp household.....	A-80
Table A4.8—Policy when clients fail to meet periodic reporting deadlines	A-81
Table A4.9—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF work rules	A-83
Table A4.10—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF requirements other than work rules	A-86
Table A4.11—Food stamp employment and training requirements	A-90
Table A4.12—Child support sanctions for non-TANF food stamp recipients.....	A-94
Table A4.13—ABAWDs and the work requirement	A-96
Table A4.14—TANF case closures due to program sanctions and effect on continuation of food stamp benefits	A-98
Table A4.15—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households when they reach the TANF time limit.....	A-101
Table A4.16—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily due to employment.....	A-104
Table A4.17—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily, but not for employment.....	A-106
Table A4.18—Staff opinions on issues affecting continued food stamp participation by eligible households	A-109

Table A4.19—Supervisor recommendations for changes to increase the number of eligible households who continue to receive food stamps after leaving TANF A-112

Table A4.20—Caseworker recommendations for changes to increase the number of eligible households who continue to receive food stamps after leaving TANF A-113

Table A2.1—Local food stamp outreach			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Agency conducting outreach locally:			
Both food stamp agency and another agency	38.0% (5.2%)	30.7% (8.0%)	40.5% (6.2%)
Food stamp agency only	18.7% (3.4%)	27.8% (6.9%)	15.5% (3.6%)
Another agency/organization only	19.2% (4.4%)	26.2% (8.8%)	16.7% (4.8%)
No outreach	17.1% (4.1%)	5.4% (3.7%)	21.3%** (5.0%)
Food stamp supervisor did not know whether there is FSP outreach	7.1% (2.6%)	10.0% (5.9%)	6.0% (2.8%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Coordinated with Medicaid or State Child Health Insurance (SCHIP) outreach			
	58.5% (4.9%)	63.4% (7.7%)	56.8% (5.7%)
c. Specific populations targeted for food stamp outreach:			
Elderly	36.5% (4.2%)	35.5% (7.9%)	36.8% (5.3%)
Immigrant/refugee populations	27.2% (4.4%)	13.0% (4.8%)	32.2%** (5.8%)
Disabled	24.0% (4.1%)	21.2% (6.5%)	25.0% (5.2%)
Homeless	17.9% (3.4%)	13.9% (5.0%)	19.3% (4.2%)
Working families	16.5% (3.4%)	18.4% (7.2%)	15.8% (3.8%)
Former TANF recipients	13.1% (3.1%)	19.0% (6.3%)	11.1% (3.5%)
ABAWDs	4.5% (1.4%)	6.4% (4.1%)	3.8% (1.3%)
People living in rural areas	4.3% (1.4%)	6.0% (0.9%)	3.7% (1.9%)

Continued

Table A2.1—Local food stamp outreach—Continued			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Families with children	2.5% (1.0%)	0%	3.4%** (1.4%)
Drug and alcohol program participants	2.1% (1.5%)	0%	2.8% (2.0%)
Specific racial/ethnic/religious groups	2.3% (1.4%)	3.5% (3.4%)	2.0% (1.4%)
The unemployed	1.4% (1.0%)	2.8% (2.8%)	0.9% (0.9%)
No specific group is targeted	37.4% (4.5%)	50.6% (8.7%)	32.8%* (5.4%)
d. Outreach methods:			
Presentations for community groups or at community sites	70.2% (4.6%)	78.9% (7.6%)	67.2% (5.8%)
Flyers, posters, and brochures	69.0% (4.8%)	75.2% (7.9%)	66.8% (5.7%)
Toll-free phone number or hotline	54.1% (5.4%)	47.9% (9.1%)	56.2% (6.2%)
Newspaper articles	37.0% (4.7%)	41.7% (8.7%)	35.3% (5.3%)
PSAs	32.6% (5.2%)	36.2% (9.4%)	31.4% (5.9%)
Internet	28.1% (4.2%)	33.1% (7.3%)	26.4% (5.2%)
Direct mailing	24.0% (4.1%)	19.1% (6.0%)	25.8% (5.1%)
Calls or home visits to former participants	14.4% (3.8%)	4.4% (6.3%)	14.4% (4.5%)
Billboards or ads on buses	10.3% (2.9%)	4.4% (4.3%)	2.3% (3.5%)
Number of respondents^c	124	36	88

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.2—Availability of Food Stamp Program informational materials in the local offices			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Are general FSP informational materials available?			
Yes	91.1% (3.3%)	97.0% (2.9%)	89.0% (4.3%)
No	8.9% (3.3%)	3.0% (2.9%)	11.0% (4.3%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Types of materials observed:			
Posters	80.4% (4.4%)	84.3% (6.4%)	79.0% (5.5%)
Pamphlets/brochures	64.0% (4.7%)	71.4% (6.0%)	61.4% (6.1%)
Videotapes	20.9% (3.7%)	26.0% (8.1%)	19.1% (4.1%)
Digital display	3.9% (2.1%)	0%	5.3%* (2.8%)
c. Are general FSP informational materials printed in another language available?			
Yes	62.1% (4.6%)	57.3% (9.9%)	63.8% (5.2%)
No	34.3% (4.5%)	39.8% (9.8%)	32.4% (5.3%)
Not reported	3.5% (1.8%)	2.8% (2.8%)	3.8% (2.2%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
d. Types of materials observed:			
Posters	54.4% (4.4%)	47.3% (10.0%)	56.9% (4.7%)
Pamphlets/brochures	43.6% (4.4%)	44.0% (8.1%)	43.5% (5.7%)
Videotapes	10.7% (2.5%)	5.5% (3.8%)	12.6% (3.4%)
Digital display	0.8% (0.8%)	0%	1.1% (1.1%)

Continued

Table A2.2—Availability of Food Stamp Program informational materials in the local offices— Continued			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
e. Are informational materials available indicating that households not receiving TANF may still qualify for food stamps?			
Yes	48.6% (5.1%)	48.2% (8.5%)	48.8% (6.0%)
No	44.2% (5.1%)	44.5% (9.5%)	44.0% (5.8%)
Not reported	7.2% (2.6%)	7.4% (5.3%)	7.2% (2.9%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
f. Types of materials observed:			
Posters	43.4% (4.8%)	45.7% (8.5%)	42.7% (5.7%)
Pamphlets/brochures	41.4% (4.9%)	42.3% (8.4%)	41.1% (6.1%)
Number of observations^c	113	34	79

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of observations is the number of office observations providing responses to the question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Observations. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.3—Office practices regarding legal immigrants			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Do legal immigrants routinely (in a typical month) come to office seeking services?			
Yes	74.8% (4.4%)	56.2% (9.2%)	81.3%** (4.8%)
No	25.2% (4.4%)	43.9% (9.2%)	18.7%** (4.8%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Types of written information staff distribute to legal immigrants:			
b. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, written information describing the special eligibility rules for adults and children in the household			
Information is available	49.6% (4.9%)	43.6% (8.2%)	51.6% (6.3%)
Information is not available	24.0% (4.4%)	7.7% (5.5%)	29.7%*** (5.6%)
Supervisor did not know	1.3% (0.9%)	4.8% (3.3%)	0%
Total	74.8%	56.2%	81.3%
c. Among offices providing written information describing the special eligibility rules for adults and children in the household, <u>information available in a language other than English</u>			
Information is available in other languages	48.0% (4.8%)	40.8% (8.2%)	50.6% (6.2%)
Information is only available in English	1.5% (1.1%)	2.8% (2.8%)	1.1% (1.1%)
Total	49.6%	43.6%	51.6%

Continued

Table A2.3—Office practices regarding legal immigrants—Continued			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>d. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, written information assuring legal immigrants that accepting food stamps cannot affect their ability to become citizens in the future</i>			
Information is available	27.0% (4.1%)	18.7% (6.8%)	29.9% (5.3%)
Information is not available	35.5% (4.8%)	23.8% (8.4%)	39.6% (5.8%)
Supervisor did not know	12.3% (3.5%)	13.7% (4.3%)	11.8% (4.5%)
Total	74.8%	56.2%	81.3%
<i>e. Among offices providing written information assuring legal immigrants that accepting food stamps cannot affect their ability to become citizens, information available in a language other than English</i>			
Information is available in other languages	25.5% (4.0%)	15.9% (6.5%)	28.9% (5.2%)
Information is only available in English	1.5% (1.1%)	2.8% (2.8%)	1.1% (1.1%)
Total	27.0%	18.7%	29.9%
Methods used for informing/training caseworkers regarding food stamp eligibility rules for immigrants:			
<i>f. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, special training sessions used for informing/training caseworkers about food stamp eligibility for immigrants</i>			
Held	64.6% (4.7%)	56.2% (9.2%)	67.5% (5.4%)
Not held	9.6% (2.5%)	0.0%	12.9%*** (3.3%)
Supervisor did not know	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.9%)
Total	74.8%	56.2%	81.3%

Continued

Table A2.3—Office practices regarding legal immigrants—Continued			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>g. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, simplified written guides developed</i>			
Available	48.5% (4.6%)	32.3% (7.9%)	54.2%** (5.7%)
Not available	24.1% (4.1%)	15.3% (7.0%)	27.1% (5.4%)
Supervisor did not know	2.2% (0.6%)	8.5% (2.6%)	0%***
Total	74.8%	56.2%	81.3%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76
Field Observers' Reports:			
<i>h. Informational materials describing the food stamp eligibility rules for legal immigrants are available in the reception area</i>	45.5% (4.4%)	37.1% (8.3%)	48.4% (5.3%)
<i>i. Informational materials describing the food stamp eligibility rules are available in the food stamp office in languages other than English</i>	39.4% (4.3%)	22.7% (6.7%)	45.1%*** (5.5%)
<i>j. Informational materials describing the food stamp eligibility rules for children of immigrants who are not eligible for food stamps are available:</i>			
Available in English	24.5% (3.9%)	16.8% (6.3%)	27.4% (5.1%)
Also available in other languages	22.0% (4.0%)	16.8% (6.2%)	23.9% (5.0%)
Number of observations^d	108-113	33-34	74-79

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of observations is the number of office observations providing responses to the question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey; Local Food Stamp Office Observations. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.4—Caseworkers’ practices regarding food stamps and immigrants			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Do caseworkers routinely (in a typical month) see immigrants seeking food stamp services?			
Yes	58.1% ^c (3.9%)	47.5% (7.5%)	61.8% (4.8%)
No	41.9% (3.9%)	52.5% (7.5%)	38.2% (4.8%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, caseworkers’ perceived difficulty in implementing food stamp eligibility rules for immigrants:			
Very difficult	5.0% (1.6%)	2.7% (1.8%)	5.8% (2.2%)
Somewhat difficult	27.1% (3.8%)	24.8% (5.7%)	27.9% (4.4%)
Not at all difficult	26.0% (3.8%)	20.1% (6.0%)	28.0% (4.4%)
Total	58.1%	47.5%	61.8%
c. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, is specialized training received by caseworkers on food stamp eligibility determination for households where at least one applicant is not a U.S. citizen?			
Yes	43.0% (3.6%)	35.0% (7.6%)	45.8% (4.1%)
No	14.7% (2.9%)	12.5% (4.8%)	15.5% (3.4%)
Don’t know	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Total	58.1%	47.5%	61.8%

Continued

Table A2.4—Caseworkers’ practices regarding food stamps and immigrants—Continued			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>d. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, do caseworkers routinely inform immigrants that they may be able to receive food stamps for their children?</i>			
Yes	53.7% (3.6%)	43.0% (7.3%)	57.4%* (4.4%)
No	3.2% (1.6%)	1.4% (1.4%)	3.8% (2.1%)
Don't know	1.2% (0.7%)	3.1% (2.2%)	0.6% (0.6%)
Total	58.1%	47.5%	61.8%
<i>e. Among offices routinely serving legal immigrants, application advice given to immigrants who appear ineligible because of when they entered the country:</i>			
Caseworker suggests that they complete the application form	48.0% (3.7%)	41.1% (7.2%)	50.4% (4.4%)
Caseworker tells them to complete the application form only if they have children	3.9% (2.0%)	1.6% (1.6%)	4.6% (2.6%)
Caseworker does not give advice on filling out the application form because this step is completed before a client sees a worker	1.1% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.5%* (0.9%)
Caseworker tells them not to bother applying	2.1% (1.1%)	2.2% (2.1%)	2.1% (1.3%)
Caseworker gives them a choice	0.7% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.7%)
Not reported	2.3% (1.0%)	2.7% (1.8%)	2.2% (1.1%)
Total immigrants seeking services	58.1%	47.5%	61.8%
<i>Number of respondents^d</i>	218	66	152

Continued

Table A2.4—Caseworkers’ practices regarding food stamps and immigrants—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c This percentage is less than the percentage of supervisors who report their offices routinely serve immigrants (table A2.3a) because not all caseworkers in any given office serve immigrants.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.5—Availability of food stamp applications			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Availability of food stamp applications in reception areas:			
Forms available to all in front waiting area	90.3% (3.1%)	84.9% (7.3%)	92.1% (3.5%)
Clients cannot usually obtain the application form in the front waiting area, but must wait until they meet with a caseworker	9.7% (3.1%)	15.1% (7.3%)	7.9% (3.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Availability of food stamp applications by mail:			
Available by mail to all upon request	87.4% (3.3%)	82.8% (7.4%)	89.0% (3.8%)
Available by mail only to persons staff determine are unable to come to office	8.4% (2.8%)	6.9% (4.8%)	8.9% (3.5%)
Applications not available by mail	4.3% (1.7%)	10.3% (6.0%)	2.1% (1.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
c. Are application forms available at community sites other than the food stamp office?			
Yes	67.5% (3.8%)	52.9% (8.2%)	72.6%** (4.7%)
No	32.5% (3.8%)	47.1% (8.2%)	27.4%** (4.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
d. Types of community locations where application forms are available:			
Hospitals	42.1% (4.9%)	28.9% (8.1%)	46.8%* (6.5%)
Community health clinics	33.3% (5.0%)	23.3% (7.6%)	36.8% (6.4%)
Community action agencies	30.9% (4.4%)	32.1% (8.6%)	30.5% (5.0%)
Senior centers	28.7% (4.3%)	27.3% (7.0%)	29.2% (5.2%)
Agencies serving homeless	22.8% (4.4%)	22.3% (7.7%)	22.9% (5.1%)
Job centers/Unemployment offices	21.8% (4.7%)	22.2% (6.8%)	21.6% (5.8%)
Agencies serving immigrants	18.2% (4.3%)	9.9% (5.7%)	21.1% (5.3%)
Schools	13.6% (3.8%)	9.8% (5.6%)	14.9% (4.5%)
Health departments/WIC clinics	13.1% (3.5%)	13.7% (5.8%)	12.8% (4.1%)
Food pantries	12.7% (3.6%)	13.4% (6.3%)	12.5% (4.3%)
Public housing offices	12.7% (4.0%)	8.9% (5.1%)	14.0% (5.1%)
Number of respondents^c	108-109	32-33	76

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.6—Extended or limited office hours			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Extended or limited overall office hours:			
Opens before 8 a.m. at least one day/week	46.6% (4.6%)	32.1% (7.3%)	51.6%** (5.3%)
Stays open after 5 p.m. at least one day/week	22.3% (3.9%)	16.9% (5.6%)	24.2% (4.7%)
Opens at least one Saturday/month	2.8% (1.7%)	2.3% (2.4%)	3.0% (2.1%)
Closes before 5 p.m. more than one day/week	14.3% (3.2%)	10.8% (5.8%)	15.6% (3.6%)
Closes for lunch period more than one day/week	1.4% (1.0%)	3.5% (3.4%)	0.7% (0.7%)
b. Hours food stamp applications are accepted:			
Before 8 a.m. at least one day/week	45.5% (4.6%)	32.1% (7.3%)	50.2%** (5.4%)
After 5 p.m. at least one day/week	19.9% (3.8%)	16.9% (5.6%)	20.9% (4.6%)
At least one Saturday/month	2.0% (1.6%)	0.0%	2.7% (2.1%)
Stops accepting applications before 5 p.m. more than one day/week.	13.3% (3.1%)	10.8% (5.8%)	14.2% (3.9%)
Does not accept applications during lunch period more than one day/week	2.2% (1.3%)	3.5% (3.4%)	1.7% (1.2%)

