



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

Family Programs
Report
December 2012

Performance Measurement for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Modernization Initiatives: Individual State Findings

Final Report

Authors:

Kathleen Keefe
Emily Sama-Miller
Laura Castner
Maura Bardos
Elizabeth Clary
Sarah Wissel
Larry Vittoriano

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research
1100 1st Street, NE, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20002-4221
Telephone: (202) 484-9220
Facsimile: (202) 863-1763

Submitted to:

Office of Research and Analysis
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302-1500

Project Director:

Laura Castner

Project Officer:

Rosemarie Downer

This study was conducted under Contract number AG-3198-D-08-0105 with the Food and Nutrition Service.

This report is available on the Food and Nutrition Service website: <http://www.fns.usda.gov>

Suggested Citation:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis, Performance Measurement for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Modernization Initiatives: Individual State Findings, by Kathleen Keefe, Emily Sama-Miller, Laura Castner, Maura Bardos, Elizabeth Clary, Sarah Wissel, and Larry Vittoriano, Project Officer: Rosemarie Downer, Alexandria, VA: 2012.

Profile: California

State Administered or County Administered: County

Number of Local/County Agencies Interviewed: 4

Number of Partners Interviewed: 5

Initiatives Active in State: Call Center, Online System, Document Imaging, Partnering, Waiver of Face-to-Face Interview, Online Expedited Applications, Application Tracking

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
CALL CENTER (Regionally)				
None				
ONLINE SYSTEM (Regionally)				
Number of Applications Downloaded	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Online Applications Submitted per Month	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Number of Multiple Applications	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Percent of Applicants with Hardship Reason for Requesting Phone Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Average Level of Benefits	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of First-Time Applications Denied	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Clients Requesting Help to Apply Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Average Number of Changes Submitted per Month	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Changes Started	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Changes Submitted	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applicants who did not Receive Help to Apply Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications Received	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Number of Applications Started	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of First-Time Applications Approved	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Average Number of Accounts Created per Month	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Number of Log-ins	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Average Number of Screenings Started: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Average Number of Screenings Completed: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Users Selecting Spanish Language	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Screenings Resulting in Application Submission: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Online Screenings Started: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Online Screenings Completed: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applicants Who Received Help to Apply Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Average Number Started per Month	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Average Number Submitted per Month	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Number of One-page/Requests for Assistance Submitted	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications with Filing Date Only	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Submitted With All Application Questions Answered	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applicants who Received Help to Apply Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
DOCUMENT IMAGING (Regionally)				
Number of Documents Received	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Documents Processed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Documents Scanned	Locally	Not reported	No	No

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Amount of Days in Queue to be Indexed	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Number of Documents in Error Queue	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Number of Documents Pending Indexing	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Barcode Errors	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Queues with Over 1,000 Documents	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
PARTNERING (Regionally)				
Percent of Partners Providing Application Assistance	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Partners	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number Accepting Applications	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number Providing Application Assistance	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number Clients Assisted per Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Received per Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
WAIVER OF FACE-TO-FACE INTERVIEW (Regionally)				
Number of Redetermination Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Face-to-Face Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Telephone Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Interviews Conducted by Telephone	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Percent of Interviews Conducted Face-to-Face	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Percent of Telephone Interview Requests Honored	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Total Number of Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Home Visit Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Number of Missed Interviews	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Notice of Missed Interview Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applicants Requesting a Phone Interview	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applicants Requesting an In-Person Interview	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applicants who Did Not Answer to Type of Interview Requested	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent that are Missed and have Notice Mailed	Locally	Not reported	No	No
ONLINE EXPEDITED APPLICATIONS (Regionally)				
Percent of Applications Approved: Online Expedited	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications Approved: Online All	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Online All	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Expedited Applications Received Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Online Expedited	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
APPLICATION TRACKING (Statewide)				
Percent of Total Recertifications Approved	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	No	No
Average Benefit Amount (for those eligible)	Statewide	None	No	No
Number of Recertifications Approved: Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Number of Recertifications Approved: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Online Recertifications Approved	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Approved: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Approved: Face-to-Face Interviewed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Phone Interviewed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Approved: Phone Interviewed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Approved: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Approved: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Approved: Face-to-Face Interviewed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Online Applications Approved	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications Approved After Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Percent of Recertifications Approved After Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Community Partner Applications Approved	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Mailed Applications