Continued

Table A2.6—Extended or limited office hours—Continued			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
c. Hours for conducting eligibility interviews:			
Begin before 8:00 a.m. at least one day/week	39.0% (4.8%)	29.1% (8.1%)	42.4% (5.6%)
Conducted after 5:00 p.m. at least one day/week	15.7% (3.1%)	6.4% (4.0%)	19.0%** (3.9%)
Conducted at least one Saturday/month	2.0% (1.6%)	0.0%	2.7% (2.1%)
Stop being conducted before 5:00 p.m. more than one day/week	20.0% (3.9%)	19.3% (7.1%)	20.3% (4.3%)
Not conducted during lunch period more than one day/week	4.5% (1.8%)	2.7% (2.6%)	5.1% (2.2%)
d. Combinations of extended office hours for eligibility interviews:			
Office conducts eligibility interviews before 8:00 a.m. and after 5:30 p.m. at least one day/week	12.2% (2.6%)	3.5% (2.9%)	15.2%*** (3.3%)
Office open for eligibility interviews on at least one Saturday/month and open late and/or early at least one day/week	2.0% (1.6%)	0.0%	2.7% (2.1%)
e. Is a secure, after-hours drop box available for application materials?			
Yes	27.8% (4.4%)	26.1% (6.2%)	28.4% (5.3%)
No	71.4% (4.4%)	73.9% (6.2%)	70.5% (5.4%)
Don't know	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.1% (1.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	124	36	88

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.7—Transportation issues			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. <i>Furthest distance any clients have to travel from home to the food stamp office:</i>			
Less than one mile	1.9% (1.0%)	2.2% (2.1%)	1.8% (1.1%)
At least one, but less than five miles	12.3% (2.0%)	2.2% (2.1%)	15.8%*** (3.0%)
At least five, but less than ten miles	18.9% (2.7%)	6.0% (3.6%)	23.4%*** (3.3%)
At least ten, but less than twenty miles	29.3% (3.8%)	27.6% (6.0%)	29.9% (4.9%)
More than twenty miles	34.0% (3.4%)	60.6% (7.4%)	24.6%*** (4.1%)
Caseworker could not give an estimate of how far clients have to travel	3.7% (1.6%)	1.5% (1.5%)	4.4% (2.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. <i>Are there public transit routes that reach within one-half mile of the food stamp office site?</i>			
Yes	76.4% (3.8%)	47.5% (8.9%)	86.6%*** (4.2%)
No	22.3% (3.7%)	49.3% (8.9%)	12.9%*** (4.1%)
Don't know	1.2% (0.9%)	3.2% (3.1%)	0.6% (0.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A2.7—Transportation issues—Continued			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
c. Among offices with public transit routes within one-half mile of office, proportion of clients living in areas served by these routes:			
Less than one-fourth	4.6% (1.9%)	5.5% (2.7%)	4.3% (2.4%)
At least one-fourth, but less than one-half	8.8% (1.8%)	10.2% (3.9%)	8.3% (2.0%)
At least one-half, but less than three-fourths	17.7% (2.8%)	11.7% (4.1%)	19.8% (3.5%)
At least three-fourths, but not all	27.7% (4.2%)	13.0% (4.7%)	32.9%*** (5.0%)
All	13.3% (2.8%)	4.9% (2.7%)	16.2%** (3.6%)
Caseworker could not estimate proportion of clients served by public transit routes	4.4% (1.5%)	2.3% (2.2%)	5.1% (1.9%)
Total	76.4%	47.5%	86.6%
d. Availability of transportation assistance to office:			
Agency offers transportation assistance to help people come to the office for applications or recertifications	27.4% (3.8%)	30.9% (6.9%)	26.2% (4.3%)
No transportation assistance	66.7% (3.7%)	62.9% (7.2%)	68.1% (4.3%)
Caseworker did not know	5.9% (1.6%)	6.2% (3.3%)	5.8% (2.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A2.7—Transportation issues—Continued			
Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Experience is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
e. <i>Specific populations transportation assistance is made available for:</i>			
Available to anyone who requests it	13.8% (2.5%)	11.9% (3.4%)	14.4% (3.0%)
Disabled	6.6% (1.8%)	11.3% (4.5%)	5.0% (1.8%)
Elderly	5.7% (1.9%)	14.9% (5.4%)	2.5%** (1.2%)
TANF participants	4.2% (1.9%)	1.4% (1.4%)	5.2% (2.5%)
Those living in rural or outlying areas	1.4% (0.7%)	1.4% (1.4%)	1.4% (0.9%)
Homeless	0.7% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.7%)
f. <i>Types of transportation assistance available:</i>			
Cash, vouchers, or public transit tokens	14.8% (2.8%)	6.2% (3.5%)	17.8%** (3.5%)
Van or car service	11.1% (2.6%)	19.1% (6.4%)	8.3% (2.8%)
Total transportation assistance available	27.4%	30.9%	26.2%
Number of respondents^c	218	66	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.8—Physical accessibility of food stamp offices			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice was Observed^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Are there street signs on the intersections surrounding the building?			
Yes, on all of them	64.7% (4.0%)	59.7% (8.0%)	66.5% (5.1%)
Yes, on some intersections	16.3% (4.0%)	19.4% (6.5%)	15.2% (4.5%)
No, not on any intersection	19.0% (3.3%)	20.9% (7.1%)	18.3% (3.8%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Does the building have a sign on the outside indicating the name of the office?			
Yes	90.4% (2.9%)	89.1% (5.1%)	90.8% (3.4%)
No	9.6% (2.9%)	10.9% (5.1%)	9.2% (3.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
c. Is the street address visible on the outside of the building?			
Yes	65.0% (4.1%)	51.0% (7.9%)	69.9%** (5.3%)
No	32.6% (4.0%)	46.4% (7.9%)	27.7%* (5.3%)
Not reported	2.5% (1.5%)	2.7% (2.6%)	2.4% (1.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
d. Is parking available for applicants who drive?			
Free parking available	88.2% (3.9%)	93.0% (4.2%)	86.5% (5.0%)
Paid parking available	10.8% (3.8%)	7.0% (4.2%)	12.1% (4.8%)
No parking available	1.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A2.8—Physical accessibility of food stamp offices—Continued			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice was Observed^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
e. <i>Is handicapped parking available?</i>			
Yes	92.2% (2.6%)	90.5% (4.8%)	92.8% (3.1%)
No	7.8% (2.6%)	9.5% (4.8%)	7.2% (3.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
f. <i>Is the building wheelchair accessible?</i>			
Yes	95.2% (2.0%)	97.7% (2.3%)	94.3% (2.6%)
No	4.8% (2.0%)	2.3% (2.3%)	5.7% (2.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of observations^c</i>	113	34	79

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of observations is the number of office observations providing responses to the question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Observations. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.9—Observations of crowding and lines in reception area			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice was Observed^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Existence of a line at the food stamp reception area (based on three different observation periods):			
Yes, always	10.5% (3.0%)	0%	14.2%*** (3.9%)
Yes, but only at certain times	52.1% (4.4%)	38.7% (9.7%)	56.8%* (5.1%)
No lines	37.4% (4.7%)	61.3% (9.7%)	29.0%*** (5.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Availability of sufficient seating (based on three different observation periods):			
Yes, seats were always available	86.6% (2.8%)	87.3% (6.1%)	86.4% (3.4%)
No, there were always some people standing	0%	—	—
Varies	13.4% (2.8%)	12.7% (6.1%)	13.6% (3.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of observations^c	113	34	79

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of observations is the number of office observations providing responses to the question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Observations. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Clients can inquire, over the telephone, about how to apply for food stamps	99.6% (0.4%)	100% (0%)	99.5% (0.5%)
b. Clients can inquire, over the telephone, about what information they will need to bring with them to apply for food stamps	100.0% (0.0%)	100.0% (0.0%)	100.0% (0.0%)
c. Clients can schedule, over the telephone, an eligibility interview for an initial application	68.4% (4.2%)	87.3% (5.4%)	61.8%*** (5.2%)
Number of respondents^c	124	36	88

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.11—Special accommodations for persons with hardships			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Caseworkers' Reports:			
a. Do caseworkers routinely offer telephone or in-home interviews for persons with hardships (regardless of whether a request is made on the part of the client)?			
Yes	75.1% (2.5%)	83.1% (5.3%)	72.3%* (2.8%)
No	24.7% (2.5%)	16.1% (5.4%)	27.7%* (2.8%)
Don't know	0.2% (0.2%)	0.8% (0.8%)	0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Specific groups routinely offered telephone or in-home interviews by caseworkers:			
Households with disabled individuals	65.3% (2.8%)	73.7% (5.0%)	62.3%* (3.4%)
Households with elderly individuals	49.3% (2.8%)	58.5% (6.5%)	46.1%* (3.1%)
Households lacking transportation	16.6% (2.2%)	29.1% (5.6%)	12.2%*** (2.0%)
Bedridden or homebound individuals	10.2% (1.7%)	10.0% (3.5%)	10.3% (2.0%)
Households with earnings or other work-related commitments that pose a barrier to coming into the office	6.2% (1.6%)	3.5% (2.1%)	7.1% (2.0%)
TANF households	2.1% (0.8%)	1.3% (0.9%)	2.4% (1.0%)
Caregivers for disabled or elderly individuals	1.3% (0.6%)	2.1% (1.5%)	1.0% (0.6%)
Pregnant women	0.9% (0.3%)	0%	1.2%*** (0.4%)
Individuals who cannot make it in and do not have an authorized representative	0.6% (0.4%)	0.8% (0.8%)	0.6% (0.4%)
Offered to anyone who requests it	2.2% (1.6%)	4.5% (4.4%)	1.4% (1.4%)
Number of respondents^c	373	110	263

Continued

Table A2.11—Special accommodations for persons with hardships—Continued			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Field Observers' Reports:			
<i>c. Are food stamp applications available in large print for persons with limited vision?</i>			
Yes	8.2% (2.5%)	8.8% (4.8%)	8.0% (3.3%)
No	84.7% (3.3%)	76.3% (6.7%)	87.7% (4.0%)
Don't know	7.1% (2.1%)	15.0% (5.1%)	4.3%* (2.2%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of observations^d</i>	109	33	76

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

^d The number of observations is the number of office observations providing responses to the question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey and Local Food Stamp Office Observations. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.12—Availability of interpretation services for non-English-speaking-clientele			
Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy^a is in Effect or Experience is Reported (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. <i>Non-English-speaking clients routinely (in a typical month) come to office seeking services</i>	77.5% (3.9%)	53.0% (9.2%)	86.0%*** (4.4%)
b. <i>Bilingual caseworkers are available in the office who can provide services to the non-English-speaking clientele</i>	61.9% (4.5%)	44.4% (9.9%)	68.0%** (5.8%)
c. <i>Among offices that routinely serve non-English-speaking clients, availability of interpreters:</i>			
Interpreters available (in person or by phone) to food stamp clients during <u>all</u> office hours	47.4% (4.9%)	38.6% (9.2%)	50.4% (5.9%)
Interpreters available (in person or by phone) to food stamp clients at least three-quarters but not all office hours	15.3% (3.7%)	5.5% (3.8%)	18.8%** (4.9%)
Interpreters available (in person or by phone) to food stamp clients at least one-half but less than three-quarters of office hours	1.7% (1.2%)	2.5% (2.4%)	1.4% (1.4%)
Interpreters available (in person or by phone) to food stamp clients less than one-half of office hours	1.6% (1.2%)	0.0%	2.2% (1.5%)
Interpreters not available to food stamp clients	6.0% (2.3%)	6.4% (4.5%)	5.9% (2.6%)
Supervisor did not know if interpreters were available or how often	5.5% (3.1%)	0.0%	7.4%*** (4.0%)
Total	77.5%	53.0%	86.0%
<i>Number of respondents^c</i>	109	33	76

Continued

Table A2.12—Availability of interpretation services for non-English speaking clientele— Continued			
Caseworkers' Reports:			
d. Caseworkers routinely (in a typical month) see individuals who speak no or limited English	70.6% (4.0%)	60.4% (8.4%)	74.1% (4.7%)
e. Translators or bilingual caseworkers are available (in person or by telephone) to help such clients complete the application process	63.8% (4.5%)	51.4% (8.9%)	68.1% (5.3%)
Number of respondents^d	218	66	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.13—Special office practices for food stamp clients with children			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or was Observed^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Clients asked <i>not</i> to bring children in the office	6.0% (2.0%)	6.5% (4.4%)	5.8% (2.6%)
b. Childcare available at the food stamp office	14.6% (3.5%)	11.8% (4.0%)	15.6% (4.7%)
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76
Field Observers' Reports:			
c. Space available within reception area for children to play:			
Yes, dedicated play area within the reception area	26.3% (4.5%)	26.0% (7.7%)	26.5% (5.7%)
Yes, but floor space only	33.8% (4.8%)	26.3% (7.9%)	36.4% (5.7%)
Space for children to play is quite limited	28.3% (4.6%)	41.2% (8.9%)	23.8%* (5.3%)
There is no space available	10.8% (3.7%)	6.6% (4.0%)	12.2% (4.8%)
Not reported	0.8% (0.8%)	0%	1.1% (1.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
d. Toys or materials for children to play with were observed in reception area			
Yes	28.9% (4.7%)	31.5% (7.7%)	28.0% (5.8%)
Yes, but not enough or not in good condition	5.4% (2.1%)	9.1% (5.5%)	4.1% (2.1%)
Yes, but only books/magazines (no toys)	6.7% (2.1%)	7.9% (4.4%)	6.3% (2.8%)
No	59.0% (5.3%)	51.6% (9.2%)	61.6% (6.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
e. Restrooms observed to have a diaper changing area	46.6% (5.1%)	25.4% (5.7%)	54.0%*** (6.2%)
Number of observations^d	113	34	79

Continued

Table A2.13—Special office practices for food stamp clients with children—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of observations is the number of office observations providing responses to the question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey; Local Food Stamp Office Observations. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A2.14—Recommendations for changes in local office practices to increase number of food stamp applicants

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Recommendation was Made ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
Expand or improve outreach	33.1% (5.3%)	26.2% (8.3%)	35.6% (6.1%)	20.3% (2.8%)	19.3% (4.5%)	20.7% (3.3%)
Increase staff	19.9% (4.1%)	6.1% (4.2%)	24.9%*** (5.4%)	9.9% (2.1%)	5.7% (1.8%)	11.4%* (2.7%)
Expand office hours	13.3% (3.5%)	17.0% (7.8%)	11.9% (4.0%)	4.5% (1.6%)	2.2% (1.2%)	5.3% (2.1%)
Improve reception area	5.3% (3.2%)	5.5% (3.9%)	5.2% (4.1%)	3.2% (1.5%)	4.8% (1.9%)	2.7% (1.9%)
Increase number of offices or make locations more convenient	3.2% (1.7%)	2.6% (2.6%)	3.4% (2.1%)	4.9% (1.7%)	3.4% (2.6%)	5.4% (2.0%)
Outstation staff at other agencies	2.4% (1.6%)	5.4% (4.9%)	1.3% (1.3%)	2.3% (0.8%)	1.8% (1.3%)	2.5% (1.0%)
Improve coordination with other agencies	2.4% (1.5%)	5.0% (3.5%)	1.5% (1.5%)	1.5% (0.6%)	0.8% (0.8%)	1.8% (0.8%)
Other ^c	30.6% (4.6%)	41.5% (8.8%)	26.8% (5.5%)	20.4% (2.8%)	18.2% (5.4%)	21.1% (3.3%)
No recommendations made	28.7% (4.8%)	29.1% (9.2%)	28.6% (5.3%)	52.9% (4.0%)	56.4% (6.6%)	51.6% (5.0%)
Number of respondents^d	112	34	78	373	110	263

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The “other” category includes recommendations that went beyond the intended scope of the question (e.g., recommendations for changes in program eligibility and benefit rules), and those where the percentage was less than 2 percent.

^d The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.1—Eligibility interview appointments

Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Usual scheduling procedures for in-person eligibility interviews:			
Appointments are scheduled in advance	53.3% (4.2%)	71.7% (7.4%)	46.8%*** (4.8%)
Individuals need to go into the office and line up for an appointment	45.0% (4.1%)	25.8% (7.4%)	51.7%*** (4.7%)
Both ways of scheduling an appointment are used	1.6% (0.7%)	1.9% (1.1%)	1.5% (0.9%)
Group orientation occurs at 8 a.m. and then interview is scheduled	0.2% (0.2%)	0.6% (0.6%)	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Among offices that schedule appointments, usual procedures for missed appointments:			
Keep case pending for a specific period to give client time to contact office to reschedule	24.6% (2.9%)	30.0% (6.0%)	22.7% (3.7%)
Notify client he or she must schedule another interview	17.1% (2.4%)	23.0% (5.1%)	15.0% (3.2%)
Automatically reschedule for another day	9.5% (2.2%)	15.8% (5.9%)	7.4% (1.9%)
Automatically deny the application	2.7% (0.7%)	3.9% (1.8%)	2.2% (0.9%)
Schedule a phone interview	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Turn case over to supervisor	0.2% (0.2%)	0.0%	0.2% (0.2%)
Clients are given two interview times when the eligibility interview appointment is scheduled	0.2% (0.2%)	0.0%	0.3% (0.3%)
Caseworker did not know usual procedures	0.4% (0.4%)	1.5% (1.4%)	0.0% (0.0%)
Total	55.1%	74.2%	48.3%

Continued

Table A3.1—Eligibility interview appointments—Continued

Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>c. Among offices that schedule appointments in advance, usual procedures for clients who show up late for appointments (at least 30 minutes past their scheduled appointment):</i>			
Reschedule for the same day	30.1% (3.6%)	42.4% (7.4%)	25.8%** (3.8%)
Reschedule for another day	24.1% (2.5%)	28.8% (5.5%)	22.5% (3.4%)
Don't know	0.8% (0.6%)	3.0% (2.3%)	0.0%
Total	55.1%	74.2%	48.3%
<i>Number of respondents^c</i>	373	110	263

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.2—Total number of visits required to complete the food stamp application process (and changes since welfare reform)^a

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^b (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^c		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^c	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
Caseworkers' Reports:						
a. Usual number of required visits to complete the food stamp application process:						
Process usually completed the first day client goes into the office	48.0% (4.3%)	43.3% (7.1%)	49.7% (5.3%)	50.5% (4.2%)	47.3% (7.3%)	51.7% (5.1%)
Usually two visits required	50.0% (4.1%)	56.7% (7.1%)	47.6% (5.1%)	47.2% (4.2%)	51.2% (7.2%)	45.8% (5.1%)
Usually three visits required	1.5% (1.0%)	0.0%	2.1% (1.3%)	1.9% (1.0%)	1.5% (1.5%)	2.0% (1.2%)
Don't know	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.6% (0.6%)	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^d	152	44	108	153	45	108
Supervisors' Reports:						
b. Current number of required visits compared with before welfare reform:						
The same number of visits	52.8% (5.0%)	52.1% (7.7%)	53.0% (6.2%)	66.6% (4.6%)	72.5% (7.6%)	64.5% (6.3%)
More visits	19.1% (4.0%)	18.2% (6.9%)	19.5% (4.7%)	7.4% (2.3%)	9.3% (5.3%)	6.7% (3.0%)
Fewer visits	10.2% (2.9%)	3.0% (2.9%)	12.7%** (3.8%)	11.8% (3.8%)	3.0% (2.9%)	14.9%** (4.8%)
Supervisor has not been in the office since 1996	17.1% (4.0%)	23.8% (7.5%)	14.8% (4.7%)	14.2% (3.7%)	15.2% (6.3%)	13.9% (4.6%)
Supervisor did not know	0.8% (0.8%)	3.0% (2.9%)	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^e	109	33	76	109	33	76

Continued

Table A3.2—Total number of visits required to complete the food stamp application process (and changes since welfare reform)^a—Continued

^a This includes the filing of the application, the eligibility interview, and all steps to complete the process, but does not include visits clients may make only to drop off verification documents.

^b Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^c A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

^e The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.3—Required steps in the food stamp application process before the food stamp eligibility interview (and changes since welfare reform)

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF/Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
Caseworkers' Reports:						
a. Is the food stamp application form usually filed/signed before, during, or after the food stamp eligibility interview?						
Before	63.7% (4.0%)	65.7% (7.4%)	63.0% (5.2%)	63.4% (3.9%)	65.9% (8.3%)	62.5% (5.2%)
During	35.1% (3.9%)	32.8% (7.2%)	36.0% (5.2%)	35.7% (3.9%)	32.5% (8.4%)	36.9% (5.2%)
After	1.2% (0.9%)	1.5% (1.5%)	1.0% (1.0%)	0.5% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.6% (0.6%)
Other	—	—	—	0.4% (0.4%)	1.6% (1.6%)	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	152	44	108	153	45	108
Supervisors' Reports:						
b. Are applicants usually required to attend one or more meetings/sessions before their food stamp eligibility interview?						
Yes	25.7% (3.8%)	24.9% (7.4%)	26.0% (4.8%)	10.5% (3.4%)	14.6% (6.1%)	9.1% (3.9%)
No	74.3% (3.8%)	75.1% (7.4%)	74.0% (4.8%)	89.5% (3.4%)	85.4% (6.1%)	90.9% (3.9%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A3.3—Required steps in the food stamp application process before the food stamp eligibility interview (and changes since welfare reform)—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF/Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
c. Among offices with requirement to attend meeting(s) before the food stamp eligibility interview, whether requirement was in place before 1996:						
Requirement exists today and was in place before 1996	4.6% (2.0%)	5.3% (3.7%)	4.4% (2.3%)	3.3% (1.7%)	5.3% (3.7%)	2.6% (1.9%)
Requirement exists today, but was not in place before 1996	12.9% (3.7%)	9.3% (5.3)	14.2% (4.6%)	4.7% (2.2%)	6.9% (4.8%)	4.0% (2.4%)
Requirement exists today, but respondent (supervisor) has not been in the office since 1996	7.4% (2.4)	10.3% (5.0%)	6.4% (3.0%)	2.5% (2.0%)	2.5% (2.4%)	2.5% (2.5%)
Supervisor did not know whether this requirement was in place before 1996	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.1% (1.1%)	0.0%	—	—
Total	25.7%	24.9%	26.0%	10.5%	14.6%	9.1%
d. Among offices with requirement to attend meeting(s) before the food stamp eligibility interview, number of meetings required:						
One meeting/session	14.5% (3.2%)	14.3% (6.0%)	14.7% (4.4%)	7.3% (3.0%)	12.3% (5.9%)	5.5% (3.3%)
Two meetings/sessions	7.2% (2.8%)	10.7% (5.2%)	6.0% (3.2%)	1.3% (0.9%)	2.3% (2.3%)	1.0% (1.0%)
More than two meetings/sessions	3.1% (1.6%)	0.0%	4.2%* (2.2%)	1.9% (1.4%)	0.0%	2.6% (1.9%)
Don't know	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.1% (1.1%)	0.0%	—	—
Total	25.7%	24.9%	26.0%	10.5%	14.6%	9.1%

Continued

Table A3.3—Required steps in the food stamp application process before the food stamp eligibility interview (and changes since welfare reform)—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF/Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
e. Among offices with requirement to attend meeting(s) before the food stamp eligibility interview, purpose(s) of these required meetings/sessions (more than one can apply):						
Program orientation/description of program requirements	19.1% (3.8%)	22.6% (7.3%)	17.9% (5.0%)	7.2% (2.9%)	9.3% (5.3%)	6.5% (3.4%)
Employment-related	19.1% (3.4%)	20.1% (7.0%)	18.7% (4.1%)	5.2% (2.2%)	9.8% (5.5%)	3.6% (2.1%)
Description of available support services	7.6% (2.5%)	2.3% (2.3%)	9.4%* (3.3%)	2.2% (1.7%)	0.0%	3.0% (2.3%)
Description of resources available as an alternative to applying for TANF	1.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.3% (1.3%)	—	—	—
Child support requirement-related	1.5% (1.0%)	3.0% (2.9%)	0.9% (0.9%)	—	—	—
f. Food stamp application usually cannot be signed and dated until client attends required meetings/sessions	6.6% (2.7%)	2.3% (2.3%)	8.1% (3.6%)	5.4% (2.4%)	4.8% (3.3%)	5.6% (3.0%)

Continued

Table A3.3—Required steps in the food stamp application process before the food stamp eligibility interview (and changes since welfare reform)—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF/Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
g. Among offices with requirement to attend meeting(s) before the food stamp eligibility interview, number of meetings held in a building other than where the eligibility interview occurs:						
No meetings/sessions held in another building	13.6% (3.2%)	16.5% (6.3%)	12.6% (4.0%)	7.2% (2.9%)	14.6% (6.1%)	4.6% (3.2%)
One required meeting/session held in another building	8.2% (3.1%)	8.4% (4.8%)	8.1% (3.8%)	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.9%)
Two or more required meetings/sessions held in another building	3.1% (1.6%)	0.0%	4.2%* (2.2%)	2.7% (1.6%)	0.0%	3.6%* (2.1%)
Supervisor did not know	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.1% (1.1%)	—	—	—
Total	25.7%	24.9%	26.0%	10.5%	14.6%	9.1%
Number of respondents^d	109	33	76	109	33	76

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.4—TANF up-front job search requirements for TANF/food stamp applicants

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
a. TANF/FS applicants required to conduct job search or engage in job search activities before their TANF application can be approved	37.9% (5.3%)	39.8% (8.4%)	37.2% (5.9%)	27.2% (3.3%)	27.6% (6.4%)	27.1% (4.4%)
b. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, proportion of participants subject to requirements:						
Less than one-quarter	5.6% (2.3%)	10.8% (5.2%)	3.8% (2.4%)	6.0% (1.7%)	5.8% (2.9%)	6.1% (2.3%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	8.7% (4.0%)	3.2% (3.1%)	10.7% (5.1%)	0.8% (0.6%)	1.5% (1.5%)	0.6% (0.6%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	5.2% (2.2%)	9.3% (5.2%)	3.8% (2.2%)	3.1% (1.2%)	2.9% (2.1%)	3.2% (1.5%)
At least three-quarters, but not all	8.4% (2.5%)	8.0% (4.4%)	8.5% (2.9%)	10.0% (2.6%)	7.1% (2.5%)	11.0% (3.4%)
All	8.1% (2.8%)	5.5% (3.8%)	9.1% (3.6%)	7.3% (1.5%)	10.3% (4.2%)	6.3% (1.7%)
Don't know	1.8% (1.3%)	3.0% (2.9%)	1.4% (1.4%)	0.0%	—	—
Total	37.9%	39.8%	37.2%	27.2%	27.2%	27.1%
c. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, when are TANF/FS applicants usually informed about requirements?						
Before filing the food stamp application	8.5% (2.8%)	12.0% (5.6%)	7.3% (3.1%)	NA	NA	NA
During the interview in which they file the food stamp application	15.6% (4.4%)	7.7% (4.4%)	18.4% (5.5%)	NA	NA	NA
After filing the food stamp application	11.1% (3.1%)	13.9% (5.9%)	10.1% (3.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Supervisor did not know or there was no consistent policy	2.7% (1.5%)	6.2% (4.2%)	1.4% (1.4%)	NA	NA	NA
Total	37.9%	39.8%	37.2%			

Continued

**Table A3.4—TANF up-front job search requirements for TANF/food stamp applicants—
Continued**

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
d. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, are workers instructed to tell clients they are not required to complete these to receive food stamp benefits?						
Yes	30.5% (5.1%)	27.6% (7.7%)	31.5% (5.9%)	NA	NA	NA
No	5.6% (1.8%)	9.1% (5.0%)	4.3% (1.5%)	NA	NA	NA
Don't know	1.8% (1.3%)	3.0% (2.9%)	1.4% (1.4%)	NA	NA	NA
Total	37.9%	39.8%	37.2%			
e. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, what are TANF applicants told about food stamps when job search requirements are explained:						
Encouraged to complete food stamp application	NA	NA	NA	23.5% (3.3%)	27.6% (6.4%)	22.1% (4.4%)
Food stamps not mentioned at all	NA	NA	NA	2.7% (1.0%)	0.0%	3.6% (1.4%)
They have usually been seen by a food stamp worker by this point	NA	NA	NA	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.0% (1.0%)
Don't know	NA	NA	NA	0.3% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Total				27.2%	27.6%	27.1%
f. Completing up-front TANF job search requirement requires meeting with an employment counselor or employment specialist at a location other than the food stamp office	16.9% (4.1%)	8.5% (4.7%)	19.9%* (5.2%)	NA	NA	NA

Continued

**Table A3.4—TANF up-front job search requirements for TANF/food stamp applicants—
Continued**

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)						
	Type of Respondent						
	Supervisor			Caseworker			
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +		
g. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, do caseworkers usually verify TANF job search contacts by directly getting in touch with the employers whom applicants indicate they have contacted?	Yes	NA	NA	NA	11.1% (2.4%)	17.4% (5.2%)	8.9% (2.7%)
	No	NA	NA	NA	15.1% (2.7%)	11.3% (5.1%)	10.8% (3.6%)
	Don't know	NA	NA	NA	1.1% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.0%)
	Total				27.2%	28.7%	25.9%
h. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, when clients are notified that they are ineligible to receive TANF because of failure to complete up-front job search activities, are workers instructed to inform clients that they still may be eligible to receive food stamps?	Yes	33.7% (5.1%)	33.5% (8.2%)	33.7% (5.7%)	NA	NA	NA
	No	4.2% (1.9%)	6.3% (4.3%)	3.5% (2.0%)	NA	NA	NA
	Total	37.9%	39.8%	37.2%			

—Continued

**Table A3.4—TANF up-front job search requirements for TANF/food stamp applicants—
Continued**

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
<i>i. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants required to do job search activities, in a typical month, the proportion of applicants subject to the requirement who complete the food stamp application process and have food stamp eligibility determined:</i>						
More than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	21.9% (3.2%)	23.6% (6.1%)	21.4% (4.0%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	2.3% (1.2%)	4.1% (3.0%)	1.7% (1.2%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	NA	NA	NA	0.3% (0.3%)	1.2% (1.2%)	0.0%
At least 5 percent, but less than one-quarter	NA	NA	NA	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.0% (1.0%)
Less than 5 percent	NA	NA	NA	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Don't know	NA	NA	NA	1.9% (1.0%)	0.0%	2.6%* (1.4%)
Total				27.2%	27.6%	27.1%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76	214	62	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.5—Lump sum cash payments or expense vouchers offered to TANF clients in lieu of applying for TANF

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
a. Lump sum cash payments or expense vouchers (“diversion assistance”) offered to potential TANF applicants in lieu of applying for TANF cash grants	54.7% (4.5%)	47.2% (9.5%)	57.3% (5.7%)	40.0% (4.0%)	38.6% (8.1%)	40.5% (5.0%)
b. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants may be offered lump sum payments, are some or all potential TANF applicants offered such payments or vouchers?						
Some	30.0% (4.6%)	34.1% (9.3%)	28.6% (5.5%)	NA	NA	NA
All	23.2% (4.3%)	13.2% (5.8%)	26.7%* (5.5%)	NA	NA	NA
Don't know	1.5% (1.1%)	0.0%	2.1% (1.5%)			
Total	54.7%	47.2%	57.3%			
c. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants may be offered lump sum payments, when during the food stamp application process clients are usually informed about the lump sum payment or voucher option:						
Before filing the food stamp application	14.3% (3.7%)	13.3% (6.6%)	14.7% (4.4%)	NA	NA	NA
During the interview in which they file the food stamp application	26.2% (4.6%)	18.5% (6.9%)	28.9% (5.9%)	NA	NA	NA
After filing the food stamp application	12.5% (2.9%)	15.5% (6.6%)	11.5% (3.4%)	NA	NA	NA
Don't know	1.7% (1.2%)	0.0%	2.2% (1.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Total	54.7%	47.2%	57.3%			

Continued

Table A3.5—Lump sum cash payments or expense vouchers offered to TANF clients in lieu of applying for TANF—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
d. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants may be offered lump sum payments, when individuals are told about the rules for available payments, the caseworker usually:						
Encourages food stamp application	NA			33.6% (3.7%)	37.0% (7.7%)	32.4% (4.7%)
Does not mention food stamps	NA			3.6% (1.0%)	0.0%	4.9%*** (1.3%)
Other	NA			1.5% (0.9%)	0.0%	2.1% (1.2%)
Don't know	NA			1.2% (0.9%)	1.5% (1.5%)	1.1% (1.1%)
Total				40.0%	38.6%	40.5%
e. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants may be offered lump sum payments, in a typical month, the proportion of clients interested in applying for TANF and likely to be eligible for it, that receive payments or vouchers instead of becoming TANF recipients:						
None	12.5% (3.9%)	12.9% (5.5%)	12.3% (5.0%)	13.0% (2.4%)	14.5% (5.2%)	12.4% (2.6%)
At least one, but less than one-quarter	32.6% (4.8%)	25.4% (8.4%)	35.1% (5.9%)	23.3% (3.9%)	19.8% (6.3%)	24.5% (5.0%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	1.1% (1.1%)	0.0%	1.5% (1.5%)	2.6% (0.8%)	4.2% (3.1%)	2.0% (1.1%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	0.7% (0.7%)	2.8% (2.8%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.6%)	0.0%	1.1% (0.8%)
More than three quarters, but not all	1.5% (1.1%)	3.0% (3.0%)	1.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	—	—
Don't know	6.3% (2.4%)	3.1% (3.1%)	7.5% (3.0%)	0.3% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.4% (0.4%)
Total	54.7%	47.2%	57.3%	40.0%	38.6%	40.5%

Continued

Table A3.5—Lump sum cash payments or expense vouchers offered to TANF clients in lieu of applying for TANF—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
<i>f. Among offices where TANF/FS applicants may be offered lump sum payments and in a typical month some applicants receive such payments, the proportion who complete the food stamp application process and have their food stamp eligibility determined:</i>						
More than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	19.6% (3.2%)	16.9% (4.9%)	20.6% (4.4%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	2.4% (1.4%)	0.0%	3.3%* (1.9%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	NA	NA	NA	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.6% (0.6%)
At least 5 percent, but less than one-quarter	NA	NA	NA	1.2% (0.7%)	1.7% (1.7%)	1.0% (0.7%)
Less than 5 percent	NA	NA	NA	2.6% (1.2%)	5.4% (3.2%)	1.6% (1.2%)
Don't know	NA	NA	NA	0.7% (0.5%)	0.0%	1.0% (0.7%)
Total				27.0%	24.0%	28.1%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76	214	62	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.6—Requirements that TANF clients explore alternative resources before applying for TANF

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Requirement for TANF applicants to explore alternative resources before applying for TANF	8.6% (2.1%)	15.0% (4.9%)	6.4% (2.2%)	16.7% (2.8%)	10.1% (4.6%)	19.0% (3.8%)
b. Among offices where some TANF/FS applicants required to explore alternative resources, the proportion of clients required to explore alternative resources:						
Less than one-quarter	3.8% (1.5%)	4.7% (0.7%)	3.5% (2.1%)	4.4% (1.8%)	1.5% (1.5%)	5.4% (2.2%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	0.0%	—	—	2.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	2.6%* (1.4%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	0.0%	—	—	2.6% (1.4%)	2.3% (2.3%)	2.7% (1.7%)
At least three-quarters, but not all	0.6% (0.6%)	2.5% (2.4%)	0.0%	5.7% (1.4%)	6.4% (3.7%)	5.4% (1.6%)
All	4.2% (1.7%)	7.9% (4.3%)	2.9% (1.7%)	2.1% (0.9%)	0.0%	2.8%** (1.2%)
Total	8.6%	15.0%	6.4%	16.7%	10.1%	19.0%
c. Among offices where some TANF/FS applicants required to explore alternative resources, when during the food stamp application process are TANF/FS clients usually informed about the requirement to explore alternative resources?						
Before filing the food stamp application	1.0% (1.1%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.4%)	NA	NA	NA
During the interview in which they file the food stamp application	3.5% (1.6%)	7.4% (4.2%)	2.1% (1.5%)	NA	NA	NA
After filing the food stamp application	4.1% (1.7%)	7.6% (4.3%)	2.9% (1.7%)	NA	NA	NA
Total	8.6%	15.0%	6.4%			

Continued

Table A3.6—Requirements that TANF clients explore alternative resources before applying for TANF—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
d. Among offices where some TANF/FS applicants required to explore alternative resources, what caseworker usually says about food stamps when talking to clients about exploring alternative resources:						
Encourages submittal of food stamp application that day	NA	NA	NA	15.2% (2.7%)	10.1% (4.6%)	17.0% (3.6%)
Discourages food stamp applications	NA	NA	NA	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Does not mention food stamps	NA	NA	NA	1.1% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.1%)
Total				16.7%	10.1%	19.0%

Continued

Table A3.6—Requirements that TANF clients explore alternative resources before applying for TANF—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
<i>e. Among offices where some TANF/FS applicants required to explore alternative resources, the proportion who complete the food stamp application process and have their food stamp eligibility determined:</i>						
More than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	10.8% (2.6%)	6.7% (4.0%)	12.2% (3.3%)
At least one-half, but less than three quarters	NA	NA	NA	2.2% (1.1%)	2.2% (2.1%)	2.2% (1.2%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	NA	NA	NA	1.3% (0.7%)	1.2% (1.2%)	1.4% (0.8%)
At least 5 percent, but less than one-quarter	NA	NA	NA	0.6% (0.6%)	0.0%	0.8% (0.8%)
Less than 5 percent	NA	NA	NA	1.4% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.8%* (1.1%)
Don't know	NA	NA	NA	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Total				16.7%	10.1%	19.0%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76	214	62	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.7—Food stamp applicant job search requirement

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
a. Non-TANF food stamp applicants are required to conduct job search activities before benefits can be provided	13.8% (3.8%)	15.5% (6.8%)	13.2% (4.7%)	13.9% (3.1%)	6.2% (3.1%)	16.6%** (3.7%)
b. Among offices where some non-TANF food stamp applicants are required to conduct job search activities, groups required to conduct up-front job search activities:						
All mandatory work registrants	9.5% (3.7%)	9.8% (5.8%)	9.4% (4.4%)	NA	NA	NA
Able-bodied adults without dependents, aged 18-55 (ABAWDs)	13.1% (3.7%)	15.5% (6.8%)	12.2% (4.6%)	NA	NA	NA
c. Among offices where some non-TANF food stamp applicants are required to conduct job search activities, the proportion (who are not elderly or disabled) required to conduct such activities before the food stamp application can be approved:						
Less than one-quarter	6.6% (2.2%)	10.2% (6.0%)	5.3% (2.4%)	NA	NA	NA
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	1.2% (0.9%)	0.0%	1.6% (1.2%)	NA	NA	NA
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	0%	—	—	NA	NA	NA
More than three-quarters	5.4% (3.1%)	3.0% (2.9%)	6.3% (4.0%)	NA	NA	NA
Don't know	0.6% (0.6%)	2.3% (2.3%)	0.0%	NA	NA	NA
Total	13.8%	15.5%	13.2%			

Continued

Table A3.7—Food stamp applicant job search requirement—Continued

Practice/Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
<i>d. Completing up-front food stamp applicant job search requirement requires meeting with an employment counselor or employment specialist <u>at a location other than the food stamp office</u></i>	9.5% (3.6%)	6.9% (5.1%)	10.5% (4.5%)	NA	NA	NA
<i>e. Caseworkers usually verify non-TANF food stamp applicant job search contacts by getting in touch with the employers whom applicants indicate they have contacted</i>	NA	NA	NA	4.3% (1.5%)	3.6% (2.6%)	4.6% (1.8%)
<i>f. Among offices where some non-TANF food stamp applicants are required to conduct job search activities, the proportion subject to the requirement who complete the food stamp application process and have their food stamp eligibility determined:</i>						
None	NA	NA	NA	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
Less than one-quarter	NA	NA	NA	3.6% (1.4%)	0.0%	4.9%*** (1.9%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	NA	NA	NA	1.9% (1.0%)	1.5% (1.5%)	2.0% (1.2%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	1.2% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.6% (1.0%)
More than three-quarters	NA	NA	NA	6.8% (2.2%)	4.7% (2.8%)	7.6% (2.7%)
Total				13.9%	6.2%	16.6%
Number of respondents	109	33	76	218	66	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.8—Excess medical expense deduction (for the elderly and disabled)

Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Procedures for informing/training caseworkers:			
Special training sessions held in last three years	69.2% (5.4%)	78.0% (7.7%)	66.1% (6.5%)
Simplified written guides developed	47.3% (4.6%)	58.6% (9.4%)	43.4% (5.7%)
Case reviews	5.2% (1.7%)	16.7% (5.4%)	1.2%*** (1.2%)
Discussed at staff meetings	7.7% (2.8%)	5.9% (4.0%)	8.4% (3.4%)
b. Policy on informing/assisting clients with the deduction:			
Caseworkers instructed to help these applicants by contacting providers or pharmacies for them	52.4% (4.7%)	63.2% (9.4%)	48.6% (5.7%)
Caseworkers required to provide special instructions during interview	38.6% (4.8%)	41.7% (9.1%)	37.5% (5.7%)
Special written information provided to elderly and disabled when they apply	9.6% (2.5%)	5.2% (3.6%)	1.1% (3.0%)
Referrals made to outside agencies that provide assistance	8.0% (2.6%)	10.6% (5.3%)	7.0% (2.9%)
Number of respondents^c	110	34	76
Caseworkers' Reports:			
c. Caseworkers report providing elderly and disabled with written information or detailed verbal instructions on what they need to do to claim the deduction	91.6% (2.0%)	92.5% (3.3%)	91.2% (2.5%)

Continued

Table A3.8—Excess medical expense deduction (for the elderly and disabled)—Continued

Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
d. Additional assistance caseworkers report providing to elderly or disabled clients to claim the medical expense deduction:			
Call medical providers/pharmacists directly to obtain information on expenses	48.4% (4.3%)	63.1% (7.3%)	43.2%** (5.2%)
No additional assistance provided	36.2% (3.6%)	22.2% (5.5%)	41.1%*** (4.6%)
Review medical receipts	18.2% (3.7%)	20.2% (4.9%)	17.5% (4.8%)
Referrals made to outside agencies	8.9% (2.1%)	8.4% (4.0%)	9.1% (2.5%)
Help to fill out the forms	2.6% (1.5%)	0.0%	3.5%* (2.0%)
Call other sources of information to obtain needed reports/bank statements/transportation expenses	2.0% (0.9%)	2.9% (2.0%)	1.7% (1.0%)
Provide any help requested	0.9% (0.9%)	0.0%	1.3% (1.2%)
Pick up their medical receipts	0.7% (0.5%)	2.5% (1.7%)	0.0%
Request assistance from other family members in obtaining documentation	0.7% (0.4%)	0.6% (0.6%)	0.8% (0.6%)

Continued

Table A3.8—Excess medical expense deduction (for the elderly and disabled)—Continued

Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect or Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
e. Caseworkers' estimate of the percentage of elderly or disabled clients they see in a typical month who claim the excess medical expense deduction:			
None	4.8% (1.6%)	5.4% (3.3%)	4.6% (1.8%)
At least one client, but less than 10 percent	32.2% (3.6%)	32.1% (6.5%)	32.2% (4.3%)
At least 10 percent, but less than 50 percent	34.6% (3.3%)	40.8% (6.5%)	32.4% (3.5%)
At least 50 percent, but less than 90 percent	18.9% (2.8%)	11.1% (4.7%)	21.6%* (3.3%)
More than 90 percent	7.8% (1.8%)	9.1% (3.8%)	7.3% (2.2%)
Caseworker could not provide an estimate	1.7% (0.9%)	1.5% (1.5%)	1.8% (1.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^d	226	68	158

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.9—Verification requirements (involvement of third-party contacts)

Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
a. Usual verification requirements for household income:						
Requires form to be completed by employer or past employer	56.0% (4.1%)	49.5% (7.8%)	58.3% (4.9%)	44.9% (4.2%)	39.9% (6.6%)	46.6% (4.9%)
Caseworker routinely contacts employers to verify	35.8% (3.6%)	32.7% (7.4%)	36.9% (4.1%)	27.6% (3.4%)	28.7% (7.1%)	27.3% (3.8%)
No third-party verification requirement	34.2% (3.6%)	38.1% (6.5%)	32.8% (4.4%)	43.5% (3.9%)	47.6% (6.3%)	42.1% (4.5%)
b. Usual verification requirements for household circumstances:						
Requires special form completed by a third party	45.2% (4.8%)	45.1% (8.6%)	45.3% (5.8%)	45.7% (4.8%)	42.9% (8.6%)	46.7% (5.8%)
Caseworker routinely contacts third party to verify	21.8% (3.4%)	22.2% (6.2%)	21.7% (4.0%)	19.9% (3.1%)	20.3% (6.4%)	19.8% (3.8%)
No third-party verification requirement	46.7% (4.6%)	44.2% (8.0%)	47.5% (5.4%)	47.8% (4.7%)	47.4% (7.8%)	48.0% (5.8%)
c. Usual verification requirements for shelter costs:						
Requires special form completed by a third party	36.7% (4.5%)	29.2% (7.6%)	39.3% (5.6%)	34.1% (4.5%)	32.8% (7.5%)	34.6% (5.6%)
Caseworker routinely contacts third party to verify	18.3% (3.3%)	12.8% (5.1%)	20.2% (4.0%)	20.8% (3.1%)	19.7% (5.9%)	21.1% (3.6%)
No third-party verification requirement	56.8% (4.8%)	63.5% (7.9%)	54.4% (5.8%)	54.5% (4.9%)	56.4% (8.4%)	53.9% (5.9%)

Continued

Table A3.9—Verification requirements (involvement of third-party contacts)—Continued

Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Food Stamp Applicant					
	TANF/Food Stamp Applicant			Non-TANF Food Stamp Applicant		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
d. How many types of information must usually be verified through a form completed by a third party?						
Zero	30.2% (4.4%)	31.2% (7.3%)	29.9% (5.3%)	34.5% (4.6%)	33.6% (6.6%)	34.8% (5.8%)
One	23.8% (4.0%)	26.9% (8.1%)	22.7% (4.7%)	21.9% (3.8%)	26.5% (7.3%)	20.3% (4.4%)
Two	23.8% (3.0%)	28.8% (6.7%)	22.1% (3.5%)	28.0% (4.2%)	30.6% (6.5%)	27.1% (4.9%)
Three	22.2% (3.7%)	13.1% (5.0%)	25.3%* (4.7%)	15.6% (2.9%)	9.3% (3.7%)	17.8% (3.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
e. Additional third-party verifications required of clients who also are applying for TANF:						
No additional verification requirements	49.5% (4.1%)	65.7% (7.1%)	43.8%*** (4.5%)	NA	NA	NA
Verify compliance with child support	18.7% (3.9%)	16.4% (6.2%)	19.6% (4.5%)	NA	NA	NA
Verify child's school attendance	18.6% (2.4%)	10.5% (3.9%)	21.4%** (3.0%)	NA	NA	NA
Verify child's immunizations	15.2% (2.4%)	12.2% (3.9%)	16.2% (3.0%)	NA	NA	NA
Provide child's birth certificate	4.7% (1.8%)	1.4% (1.4%)	1.4% (1.4%)	NA	NA	NA
Verify own school attendance if a teen parent	4.2% (1.4%)	5.2% (3.1%)	3.8% (1.6%)	NA	NA	NA
Verify attendance at school conferences	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.9%)	NA	NA	NA
Number of respondents^c	214	62	152	218	66	152

Continued

Table A3.9—Verification requirements (involvement of third-party contacts)—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.10—Information and assistance provided to applicants with regard to meeting verification requirements

Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Does caseworker routinely provide applicants with written instructions about the verification documentation they need?			
Yes	99.1% (0.4%)	99.3% (0.7%)	99.0% (0.5%)
No	0.9% (0.4%)	0.8% (0.7%)	1.0% (0.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. What caseworker does if after 30 days a food stamp applicant has provided some documentation for determining food stamp eligibility but is still missing some items:			
Notifies applicant that some items are missing before denying application	77.4% (2.7%)	72.8% (6.3%)	78.9% (2.9%)
Denies application without notice	22.1% (2.6%)	27.2% (6.3%)	20.3% (2.8%)
Caseworker did not know	0.6% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.8% (0.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	373	110	263

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.11—Caseworkers’ recommendations for changes in office verification procedures that could improve food stamp application rate by eligible households

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworkers Made Recommendations ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Provide clearer information on what is required of clients	10.3% (2.2%)	4.5% (1.9%)	12.4%** (3.1%)
Provide assistance in obtaining verification	5.3% (1.3%)	1.5% (1.1%)	6.7%** (1.7%)
Verify fewer items	4.8% (1.2%)	8.8% (2.9%)	3.4%* (1.2%)
Accept a wider range of documentation or material	3.7% (1.0%)	6.9% (2.8%)	2.5% (0.7%)
Provide information on required documents in advance (before the eligibility interview)	2.6% (0.8%)	2.2% (1.6%)	2.7% (0.8%)
Simplify forms/process	2.1% (0.9%)	0.0%	2.8%** (1.2%)
Make policy changes (e.g., raise income limit)	1.8% (0.7%)	2.1% (1.5%)	1.6% (0.8%)
Improve contact with employers	1.4% (0.7%)	1.9% (1.4%)	1.2% (0.8%)
Reminder notices	1.3% (0.6%)	1.8% (1.3%)	1.2% (0.7%)
More contact with other agencies	1.2% (0.6%)	1.1% (0.8%)	1.3% (0.8%)
Extend office hours	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
No recommendation made	69.5% (3.2%)	77.9% (4.7%)	66.5%* (3.9%)
Number of respondents^c	373	110	263

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.12—Home visits for front-end fraud investigations			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Office or contractor conducts front-end fraud investigations using unscheduled visits to the applicant's residence	48.5% (4.5%)	33.4% (9.2%)	53.7%* (5.8%)
b. Among offices that conduct front-end fraud investigations, the proportion of all food stamp applications submitted that are subject to these investigations:			
Less than 5 percent	12.0% (3.0%)	21.1% (7.8%)	8.7% (3.3%)
At least 5 percent, but less than one-quarter	15.3% (4.0%)	4.8% (3.4%)	19.0%** (5.2%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	8.0% (2.6%)	4.5% (4.4%)	9.3% (3.2%)
More than one-half	4.8% (1.4%)	3.0% (2.9%)	5.5% (1.6%)
Supervisor unable to provide estimate	8.4% (3.3%)	0.0%	11.3%*** (4.4%)
Total	48.5%	33.4%	53.7%
c. Among offices that conduct front-end fraud investigations, factors that make it more likely a household will receive a home visit:			
Expenses exceed income	42.5% (4.4%)	30.7% (9.0%)	46.6% (5.8%)
Reasons to doubt household composition	20.1% (3.8%)	23.6% (8.4%)	18.9% (4.6%)
No earned income, but there is a history of work	17.6% (4.3%)	13.1% (6.1%)	19.1% (5.3%)
Household has earned income	10.3% (3.4%)	10.2% (5.6%)	10.3% (4.1%)
Information provided in eligibility interview inconsistent with information on the application	9.3% (3.0%)	2.3% (2.3%)	11.7%** (4.0%)
Non-citizens in the household	2.9% (1.7%)	4.5% (4.4%)	2.3% (1.7%)
Report changes in household composition	2.4% (1.5%)	4.5% (4.4%)	1.7% (1.2%)
Fluctuating income	1.4% (1.0%)	2.3% (2.3%)	1.1% (1.1%)
Previous fraud	1.4% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.9% (1.4%)
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76

Continued

Table A3.12—Home visits for front-end fraud investigations—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.13—Fingerprinting and finger imaging of food stamp applicants			
Practice/Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice or Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. There is a requirement for fingerprinting or finger imaging food stamp applicants	23.0% (4.1%)	10.3% (5.0%)	27.5%** (5.5%)
b. Among offices that fingerprint applicants, groups of applicants who are fingerprinted:			
All food stamp applicants	18.2% (3.5%)	10.3% (5.0%)	21.0% (5.1%)
Only clients applying for General Assistance (GA)	2.8% (2.8%)	0.0%	3.8% (3.7%)
Only food stamp applicants also applying for TANF	2.0% (1.2%)	0.0%	2.7%* (1.6%)
Total	23.0%	10.3%	27.5%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Being on food stamps encourages dependency:						
Strongly agree	2.2% (1.2%)	3.5% (2.0%)	1.8% (1.5%)	5.0% (1.2%)	5.1% (2.3%)	5.0% (1.4%)
Agree	15.3% (2.8%)	20.9% (6.6%)	13.3% (2.9%)	30.8% (2.5%)	29.5% (3.9%)	31.3% (3.1%)
Disagree	64.3% (4.2%)	57.4% (7.8%)	66.7% (4.8%)	50.9% (2.8%)	49.8% (4.5%)	51.3% (3.4%)
Strongly disagree	16.5% (3.2%)	16.0% (5.7%)	16.7% (3.7%)	11.3% (1.4%)	11.6% (2.5%)	11.2% (1.9%)
Don't know	1.7% (1.0%)	2.3% (2.4%)	1.5% (1.1%)	2.1% (0.7%)	4.1% (1.8%)	1.4% (0.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Immigrants should not get food stamps until they become citizens:						
Strongly agree	1.9% (1.0%)	0.0%	2.5%* (1.4%)	6.7% (1.1%)	8.0% (2.5%)	6.3% (1.2%)
Agree	13.4% (2.7%)	18.4% (6.3%)	11.7% (2.7%)	19.4% (1.9%)	27.8% (4.2%)	16.4%** (2.4%)
Disagree	54.6% (3.8%)	60.1% (7.7%)	52.7% (4.6%)	54.8% (2.5%)	44.8% (4.7%)	58.3%** (3.1%)
Strongly disagree	25.9% (3.7%)	20.1% (6.3%)	27.9% (4.6%)	13.3% (1.6%)	14.5% (3.5%)	12.8% (1.8%)
Don't know	4.2% (1.7%)	1.4% (1.4%)	5.2% (2.3%)	5.9% (1.3%)	4.9% (2.0%)	6.2% (1.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years—Continued

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
c. <i>The size of the caseloads for my workers are very large, making it difficult for them to help people as much as they should:</i>						
Strongly agree	34.3% (3.7%)	36.0% (7.3%)	33.7% (4.5%)	39.0% (3.0%)	30.4% (5.0%)	42.0%* (3.5%)
Agree	37.2% (3.6%)	27.4% (7.9%)	40.7% (4.5%)	37.8% (2.6%)	46.1% (5.3%)	34.9%* (3.0%)
Disagree	25.7% (3.6%)	36.6% (8.6%)	21.8% (4.1%)	19.1% (2.1%)	19.4% (3.6%)	19.0% (2.4%)
Strongly disagree	1.1% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.5% (1.1%)	3.6% (0.9%)	3.6% (1.4%)	3.6% (1.0%)
Don't know	1.7% (1.3%)	0.0%	2.4% (1.8%)	0.6% (0.3%)	0.5% (0.5%)	0.6% (0.3%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
d. <i>Our office actively discourages clients from becoming TANF recipients:</i>						
Strongly agree	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)	0.8% (0.6%)	0.0%	1.1% (0.8%)
Agree	9.3% (2.4%)	6.4% (4.0%)	10.4% (2.8%)	11.0% (2.1%)	11.2% (3.6%)	10.9% (2.6%)
Disagree	41.5% (4.3%)	48.2% (8.9%)	39.1% (4.6%)	52.2% (2.7%)	56.9% (4.5%)	50.5% (3.5%)
Strongly disagree	45.5% (4.3%)	42.7% (8.8%)	46.5% (4.8%)	29.1% (2.6%)	27.0% (4.3%)	29.9% (3.4%)
Don't know	3.3% (1.4%)	2.7% (1.7%)	3.5% (1.8%)	6.9% (1.3%)	4.9% (1.7%)	7.6% (1.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years—Continued

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
e. <i>It's hard for clients who work to do what needs to be done to apply for food stamps:</i>						
Strongly agree	4.0% (1.4%)	4.2% (2.2%)	3.9% (1.7%)	5.2% (1.2%)	3.4% (1.7%)	5.9% (1.5%)
Agree	25.5% (3.4%)	21.4% (7.4%)	27.0% (3.9%)	29.3% (2.4%)	33.5% (4.2%)	27.8% (2.8%)
Disagree	56.3% (4.0%)	59.1% (8.5%)	55.4% (4.5%)	52.9% (2.4%)	51.1% (5.1%)	53.6% (2.8%)
Strongly disagree	13.9% (2.9%)	15.4% (6.0%)	13.4% (3.2%)	11.9% (1.6%)	11.5% (2.8%)	12.0% (2.0%)
Don't know	0.3% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.4% (0.4%)	0.7% (0.3%)	0.6% (0.6%)	0.8% (0.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
f. <i>In the past few years it has become more difficult for eligible people to get on the Food Stamp Program:</i>						
Strongly agree	1.0% (0.8%)	2.7% (2.6%)	0.4% (0.4%)	1.3% (0.6%)	1.9% (1.2%)	1.1% (0.7%)
Agree	9.9% (2.2%)	4.1% (2.9%)	11.9%** (2.8%)	10.0% (1.7%)	7.1% (2.8%)	11.1% (1.9%)
Disagree	65.2% (3.8%)	63.7% (8.6%)	65.7% (4.2%)	64.2% (2.7%)	71.0% (4.7%)	61.8% (3.2%)
Strongly disagree	21.8% (3.7%)	23.5% (7.1%)	21.2% (4.1%)	20.9% (2.0%)	18.6% (3.8%)	21.7% (2.3%)
Don't know	2.2% (1.3%)	6.0% (4.8%)	0.9% (0.7%)	3.6% (0.9%)	1.4% (1.1%)	4.4%* (1.2%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years—Continued

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
<i>g. Among those who agree or strongly agree that it has become more difficult to get food stamps in recent years, groups affected:</i>						
Elderly	4.9% (1.8%)	2.7% (2.6%)	5.7% (2.3%)	4.4% (0.9%)	5.0% (1.8%)	4.2% (1.1%)
Adults without children	2.6% (1.2%)	5.2% (3.5%)	1.7% (1.0%)	2.4% (0.9%)	0.0%	3.3%*** (1.1%)
Immigrants	2.4% (1.3%)	1.6% (1.6%)	2.7% (1.7%)	1.9% (0.7%)	1.1% (1.1%)	2.2% (1.1%)
Disabled	2.1% (1.3%)	0.0%	2.8% (1.7%)	0.5% (0.3%)	1.0% (0.8%)	0.3% (0.3%)
Working poor	1.7% (0.9%)	1.6% (1.6%)	1.7% (1.1%)	3.4% (0.9%)	1.4% (1.0%)	4.1%* (1.2%)
Families with children	—	—	—	0.8% (0.4%)	0.0%	1.1%* (0.6%)
All groups	1.4% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.9%* (1.1%)	1.5% (0.6%)	1.5% (1.2%)	1.6% (0.8%)

Continued

Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years—Continued

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
<i>h. Among those who agree or strongly agree that it has become more difficult to get food stamps in recent years, reasons for increased difficulty:</i>						
Restrictive income and resource policies	2.4% (1.1%)	0.0%	3.2%** (1.5%)	6.6% (1.2%)	6.1% (2.7%)	6.8% (1.4%)
Too many changes in immigration laws	1.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.3% (1.3%)	—	—	—
Not enough outreach	1.0% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.0%)	—	—	—
Too much verification	0.7% (0.7%)	(2.7%) (2.6%)	(2.7%) (2.6%)	0.5% (0.4%)	0.3% (0.3%)	0.6% (0.6%)
New EBT system is intimidating	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.0% (1.0%)	—	—	—
Benefits are too low	0.6% (0.6%)	0%	0.8% (0.8%)	0.7% (0.4%)	1.2% (0.9%)	0.6% (0.4%)
Unable to access office during open hours	0.6% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.8% (0.6%)	0.3% (0.2%)	0.0%	0.4% (0.3%)
Work requirements	0.3% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.4% (0.4%)	1.6% (0.5%)	1.4% (1.1%)	1.7% (0.8%)
Transportation	—	—	—	0.9% (0.6%)	0.7% (0.7%)	0.9% (0.7%)
Short certification periods	—	—	—	0.5% (0.3%)	0.7% (0.7%)	0.5% (0.3%)
Time limits	—	—	—	0.9% (0.5%)	0.0%	1.2%* (0.7%)
Other	1.5% (0.7%)	1.6% (1.6%)	1.4% (0.8%)	2.4% (0.7%)	2.2% (1.4%)	2.5% (0.8%)
Don't know	2.2% (1.3%)	2.5% (2.4%)	2.1% (1.5%)	0.1% (0.1%)	0.0%	0.2% (0.2%)
Total	10.9%	6.8%	12.3%	14.5%	12.6%	15.4%
Number of respondents^c	201	46	155	509	36	373

Continued

Table A3.14—Staff opinions on issues that may affect the willingness of applicants to complete the process and whether Food Stamp Program accessibility has changed in recent years—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.15—Supervisor recommendations for changes in office practices and policies to increase the number of eligible households who complete the food stamp application process

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Supervisors Made Recommendation ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Increased outreach	9.4% (2.7%)	16.8% (6.9%)	6.9% (2.6%)
More staff and staff resources (e.g., computers)	6.6% (3.1%)	2.9% (2.1%)	7.9% (3.9%)
Reduce required verifications and paperwork	4.5% (1.8%)	6.5% (3.8%)	3.7% (2.0%)
Simplify food stamp application form	4.1% (1.7%)	2.7% (2.6%)	4.6% (2.1%)
Extend office hours	4.1% (1.9%)	7.8% (5.1%)	2.8% (1.8%)
Increase benefit levels and support services for applicants/clients	3.3% (1.3%)	0.0%	4.5% (1.7%)
Allow phone interviews for applicants/eliminate face-to-face requirement	2.8% (1.1%)	0.0%	3.8%*** (1.5%)
One-stop shops/better coordination with other agencies	2.2% (1.2%)	0.0%	3.0%* (1.6%)
Change program eligibility policies (e.g., raise car value, loosen eligibility requirements, more deductions)	2.0% (1.0%)	1.6% (1.6%)	2.1% (1.2%)
Lengthen certification period	1.9% (1.0%)	0.0%	2.5%* (1.3%)
Outstation staff/satellite offices	1.9% (1.4%)	0.0%	2.6% (1.8%)
Allow appointments for eligibility interviews	1.8% (1.4%)	0.0%	2.4% (1.9%)
More support/information provided to clients during application process	1.4% (1.1%)	0.0%	1.8% (1.4%)
Supervisor did not have any recommendations	61.1% (4.7%)	64.4% (8.8%)	59.9% (5.0%)
Number of respondents^c	161	43	118

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A3.16—Caseworker recommendations for changes in office practices and policies to increase the number of eligible households who complete the food stamp application process

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworkers Made Recommendation ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Change program eligibility rules	7.0% (1.3%)	6.8% (2.6%)	7.1% (1.4%)
Expand outreach	5.2% (1.4%)	3.2% (1.8%)	6.0% (1.7%)
Provide clearer information to applicants about what is required to complete the application process	4.6% (1.3%)	2.9% (1.7%)	5.3% (2.1%)
Increase staff and resources	3.5% (1.1%)	3.0% (1.7%)	3.7% (1.4%)
Improve workers' "customer service"	3.0% (1.2%)	1.5% (1.4%)	3.5% (2.0%)
Simplify verifications	2.7% (0.9%)	2.7% (1.6%)	2.7% (1.1%)
Provide more translators or bilingual caseworkers	2.4% (1.5%)	0%	3.3%* (1.9%)
Increase support services to clients	2.1% (0.8%)	1.2% (0.8%)	2.5% (1.0%)
Simplify the application form	1.9% (0.7%)	2.8% (1.7%)	1.6% (0.8%)
Process clients the same day they go to office	1.3% (0.7%)	2.2% (1.6%)	1.1% (0.7%)
Reduce caseloads	1.2% (0.6%)	2.2% (1.6%)	0.8% (0.6%)
Eliminate face-to-face interview requirement/process applications over the phone	1.1% (0.8%)	0%	1.5% (1.1%)
Increase benefit levels	0.8% (0.4%)	1.8% (1.1%)	0.4% (0.4%)
Reduce waiting time for clients at the office	0.8% (0.5%)	0%	1.1%* (0.7%)
Provide additional offices/locations in community where applicants can apply for FSP	0.8% (0.6%)	2.3% (2.2%)	0.3% (0.3%)
Have specialized caseworkers handling intake and ongoing cases	0.8% (0.6%)	1.4% (1.4%)	.6% (0.6%)
Increase coordination with other agencies	0.6% (0.4%)	0.8% (0.7%)	0.6% (0.5%)
Do not require applicants to attend a job workshop before seeing an eligibility worker	0.4% (0.4%)	0%	0.6% (0.6%)
Improve environment of office lobby	0.3% (0.3%)	0%	0.5% (0.3%)
Extend office hours	0.3% (0.3%)	0%	0.3% (0.3%)

Continued

Table A3.16—Caseworker recommendations for changes in office practices and policies to increase the number of eligible households who complete the food stamp application process—Continued

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworkers Made Recommendation ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Make reminder call to clients the day before their eligibility interview	0.2% (0.2%)	0.9% (0.9%)	0%
Caseworker did not have any recommendations	64.6% (3.2%)	69.0% (4.8%)	63.1% (4.7%)
Number of respondents^c	368	107	261

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.1—Usual length of food stamp certification periods by type of case

Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is in Effect ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)											
	Length of Food Stamp Certification Period											
	Every 1-3 Months			Every 4-6 Months			Every 7-12 Months			Every 24 Months		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000+		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>Type of Food Stamp Household</i>												
TANF cases with earned income	29.0% (4.5%)	26.9% (7.1%)	29.8% (6.0%)	34.2% (4.0%)	35.0% (7.5%)	33.9% (5.5%)	33.6% (4.6%)	35.1% (7.4%)	33.1% (5.8%)	1.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.4%)
TANF cases without earned income	10.7% (3.2%)	5.8% (4.1%)	12.4% (4.0%)	57.7% (4.4%)	62.1% (7.5%)	56.2% (5.7%)	29.4% (4.2%)	29.1% (7.9%)	29.5% (5.4%)	2.2% (1.3%)	3.0% (2.9%)	1.9% (1.3%)
Non-TANF cases with earned income	47.9% (4.2%)	53.5% (9.6%)	45.9% (5.2%)	20.8% (3.3%)	17.2% (7.6%)	22.1% (4.6%)	28.6% (4.0%)	26.9% (7.8%)	29.2% (4.6%)	2.1% (0.1%)	0.0%	2.8%*** (0.2)%
Elderly or disabled clients	1.1% (1.1%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.4%)	4.5% (1.9%)	5.7% (3.9%)	4.1% (2.2%)	76.2% (4.3%)	79.9% (6.9%)	74.9% (5.4%)	16.9% (3.8%)	11.9% (5.7%)	18.7% (4.9%)
ABAWDs	50.6% (4.8%)	42.1% (8.7%)	53.5% (5.7%)	10.7% (3.4%)	15.1% (6.8%)	9.1% (3.7%)	7.0% (2.0%)	7.9% (4.5%)	6.7% (2.1%)	0.6% (0.6%)	2.5% (2.4%)	0.0%

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150. Number of supervisors answering the survey question: 109.

Table A4.2—How often clients must visit an office to complete a recertification															
Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)														
	How often is an office visit required?														
	No Office Visit is Required			Every 1-3 Months			Every 4-6 Months			Every 7-12 Months			Every 24 Months		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
Under 2000		2000+	Under 2000		2000+	Under 2000		2000+	Under 2000		2000+	Under 2000		2000+	Under 2000
<i>Type of Food Stamp Household</i>															
TANF cases with earned income	2.0% (0.3%)	0.0%	2.7%*** (0.5%)	16.3% (3.6%)	21.7% (6.4%)	14.4% (4.4%)	29.9% (4.2%)	32.5% (7.3%)	28.9% (5.1%)	48.6% (4.4%)	39.9% (7.9%)	51.6% (5.4%)	1.0% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.4%)
TANF cases without earned income	2.0% (1.4%)	0.0%	2.7% (1.9%)	5.6% (2.2%)	5.8% (4.1%)	5.5% (2.5%)	49.5% (4.2%)	52.8% (8.0%)	48.3% (5.6%)	41.5% (4.1%)	38.4% (8.6%)	42.6% (5.7%)	0.0%	—	—
Non-TANF cases with earned income	5.2% (2.0%)	4.4% (4.3%)	5.5% (2.1%)	31.4% (3.4%)	39.7% (8.6%)	28.5% (4.3%)	18.7% (3.8%)	15.6% (7.0%)	19.7% (4.4%)	39.8% (4.3%)	32.1% (8.3%)	42.5% (5.1%)	3.5% (1.0%)	2.8% (2.8%)	3.8% (1.0%)
Elderly or disabled clients	25.6% (4.5%)	25.9% (7.4%)	25.5% (5.3%)	1.1% (1.1%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.4%)	2.1% (1.2%)	2.7% (2.6%)	1.8% (1.3%)	42.1% (4.0%)	44.2% (7.3%)	41.3% (5.3%)	29.2% (4.7%)	27.1% (8.1%)	29.9% (5.7%)
ABAWDs	3.3% (1.9%)	0.0%	4.4% (2.6%)	44.9% (4.2%)	39.7% (8.3%)	46.8% (4.9%)	8.4% (2.6%)	15.1% (6.8%)	6.1% (2.2%)	11.6% (3.4%)	10.2% (5.1%)	12.1% (4.2%)	0.0%	—	—

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150. Number of supervisors answering the survey question: 109.

Table A4.3—Food stamp recertification appointments			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Caseworkers' Reports:			
a. Does caseworker have discretion to set shorter certification periods for any food stamp client than the usual office policy?			
Yes	24.1% (2.2%)	24.8% (4.4%)	23.9% (2.6%)
No	75.9% (2.2%)	75.2% (4.4%)	76.1% (2.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Among offices where caseworkers can set shorter certification periods, set shorter periods for the following types of clients:			
Clients with fluctuating income	12.6% (1.7%)	10.5% (2.9%)	13.4% (2.1%)
Clients worker assumes to be error-prone	6.1% (1.5%)	3.8% (1.9%)	7.0% (1.8%)
Clients expecting changes in household circumstances (household members, job status)	4.0% (1.0%)	7.2% (2.5%)	2.9% (1.8%)
Clients with no income	3.7% (1.2%)	4.7% (2.8%)	3.4% (1.4%)
To align certification period with other programs	1.4% (0.6%)	3.0% (1.7%)	0.8% (0.5%)
ABAWDs	1.3% (0.8%)	0.3% (0.3%)	1.7% (1.0%)
Homeless	1.1% (0.5%)	0.0%	1.5%** (0.6%)
Clients with children	0.8% (0.6%)	2.3% (2.3%)	0.2% (0.2%)
Clients with drug/alcohol abuse	0.2% (0.2%)	0.0%	0.2% (0.2%)
Recently employed clients	0.2% (0.2%)	0.0%	0.2% (0.2%)
Other	1.3% (0.6%)	1.7% (1.4%)	1.0% (0.7%)

Continued

Table A4.3—Food stamp recertification appointments—Continued			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
c. Usual scheduling procedures for in-person recertification interviews:			
A time and date are assigned, but they can be rescheduled by the client	74.8% (2.0%)	81.2% (3.5%)	72.5% (2.5%)
Clients are assigned a specific time and date	10.7% (1.6%)	6.0% (2.4%)	12.3% (1.9%)
Clients can schedule their own appointment time and date	9.9% (1.4%)	10.4% (2.7%)	9.7% (1.6%)
Clients walk in and line up for appointment	1.4% (0.6%)	2.1% (0.9%)	1.1% (0.7%)
Clients can schedule in advance or walk in for an appointment	0.6% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.8%* (0.5%)
Other	2.5% (1.3%)	0.0%	3.3% (1.8%)
Don't know	0.3% (0.2%)	0.3% (0.3%)	0.3% (0.3%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
d. Usual practice when a client misses a recertification interview:			
Close the case when the certification period ends without any further notice	32.5% (2.4%)	33.4% (4.4%)	32.2% (2.9%)
Notify client that he/she must schedule another interview	29.1% (2.2%)	33.5% (4.5%)	27.5% (2.5%)
Notify client that food stamp benefits are discontinued and he/she will have to reapply	21.4% (2.1%)	20.2% (3.6%)	21.8% (2.6%)
Automatically schedule for another day	10.1% (1.5%)	7.9% (2.6%)	10.8% (1.8%)
Provide client with an extended deadline before closing case	2.0% (0.9%)	2.3% (1.4%)	1.9% (1.2%)
Other	1.0% (0.5%)	0.6% (0.6%)	1.1% (0.6%)
Client is not given scheduled appointment for recertification	4.1% (1.1%)	2.1% (0.9%)	4.8% (1.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.3—Food stamp recertification appointments—Continued			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
e. Usual practice when a client arrives at least 30 minutes late for a prescheduled recertification appointment:			
Reschedule for the same day	68.7% (2.3 %)	72.8% (4.0%)	67.3% (2.8%)
Reschedule for another day	25.8% (2.0%)	24.4% (3.9%)	26.2% (2.5%)
Client is not given scheduled appointment for recertification	4.1% (1.1%)	2.1% (0.9%)	4.8% (1.5%)
Don't know	1.5% (0.6%)	0.7% (0.7%)	1.7% (0.8%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
f. Do caseworkers usually report contacting clients by phone if they do not respond to notices informing them they must recertify?			
Yes	21.9% (2.1%)	25.7% (4.2%)	20.6% (2.4%)
No	77.4% (2.2%)	74.3% (4.2%)	78.5% (2.4%)
Don't know	0.6% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.9% (0.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	410	117	293
Supervisors' Reports:			
g. Are TANF and FSP recertifications usually conducted during the same appointment?			
Yes	93.9% (2.2%)	97.2% (2.8%)	92.7% (3.1%)
No	6.1% (2.2%)	2.8% (2.8%)	7.3% (3.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.3—Food stamp recertification appointments—Continued			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>h. When participants are notified they must recertify (in relation to the end of certification period):</i>			
7 days or less	2.8% (1.6%)	2.8% (2.8%)	2.8% (2.0%)
8 days to 2 weeks	26.2% (4.5%)	30.0% (7.3%)	24.9% (5.5%)
15 days to 3 weeks	8.1% (2.6%)	5.5% (3.8%)	9.0% (3.2%)
22 days to 4 weeks	11.4% (3.8%)	8.6% (4.9%)	12.3% (4.7%)
29 days to 5 weeks	26.3% (4.6%)	28.4% (8.2%)	25.6% (5.0%)
More than 5 weeks	25.3% (3.5%)	24.6% (7.6%)	25.5% (4.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of respondents^d</i>	109-111	33	76-78

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.4—Availability of telephone or at-home recertification interviews for persons with hardships			
Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is Reported^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>Types of food stamp households routinely offered telephone or at-home recertification interviews:</i>			
Households with only disabled members	70.3% (2.4%)	79.1% (3.8%)	67.3%** (3.0%)
Households with only elderly members	54.0% (2.6%)	64.6% (4.6%)	50.3%** (3.2%)
Households lacking transportation	16.1% (2.0%)	27.2% (4.7%)	12.2%*** (2.0%)
Homebound/hospitalized/temporary illness or medical condition	13.7% (1.8%)	8.0% (2.1%)	15.7%** (2.4%)
Households with earnings or other work-related commitments that pose a barrier to going into the office	6.7% (1.4%)	4.6% (2.0%)	7.4% (1.7%)
TANF households	2.6% (0.8%)	1.7% (1.3%)	2.9% (0.9%)
Other member of family is sick, disabled, or has chronic illness (e.g., child)	1.0% (0.5%)	2.1% (1.5%)	0.7% (0.4%)
Pregnant/recently gave birth	0.6% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.8% (0.6%)
Inclement weather	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
Other	1.9% (0.7%)	1.4% (0.8%)	2.1% (0.9%)
At-home recertification interviews are not routinely offered to any group	17.5% (1.9%)	14.5% (3.3%)	18.6% (2.4%)
<i>Number of respondents^c</i>	410	117	293

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.5—Caseworker recommendations for changes in office procedures to decrease the number of eligible individuals who leave the FSP because they do not complete recertification

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworkers Made Recommendations ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Lengthen certification periods	6.5% (1.5%)	5.2% (2.4%)	7.0% (1.8%)
Follow-up calls/notices to clients who miss their appointment	5.8% (1.4%)	5.1% (1.8%)	6.1% (1.8%)
Require clients to go into the office less often for recertifications	4.8% (1.2%)	6.3% (2.4%)	4.2% (1.4%)
Have caseworkers provide better explanations of the process to clients	2.6% (0.8%)	0.0%	3.5%** (1.1%)
Reminder calls/letters before their scheduled appointment	1.9% (0.7%)	2.3% (1.4%)	1.7% (0.8%)
More outreach	1.0% (0.5%)	0.6% (0.6%)	1.2% (0.7%)
Outstation workers	1.0% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.3% (1.0%)
Simplify recertification forms	1.0% (0.5%)	2.4% (1.5%)	0.5% (0.4%)
More staff	1.0% (0.5%)	2.2% (1.5%)	0.5%** (0.4%)
Provide better information in the mail explaining the process	0.8% (0.5%)	0.0%	1.1% (0.6%)
Track clients better	0.7% (0.4%)	0.3% (0.3%)	0.8% (0.5%)

Continued

Table A4.5—Caseworker recommendations for changes in office procedures to decrease the number of eligible individuals who leave the FSP because they do not complete recertification—Continued

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworkers Made Recommendations ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Improve automated computer system	0.6% (0.3%)	0%	0.8%*** (0.5%)
Have specialized recertification workers	0.6% (0.4%)	0.3% (0.3%)	0.8% (0.6%)
Have clients schedule initial appointments	0.6% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.8% (0.6%)
Give caseworkers more time to work with clients	0.5% (0.4%)	1.2% (1.2%)	0.3% (0.3%)
Other	8.8% (1.5%)	10.3% (3.0%)	8.2% (1.7%)
No suggested changes	54.8% (2.7%)	54.4% (5.3%)	54.9% (3.2%)
Don't know	11.9% (1.8%)	15.5% (3.9%)	10.6% (2.0%)
Number of respondents^c	410	117	293

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.6—Systems used for reporting of food stamp household changes			
Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Is the office in a State with a change reporting waiver?			
Yes	66.2% (2.2%)	72.6% (6.1%)	64.0% (2.9%)
No	33.8% (2.2%)	27.4% (6.1%)	36.0% (2.9%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Types of change reporting waivers:			
Income change reporting required for an \$80 or \$100 increase in earned income (instead of \$25)	29.9% (2.6%)	28.6% (7.0%)	30.4% (2.8%)
Income change reporting required for changes in the source of earned income, wage rate, or employment status (e.g., part to full or full to part time)	41.5% (2.7%)	45.7% (7.2%)	40.1% (3.4%)
Income change reporting required for changes in the source of earned income or wage rate, or for an increase or decrease in hours worked of more than five hours a week that is expected to continue for more than a month	6.5% (1.1%)	5.4% (3.1%)	6.8% (1.1%)
c. Does office require periodic reporting for any clients?			
Yes	48.6% (3.7%)	42.0% (8.2%)	50.9% (4.2%)
No	51.1% (3.7%)	58.0% (8.2%)	48.6% (4.2%)
Don't know	0.3% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.4% (0.4%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.6—Systems used for reporting of food stamp household changes—Continued			
Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is in Effect^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>d. Types of periodic reporting used:</i>			
Monthly	27.6% (2.8%)	23.8% (7.5%)	28.5% (5.2%)
Quarterly	28.7% (4.5%)	21.7% (7.7%)	31.2% (7.7%)
Other	3.1% (1.9%)	0.0%	4.2% (2.6%)
Not reported	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
<i>Number of respondents</i>	168	44	124

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Sources: Waiver information (a, b): *Change Reporting Waivers and Categorical Eligibility Summary*, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, October 2001; Periodic reporting (c, d): Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.7—Periodic reporting requirements by type of food stamp household

Policy	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)								
	Monthly Reporting Required			Quarterly Reporting Required			No Periodic Reporting Required		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>Type of Food Stamp Household</i>									
TANF clients with earnings	25.6% (4.0%)	21.0% (7.2%)	27.2% (5.1%)	24.6% (4.1%)	17.1% (6.3%)	27.2% (5.4%)	49.9% (4.3%)	61.9% (8.3%)	45.7%* (5.1%)
TANF clients without earnings	12.7% (2.9%)	12.6% (6.0%)	12.7% (3.5%)	7.6% (3.1%)	6.3% (4.3%)	8.0% (4.1%)	79.8% (4.1%)	81.1% (6.9%)	79.3% (5.0%)
Non-TANF clients with earned income	21.3% (3.7%)	21.0% (7.2%)	21.4% (4.5%)	21.5% (3.6%)	17.1% (6.3%)	23.0% (4.6%)	57.3% (4.5%)	61.9% (8.3%)	55.7% (5.6%)
Households with fluctuating income	0.7% (0.7%)	2.8% (2.8%)	0.0%	1.5% (1.1%)	2.8% (2.8%)	1.0% (1.0%)	97.8% (1.3%)	94.3% (3.9%)	99.0% (1.0%)
Recently unemployed clients	1.9% (1.0%)	7.2% (3.9%)	0.0%*	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)	97.7% (1.1%)	92.8% (3.9%)	99.5% (0.5%)
Self-employed clients ^c	0.3% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)	1.7% (1.3%)	4.5% (4.5%)	0.8% (0.8%)	97.2% (1.5%)	95.5% (4.6%)	97.8% (1.4%)
Other ^c	0.6% (0.4%)	1.2% (0.8%)	0.4% (0.4%)	1.5% (0.9%)	1.7% (1.7%)	1.5% (1.1%)	97.1% (1.1%)	97.0% (1.9%)	97.2% (1.4%)

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c Rows sum to less than 100% because a few offices allow annual or other reporting for those types of cases.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150. Number of respondents answering the survey question: 109.

Table A4.8—Policy when clients fail to meet periodic reporting deadlines

Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Among offices requiring periodic reporting, policy on actions to be taken by staff when participant does not meet the deadline for submission of the periodic report:			
Send a notice to submit the report within a set number of days	33.2% (3.4%)	39.7% (8.2%)	31.0% (3.5%)
Extend deadline without notice	2.1% (1.5%)	0%	2.8% (2.0%)
Extend deadline with a phone call reminder	0.2% (0.2%)	0%	0.3% (0.3%)
Automatically close case	12.1% (3.1%)	2.4% (1.8%)	15.5%*** (4.0%)
Don't know	1.0% (1.0%)	0%	1.4% (1.4%)
Total	48.6%	42.0%	50.9%
b. Among offices requiring periodic reporting, policy on actions to be taken by staff when participant meets the deadline but provides incomplete information:			
Send a notice to submit the report within a set number of days	38.4% (3.4%)	33.3% (7.8%)	40.2% (4.0%)
Extend deadline without notice	2.5% (1.6%)	1.4% (1.4%)	2.9% (2.0%)
Automatically close case	5.8% (2.1%)	7.3% (4.0%)	5.3% (2.4%)
No set office policy	0.8% (0.8%)	0%	1.0% (1.0%)
Don't know	1.0% (1.0%)	0%	1.4% (1.4%)
Total	48.6%	42.0%	50.9%

Continued

Table A4.8—Policy when clients fail to meet periodic reporting deadlines—Continued

Policy/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>c. Among offices requiring periodic reporting, supervisor estimate of the percent of cases closed for failure to submit the report in a typical month:</i>			
None	1.9% (1.3%)	4.5% (4.6%)	0.9% (0.7%)
Less than 5 percent, but at least 1 percent	19.6% (3.3%)	7.2% (3.8%)	23.9%*** (4.1%)
Between 5 percent and 25 percent	16.5% (3.1%)	20.7% (5.7%)	15.0% (3.6%)
Between 25 percent and 50 percent	3.7% (1.8%)	2.8% (2.8%)	4.1% (2.1%)
Couldn't provide an estimate	7.0% (1.9%)	6.8% (3.7%)	7.0% (2.4%)
Total	48.6%	42.0%	50.9%
Number of respondents^c	168	44	124

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.9—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF work rules

Policy/Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Does office have a policy of imposing sanctions on food stamp benefits for violations of TANF work requirements?			
Yes	62.9% (4.7%)	54.8% (9.1%)	65.8% (5.6%)
No	34.3% (4.6%)	37.4% (9.2%)	33.3% (5.5%)
Don't know	2.7% (1.4%)	7.8% (4.6%)	1.0% (1.0%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Among offices imposing food stamp sanctions for violations of TANF work requirements, office policy on maximum food stamp penalty imposed:			
Reduce food stamp benefits by a certain percentage	9.2% (2.9%)	8.2% (4.7%)	9.6% (3.5%)
Disqualify the head of the household	35.2% (4.6%)	34.7% (8.0%)	35.3% (5.5%)
Disqualify the whole household	18.5% (3.7%)	11.9% (6.9%)	20.9% (5.0%)
Total	62.9%	54.8%	65.8%
c. Among offices imposing food stamp sanctions for violations of TANF work requirements, does office policy allow sanctions if the household includes a child under age 6?			
Yes	14.3% (3.4%)	15.8% (6.7%)	13.8% (3.8%)
No	45.4% (5.1%)	36.3% (9.3%)	48.6% (6.3%)
Don't know	3.2% (1.6%)	2.7% (2.6%)	3.4% (2.0%)

Continued

Table A4.9—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF work rules—Continued

Policy/Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
d. Among offices who disqualify the household head for violations of TANF work requirements, length of food stamp sanction:			
A set period of time	15.0% (3.7%)	15.8% (6.4%)	14.7% (4.5%)
Until compliance	16.9% (3.7%)	16.6% (6.1%)	17.0% (4.6%)
Until compliance or withdrawal from TANF	0.6% (0.6%)	2.3% (2.4%)	0.0%
Don't know	2.7% (1.9%)	0.0%	3.6% (2.6%)
Total	35.2%	34.7%	35.3%
e. Among offices who disqualify the whole household for violations of TANF work requirements, after how many TANF work rule violations is the whole household disqualified from food stamps?			
After the first violation	13.8% (3.3%)	7.5% (5.5%)	16.0% (3.9%)
After the third violation	4.0% (1.6%)	4.4% (4.3%)	3.8% (3.7%)
Don't know	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.1% (1.1%)
Total	62.9%	54.8%	65.8%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76

Continued

Table A4.9—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF work rules—Continued

Policy/Practice	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Caseworkers' Reports:			
<i>f. Do caseworkers ever report imposing sanctions on food stamp benefits for violations of TANF work rules?</i>			
Yes	54.3% (3.5%)	56.4% (6.5%)	53.6% (4.1%)
No	44.8% (3.5%)	43.7% (6.5%)	45.2% (4.1%)
Don't know	0.9% (0.6%)	0.0%	1.2% (0.9%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^d	213	61	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.10—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF requirements other than work rules

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Does office impose sanctions on food stamp benefits for violations of TANF requirements other than work requirements?			
Yes	22.7% (3.0%)	23.3% (7.3%)	22.4% (3.7%)
No	76.8% (3.0%)	74.4% (7.6%)	77.6% (3.7%)
Don't know	0.6% (0.6%)	2.3% (2.4%)	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Among offices imposing food stamp sanctions for TANF violations other than work requirement violations, TANF non-work rule violations resulting in a food stamp sanction:			
Failure to cooperate with child support enforcement	17.7% (2.4%)	17.6% (6.6%)	17.7% (3.0%)
Minor child's school attendance problems	4.4% (2.0%)	2.8% (2.8%)	4.9% (2.5%)
Teen parent's school attendance problems	1.5% (1.1%)	3.0% (3.0%)	1.0% (1.0%)
Failure to complete child immunizations	1.5% (1.0%)	5.7% (3.9%)	0.0%

Continued

Table A4.10—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF requirements other than work rules—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
c. Among offices imposing food stamp sanctions for TANF violations other than work requirement violations, office policy on maximum food stamp penalty imposed:			
Reduce food stamp benefits by a certain percentage	4.8% (2.0%)	8.5% (4.7%)	3.5% (2.1%)
Disqualify the head of the household	13.4% (2.5%)	11.8% (5.5%)	14.0% (2.8%)
Disqualify the whole household	3.5% (1.8%)	3.0% (3.0%)	3.7% (2.2%)
Don't know	0.9% (0.9%)	0.0%	1.2% (1.2%)
Total	22.7%	23.3%	22.4%
d. Among offices that disqualify the household head for TANF violations other than work requirement violations, length of food stamp sanction:			
A set period of time	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.1% (1.1%)
Until compliance	12.6% (2.6%)	11.8% (5.5%)	12.9% (2.9%)
Total	13.4%	11.8%	14.0%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76

Continued

Table A4.10—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF requirements other than work rules—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Caseworkers' Reports:			
e. Do caseworkers report ever imposing sanctions on food stamp benefits for violations of TANF requirements other than work requirements?			
Yes	24.3% (3.2%)	25.2% (6.8%)	24.0% (3.7%)
No	73.7% (3.2%)	73.4% (6.8%)	73.8% (3.7%)
Don't know	2.0% (0.9%)	1.4% (1.4%)	2.3% (1.2%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
f. Caseworker estimate of proportion of TANF clients whose food stamp benefits are sanctioned for violation of TANF work or non-work rules (in a typical month):			
At least one client, but less than 10 percent	39.4% (3.3%)	41.6% (6.6%)	38.6% (3.6%)
At least 10 percent, but less than 50 percent	5.9% (1.5%)	2.8% (1.9%)	7.0% (1.9%)
At least 50 percent, but less than 90 percent	2.0% (1.3%)	5.8% (4.4%)	0.7% (0.7%)
More than 90 percent	0.4% (0.4%)	1.4% (1.4%)	0.0%
Caseworker could not provide an estimate	10.2% (2.5%)	7.6% (3.8%)	11.1% (3.0%)
Caseworker reported no food stamp sanctions for violations of TANF rules	42.2% (3.4%)	40.9% (6.5%)	42.6% (4.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^d	213	61	152

Continued

Table A4.10—Food stamp benefit sanctions for violations of TANF requirements other than work rules—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.11—Food stamp employment and training requirements

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Do supervisors report having a food stamp employment and training program available for clients?			
Yes	73.5% (4.8%)	63.7% (9.3%)	76.9% (5.7%)
No	26.5% (4.8%)	36.3% (9.3%)	23.1% (5.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Location of food stamp employment and training (E&T) placement staff:			
Same building as FSP eligibility staff	31.6% (5.1%)	26.8% (8.0%)	33.2% (5.7%)
Different building than FSP eligibility staff	41.9% (4.9%)	36.9% (9.4%)	43.7% (5.5%)
Total	73.5%	63.7%	76.9%
c. Existence of E&T specifically for non-TANF, non-ABAWD clients:			
Yes	63.3% (5.1%)	55.6% (9.0%)	66.0% (6.1%)
No; E&T is available, but only serves ABAWDs	8.9% (2.5%)	5.7% (4.0%)	10.0% (3.2%)
No E&T program available	26.5% (4.8%)	36.3% (9.3%)	23.1% (5.7%)
Don't know	1.3% (0.9%)	2.5% (2.4%)	0.9% (0.9%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.11—Food stamp employment and training requirements—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
d. Among offices with food stamp E&T program for non-TANF, non-ABAWD clients, are non-ABAWDs required to participate in E&T as a condition of eligibility?			
Yes	33.0% (4.8%)	23.6% (8.4%)	36.3% (5.4%)
No	26.8% (4.9%)	29.5% (8.1%)	25.9% (6.1%)
Don't know	3.5% (1.8%)	2.5% (2.4%)	3.9% (2.3%)
Total	63.3%	55.6%	66.0%
e. Among offices with food stamp E&T program for non-TANF, non-ABAWD clients, where clients are required to participate, is the requirement limited to job search or job search training?			
Yes	10.2% (3.0%)	7.9% (5.3%)	11.1% (3.7%)
No, requirement includes other E&T activities	15.4% (3.6%)	9.7% (5.8%)	17.4% (4.4%)
Don't know	7.3% (2.7%)	6.0% (4.2%)	7.8% (3.3%)
Total	33.0%	23.6%	36.3%
f. Among offices with food stamp E&T program for non-TANF, non-ABAWD clients, where clients are required to participate, what is the sanction policy if the head of the household fails to comply?			
Only the individual head of the household is sanctioned	22.7% (4.1%)	19.1% (7.1)	23.9% (4.8%)
The whole household is sanctioned	10.3% (3.0%)	4.5% (4.6%)	12.4% (3.6%)
Total	33.0%	23.6%	36.3%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76

Continued

Table A4.11—Food stamp employment and training requirements—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Caseworkers' Reports:			
<i>g. Do caseworkers report having a food stamp employment and training program available for clients who utilize the office?</i>			
Yes	68.9% (3.0%)	54.4% (6.1%)	74.0%** (3.2%)
No	29.1% (3.1%)	42.4% (5.9%)	24.5%* (3.5%)
Don't know	2.0% (1.0%)	3.2% (2.3%)	1.5% (1.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>h. Among offices with food stamp E&T programs, caseworker estimate of the proportion of non-TANF clients (ABAWDs and non-ABAWDs) required to participate in the E&T program who have their food stamp benefits sanctioned due to noncompliance with the E&T requirement:</i>			
None	10.8% (2.1%)	8.2% (3.3%)	11.7% (2.5%)
At least one client, but less than one-quarter	37.9% (3.3%)	31.0% (5.9%)	40.4% (3.9%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	7.0% (1.8%)	3.7% (2.7%)	8.1% (2.2%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	3.3% (1.3%)	3.2% (2.2%)	3.3% (1.6%)
More than three-quarters	0.8% (0.5%)	1.4% (1.4%)	0.5% (0.5%)
Program is not mandatory for any participants	0.6% (0.5%)	1.2% (1.2%)	0.4% (0.4%)
Caseworker not able to provide an estimate	8.6% (2.2%)	5.8% (2.9%)	9.6% (2.8%)
Total	68.9%	54.4%	74.0%
<i>Number of respondents^d</i>	218	66	152

Continued

Table A4.11—Food stamp employment and training requirements—Continued
--

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.12—Child support sanctions for non-TANF food stamp recipients

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. What is the food stamp sanction policy for non-TANF clients who fail to cooperate with child support enforcement agency?			
No sanction is imposed	78.3% (4.0%)	83.1% (6.4%)	76.6% (5.3%)
Only custodial parents can be sanctioned	10.3% (3.4%)	2.8% (2.8%)	12.9%* (4.4%)
Both custodial and non-custodial parents can be sanctioned	7.9% (1.8%)	11.6% (5.6%)	6.6% (2.7%)
Don't know	3.6% (1.8%)	2.5% (2.4%)	4.0% (2.3%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76
Caseworkers' Reports:			
b. Do caseworkers report imposing food stamp sanctions on any non-TANF clients for failure to cooperate with child support agency?			
Yes	27.7% (3.1%)	16.7% (4.6%)	31.6%** (3.8%)
No	69.2% (3.1%)	78.8% (5.1%)	65.8%* (3.9%)
Don't know	3.1% (1.1%)	4.5% (2.6%)	2.6% (1.2%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.12—Child support sanctions for non-TANF food stamp recipients—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>c. Among offices whose caseworkers have imposed sanctions, caseworker estimate of the proportion of non-TANF households required to cooperate with the child support agency who have had a sanction imposed for failure to cooperate:</i>			
None	5.1% (2.2%)	2.7% (1.9%)	5.9% (2.8%)
At least one household, but less than one-quarter	19.2% (2.6%)	12.5% (4.5%)	21.5% (3.2%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	1.3% (0.7%)	1.4% (1.4%)	1.2% (0.9%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
More than three-quarters	0.0%	—	—
Caseworker not able to provide an estimate	1.7% (0.9%)	0.0%	2.3%* (1.2%)
Total	27.7%	16.7%	31.6%
Number of respondents^d	218	66	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.13—ABAWDs and the work requirement

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Are ABAWDs waived from the food stamp work requirement and time limit?			
Yes	31.2% (3.5%)	32.5% (7.3%)	30.7% (4.1%)
No	68.8% (3.5%)	67.5% (7.3%)	69.3% (4.1%)
b. Among offices where ABAWDs are not waived from work requirement and time limit, existence of food stamp employment and training (E&T) program to help ABAWDs meet their work requirement:			
Yes	54.6% (4.5%)	43.9% (8.6%)	58.4% (5.6%)
No	13.6% (3.3%)	21.1% (7.9%)	10.9% (3.5%)
Don't know	0.6% (0.6%)	2.5% (2.4%)	0.0%
Total	68.8%	67.5%	69.3%
Number of respondents^c	201	46	155
Caseworkers' Reports:			
c. Usual follow-up procedures for ABAWDs who have lost food stamp benefits due to the time limit (more than one can apply):			
A written notice is sent to them	21.1% (2.9%)	14.7% (4.7%)	23.3% (3.5%)
They are contacted by telephone	8.3% (2.1%)	10.8% (3.9%)	7.4% (2.3%)
Their food stamps are put on hold	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.5% (0.5%)
No follow-up is usually conducted to explain how they might regain food stamp eligibility	40.3% (3.5%)	39.4% (5.7%)	40.6% (4.2%)
Don't know	4.9% (1.5%)	10.8% (3.8%)	2.9%* (1.5%)

Continued

Table A4.13—ABAWDs and the work requirement—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>d. Among offices where ABAWDs are not waived from work requirement and time limit, caseworker estimate of the proportion of ABAWDs who left the program due to the time limit and regained eligibility through employment or participation in the E&T program:</i>			
None	5.5% (1.8%)	5.0% (2.9%)	5.7% (2.2%)
At least one ABAWD, but less than one-quarter	25.0% (2.8%)	26.1% (5.1%)	24.7% (3.5%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	10.9% (2.0%)	8.2% (3.1%)	11.8% (2.5%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	6.6% (1.8%)	6.0% (3.4%)	6.8% (2.1%)
More than three-quarters	5.6% (1.5%)	8.6% (3.3%)	4.5% (1.6%)
Caseworker not able to provide estimate	15.4% (2.5%)	13.7% (3.8%)	15.9% (3.3%)
Total	68.8%	67.5%	69.3%
Number of respondents^d	216	66	150

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.14—TANF case closures due to program sanctions and effect on continuation of food stamp benefits

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Supervisors' Reports:			
a. Do office TANF sanction policies ever result in TANF case closures due to violations of TANF rules?			
Yes	65.1% (4.3%)	68.1% (8.0%)	64.1% (4.8%)
No	29.7% (3.5%)	31.9% (8.0%)	28.9% (4.2%)
Don't know	5.2% (3.1%)	0.0%	7.0%* (4.0%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76
Caseworkers' Reports:			
b. Do caseworkers report having closed any TANF cases due to violations of TANF rules?			
Yes	58.5% (3.4%)	62.4% (6.4%)	57.1% (4.1%)
No	40.7% (3.4%)	37.6% (6.4%)	41.8% (4.1%)
Don't know	0.8% (0.6%)	0.0%	1.1% (0.8%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.14—TANF case closures due to program sanctions and effect on continuation of food stamp benefits—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
c. Among offices where caseworkers have closed TANF cases for violation of TANF rules, when a household's TANF case is closed due to a sanction, how is food stamp certification period affected?			
No change in food stamp certification period	38.3% (3.3%)	44.3% (7.0%)	36.2% (3.8%)
Certification period is shortened to the one used for non-TANF households	7.8% (2.0%)	11.5% (4.7%)	6.6% (2.0%)
The food stamp case is automatically closed	6.6% (2.2%)	2.2% (2.2%)	8.1%* (2.8%)
The food stamp certification period is shortened to the end of the next month	3.6% (1.4%)	4.4% (2.6%)	3.3% (1.2%)
Suspend food stamp case until the client comes in for recertification	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.0% (1.0%)
Shortened to three-month certification period	0.4% (0.4%)	0.0%	0.6% (0.6%)
Depends	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
Don't know	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7%* (0.7%)
Total	58.5%	62.4%	57.1%
d. Among offices where caseworkers have closed TANF cases for violation of TANF rules, and the food stamp case is <u>not</u> closed or shortened to the end of the next month, does the household have to go into the office to have the benefit level redetermined?			
Yes	14.0% (2.5%)	18.2% (5.9%)	12.5% (2.6%)
No, information can be sent by mail or over the phone	33.2% (3.4%)	37.7% (6.9%)	31.6% (3.9%)
Don't know	0.7% (0.5%)	0.0%	1.0%** (0.7)
Total	47.8%	55.8%	45.0%

Continued

Table A4.14—TANF case closures due to program sanctions and effect on continuation of food stamp benefits—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
e. Among offices where caseworkers have closed TANF cases for violation of TANF rules and the food stamp case is closed, is the household notified that it will still be eligible for food stamp benefits?			
Yes	3.4% (1.5%)	2.2% (2.2%)	3.8% (1.8%)
No	3.2% (1.8%)	0.0%	4.3%* (2.4%)
Total	6.6%	2.2%	8.1%
f. Among offices where caseworkers have closed TANF cases for violation of TANF rules, caseworker estimate of the proportion of TANF cases that continued to receive food stamp benefits after TANF closure:			
Less than one-quarter	2.4% (1.0%)	4.9% (2.8%)	1.5% (0.9%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	0.8% (0.6%)	1.4% (1.4%)	0.6% (0.6%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	8.6% (2.1%)	2.8% (1.9%)	10.6%** (2.8%)
More than three-quarters	44.1% (3.6%)	49.9% (7.5%)	42.1% (4.6%)
Caseworker unable to provide estimate	2.6% (1.5%)	3.5% (2.4%)	2.3% (1.8%)
Total	58.5%	62.4%	57.1%
Number of respondents^d	213	61	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.15—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households when they reach the TANF time limit

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. Had the State's TANF limit come into effect?			
Yes	45.2% (4.3%)	41.0% (8.9%)	46.7% (5.7%)
No	54.8% (4.3%)	59.0% (8.9%)	53.3% (5.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. Among offices whose State's TANF time limit had come into effect, when a household leaves TANF because of the time limit, how is food stamp certification affected?			
No change in food stamp certification period	28.6% (2.8%)	25.5% (6.0%)	29.7% (3.3%)
Certification period is shortened to the one used for non-TANF households with earned income	8.3% (2.2%)	8.9% (3.8%)	8.1% (2.5%)
Certification period shortened to the end of the next month	2.4% (0.9%)	2.8% (2.0%)	2.3% (1.0%)
Food stamp case is automatically closed	0.0%	—	—
Case stays open, but is transferred to a different unit	—	—	—
Varies	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
Caseworker reported never having closed a TANF case because of the time limit	4.4% (1.3%)	3.9% (2.0%)	4.6% (1.5%)
Don't know	1.0% (0.5%)	0.0%	1.4% (0.7%)
Total	45.2%	41.0%	46.7%

Continued

Table A4.15—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households when they reach the TANF time limit—Continued

Policy/Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Policy or Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
c. Among offices whose State's TANF time limit had come into effect, whose caseworkers had closed TANF cases and the food stamp case was <u>not</u> closed or shortened to the end of the next month, does the household have to come into the office to have their benefit level redetermined?			
Yes	6.4% (1.9%)	4.6% (2.6%)	7.1% (2.3%)
No, information can be sent by mail or over the phone	19.7% (2.6%)	11.4% (5.2%)	22.5%* (3.0%)
No, contact with client needed	11.4% (2.0%)	18.4% (5.1%)	8.9% (2.1%)
Total	37.4%	34.3%	38.4%
d. Caseworker estimate of the proportion of clients who reached a State TANF time limit and continued to receive food stamps after their TANF case was closed:			
More than three-quarters	32.1% (2.9%)	33.2% (6.4%)	31.7% (3.5%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	2.7% (1.2%)	0.0%	3.7%** (1.6%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	1.9% (0.9%)	3.9% (2.3%)	1.2% (0.9%)
At least one client, but less than one-quarter	1.2% (0.9%)	0.0%	1.6% (1.2%)
None	0.9% (0.6%)	0.0%	1.2% (0.8%)
Caseworker could not provide an estimate	2.2% (0.9%)	0.0%	2.9%** (1.2%)
Total	40.8%	37.1%	42.1%
Number of respondents^c	213	61	152

Continued

Table A4.15—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households when they reach the TANF time limit—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Sources: Time limit information (a): *Temporary Assistance to Needy Families: Third Report to Congress*, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2000; Time limit policies (b, c, d): Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseloads less than 150.

Table A4.16—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily due to employment

Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. When a household leaves TANF due to employment, how is the food stamp case affected?			
No change in food stamp certification period	61.2% (3.7%)	62.2% (6.8%)	60.8% (4.3%)
Certification period is shortened to the one used for non-TANF households with earned income	27.4% (3.2%)	36.6% (6.8%)	24.2% (3.7%)
Certification period shortened to the end of the next month	4.5% (1.3%)	1.2% (1.2%)	5.7%* (1.7%)
Depends on the characteristics of the case (e.g., amount of income, whether anyone is working)	1.8% (1.0%)	0.0%	2.4%* (1.4%)
Case is transferred to another worker	1.3% (1.0%)	0.0%	1.8% (1.3%)
Food stamp case is closed	0.9% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.2% (0.9%)
Shortened to three-month certification period	0.3% (0.3%)	0.0%	0.4% (0.4%)
Don't know	2.5% (1.6%)	0.0%	3.4%* (2.1%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.16—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily due to employment—Continued

Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>b. When a household leaves TANF due to employment and the food stamp case is <u>not</u> closed or the certification period is <u>not</u> shortened to the end of the next month, what usually needs to be done to adjust food stamp benefits if no new income information is in the case file?</i>			
Benefits can be adjusted with information received by mail or over the phone	74.8% (3.2%)	85.7% (5.0%)	71.0%** (3.9%)
An office visit is usually required	16.3% (2.9%)	11.6% (4.6%)	18.0% (3.6%)
Don't know	3.4% (1.8%)	1.5% (1.5%)	4.1% (2.3%)
Total	94.6%	98.8%	93.1%
<i>c. Caseworker estimate of the proportion of clients who have left TANF due to employment and continued to receive food stamps:</i>			
More than three-quarters	68.2% (3.4%)	68.9% (6.4%)	67.9% (4.0%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	19.0% (3.0%)	25.4% (6.0%)	16.7% (3.5%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	3.4% (1.3%)	2.4% (1.7%)	3.8% (1.6%)
At least one client, but less than one-quarter	4.6% (1.7%)	3.3% (2.3%)	5.1% (2.1%)
None	0.0%	—	—
Caseworker could not provide estimate	4.8% (1.9%)	0.0%	6.5%*** (2.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of respondents^c</i>	213	61	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.17—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily, but not for employment

Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
a. When a household leaves TANF, but not for employment, what happens to the food stamp certification period?			
No change in food stamp certification period	60.6% (3.6%)	58.8% (7.0%)	61.3% (4.0%)
Certification period is shortened to the one used for non-TANF households with earned income	24.1% (3.1%)	31.8% (7.0%)	21.4% (3.3%)
Certification period shortened to the end of the next month	5.4% (1.4%)	4.5% (2.6%)	5.7% (1.6%)
Shortened to three-month certification period	1.3% (1.3%)	0.0%	1.7% (1.7%)
Food stamp case is closed	2.7% (1.1%)	3.7% (2.6%)	2.3% (1.1%)
Case is transferred to another worker	0.0%	—	—
Depends on household circumstances (e.g., amount of income)	0.0%	—	—
Client decides whether he/she wants to keep food stamp case open	0.8% (0.8%)	0.0%	1.0% (1.0%)
Don't know	5.2% (2.0%)	1.2% (1.2%)	6.6%* (2.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.17—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily, but not for employment—Continued

Practice/Experience	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Practice is in Effect or Experience is Reported ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
<i>b. When a household leaves TANF not due to employment and the food stamp case is <u>not</u> closed or the certification period shortened to the end of the month, what usually needs to be done to adjust food stamp benefits?</i>			
Benefits can be adjusted with information received through the mail or over the phone	64.2% (3.2%)	67.3% (6.4%)	63.2% (4.2%)
An office visit is usually required	13.5% (2.8%)	9.0% (4.1%)	15.1% (3.4%)
No contact with the office is usually needed to recalculate benefits	10.6% (2.2%)	15.6% (5.2%)	8.8% (2.2%)
Don't know	3.7% (1.8%)	0.0%	5.0%** (2.4%)
Total	92.0%	91.9%	92.1%
<i>c. Caseworker estimate of the proportion of clients who have left TANF voluntarily without employment and continued to receive food stamps:</i>			
More than three-quarters	63.1% (3.3%)	62.6% (6.7%)	63.3% (4.0%)
At least one-half, but less than three-quarters	15.3% (2.9%)	20.9% (5.8%)	13.3% (3.4%)
At least one-quarter, but less than one-half	8.2% (2.0%)	6.4% (3.3%)	8.9% (2.4%)
At lease one client, but less than one-quarter	5.4% (1.6%)	4.9% (2.9%)	5.6% (1.8%)
None	1.6% (1.0%)	1.5% (1.5%)	1.6% (1.2%)
Caseworker could not provide estimate	6.4% (2.0%)	3.7% (2.6%)	7.3% (2.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of respondents^c</i>	213	61	152

Continued

Table A4.17—Continuation of food stamp benefits for households who leave TANF voluntarily, but not for employment—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.18—Staff opinions on issues affecting continued food stamp participation by eligible households

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion was Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +		Under 2000	2000 +
a. People who leave the TANF rolls often also leave the Food Stamp Program without us knowing whether they are still eligible for food stamps:						
Strongly agree	2.9% (1.5%)	4.7% (3.4%)	2.2% (1.6%)	3.4% (1.0%)	0.8% (0.7%)	4.4%** (1.4%)
Agree	18.2% (3.0%)	9.0% (4.3%)	21.5%** (3.5%)	20.6% (2.0%)	13.3% (2.9%)	23.2%** (2.5%)
Disagree	53.1% (3.7%)	48.6% (8.4%)	54.6% (4.2%)	47.4% (2.4%)	54.8% (4.6%)	44.8% (2.8%)
Strongly disagree	21.1% (2.9%)	28.4% (7.9%)	18.5% (3.2%)	20.3% (2.1%)	23.3% (3.9%)	19.3% (2.4%)
Don't know	4.8% (1.5%)	9.3% (4.5%)	3.2% (1.2%)	8.3% (1.3%)	7.9% (2.2%)	8.5% (1.6%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
b. People who leave TANF and are potentially eligible for food stamps should be actively encouraged to apply for food stamps:						
Strongly agree	35.7% (3.9%)	42.1% (7.7%)	33.4% (4.2%)	27.0% (2.3%)	19.5% (3.6%)	29.6%** (2.8%)
Agree	58.8% (4.2%)	50.9% (8.8%)	61.5% (4.4%)	59.8% (2.5%)	70.4% (4.2%)	56.1%*** (3.0%)
Disagree	2.8% (1.7%)	4.3% (4.3%)	2.3% (1.7%)	7.6% (1.3%)	7.7% (2.3%)	7.6% (1.6%)
Strongly disagree	0.6% (0.5%)	1.5% (1.5%)	0.3% (0.3%)	0.5% (0.2%)	0.0%	0.6%* (0.3%)
Don't know	2.1% (1.0%)	1.2% (0.8%)	2.5% (1.3%)	5.2% (1.2%)	2.5% (1.4%)	6.1%* (1.5%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continued

Table A4.18—Staff opinions on issues affecting continued food stamp participation by eligible households—Continued

Opinion	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Opinion was Expressed ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)					
	Type of Respondent					
	Supervisor			Caseworker		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b		All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
Under 2000		2000 +	Under 2000		2000 +	
c. The setup of our computer-generated notices sometimes results in people losing food stamp benefits they are eligible for:						
Strongly agree	2.0% (1.2%)	4.3% (4.1%)	1.3% (0.7%)	5.0% (1.2%)	3.0% (1.6%)	5.7% (1.5%)
Agree	21.7% (3.3%)	19.1% (5.7%)	22.6% (3.9%)	20.9% (2.0%)	20.4% (4.3%)	21.1% (2.3%)
Disagree	63.5% (4.0%)	65.5% (8.4%)	62.8% (4.6%)	59.3% (2.3%)	58.4% (4.7%)	59.6% (2.8%)
Strongly disagree	11.5% (2.7%)	11.1% (5.7%)	11.6% (3.1%)	9.5% (1.3%)	12.2% (2.8%)	8.6% (1.5%)
Don't know	1.3% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.7%* (0.9%)	5.3% (1.1%)	6.0% (2.0%)	5.0% (1.3%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
d. It is hard for eligible working clients to do what is required to stay on the Food Stamp Program:						
Strongly agree	2.0% (0.9%)	3.2% (1.9%)	1.6% (1.1%)	2.1% (0.8%)	0.0%	2.8%*** (1.0%)
Agree	19.8% (3.2%)	15.1% (6.8%)	21.5% (3.5%)	19.8% (2.2%)	20.8% (4.0%)	19.5% (2.6%)
Disagree	61.3% (4.0%)	68.6% (8.2%)	58.7% (4.5%)	61.4% (2.5%)	63.0% (4.6%)	60.8% (3.0%)
Strongly disagree	16.5% (3.0%)	11.7% (5.1%)	18.2% (3.5%)	15.5% (1.8%)	15.5% (3.3%)	15.5% (2.2%)
Don't know	0.4% (0.4%)	1.4% (1.4%)	0.0%	1.2% (0.5%)	0.6% (0.4%)	1.4% (0.7%)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of respondents^c	201	46	155	509	136	373

Continued

Table A4.18—Staff opinions on issues affecting continued food stamp participation by eligible households—Continued

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors or caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey and Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.19—Supervisor recommendations for changes to increase the number of eligible households who continue to receive food stamps after leaving TANF

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Supervisor Made the Recommendation ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Outreach to educate public/clients of program differences both in terms of program intent and eligibility requirements	8.4% (3.3%)	7.6% (4.3%)	8.6% (4.2%)
Follow-up to inform TANF leavers about the differences in eligibility requirements between the programs	5.1% (2.1%)	3.0% (3.0%)	5.9% (2.7%)
Provide better information at application	5.0% (2.1%)	2.8% (2.8%)	5.7% (2.7%)
Encourage clients to find out if they can still get food stamps if they voluntarily leave TANF	4.6% (1.9%)	6.0% (4.2%)	4.1% (2.1%)
Change program benefit or eligibility rules	2.3% (1.9%)	0.0%	3.1%* (1.9%)
Longer certification periods	2.7% (1.6%)	10.3% (5.8%)	0.0%*
Home visits	0.8% (0.8%)	3.0% (3.0%)	0.0%
Simplified process	0.7% (0.7%)	2.7% (2.6%)	0.0%
Change computer system so it is easier to maintain the household on food stamps	0.7% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.0% (1.0%)
No suggested changes	69.0% (4.3%)	67.8% (7.5%)	69.4% (5.3%)
Number of respondents^c	109	33	76

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^c The number of respondents is the number of supervisors who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Supervisor Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.

Table A4.20—Caseworker recommendations for changes to increase the number of eligible households who continue to receive food stamps after leaving TANF

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworker Made the Recommendation (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Encourage clients to find out if they can still get FS if they get a job or decide they don't want TANF anymore	5.6% (1.5%)	2.4% (1.7%)	6.7% (2.0%)
Provide better information at application about the differences between the two programs	4.7% (1.5%)	4.5% (3.2%)	4.8% (1.7%)
Follow-up for TANF leavers to inform them about the differences in eligibility between TANF and FS	3.5% (1.4%)	4.5% (3.1%)	3.1% (1.5%)
Change eligibility rules (income standards, resource limits)	3.5% (1.3%)	1.4% (1.4%)	4.3% (1.7%)
Conduct recertifications by mail or phone	1.5% (0.9%)	2.2% (2.2%)	1.2% (0.9%)
Create FS extension/FS transition period	1.0% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.0%)
Lengthen certification period	1.0% (0.7%)	0.0%	1.4% (1.0%)
Need to change computer system so that FS case does not automatically close when client leaves TANF	1.0% (0.7%)	3.7% (2.7%)	0.0%
Less rules/reduce paperwork	0.9% (0.7%)	1.5% (1.5%)	0.7% (0.7%)
Improve transfer process of client case to new caseworker; new worker automatically opens FS case	0.8% (0.6%)	1.5% (1.5%)	0.6% (0.6%)
Allow more time for clients to go in and complete application	0.5% (0.5%)	1.7% (1.7%)	0.0%

Continued

Table A4.20—Caseworker recommendations for changes to increase the number of eligible households who continue to receive food stamps after leaving TANF—Continued

Recommendation	Percent of National Food Stamp Caseload in Offices Where Caseworker Made the Recommendation ^a (Standard Error in Parentheses)		
	All Offices	By Office Caseload ^b	
		Under 2000	2000 +
Develop an automated way to get client earnings	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
Implement quarterly reporting	0.5% (0.5%)	1.7% (1.7%)	0.0%
Decrease caseworker caseload	0.5% (0.5%)	0.0%	0.7% (0.7%)
No suggested changes	79.2% (3.0%)	83.0% (5.3%)	77.9% (3.6%)
Number of respondents^c	213	61	152

^a Survey responses are weighted so that reported percentages reflect the food stamp caseload served by the offices with the corresponding policy or practice. Weights therefore sum to the total national food stamp caseload. Also referenced as the percent of offices, weighted.

^b A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between offices with caseloads under 2,000 and 2,000 and above. Statistical significance levels are indicated as * = .10; ** = 0.05; *** = .01.

^d The number of respondents is the number of caseworkers who answered the survey question.

Source: Local Food Stamp Office Caseworker Survey. Excludes offices with caseload less than 150.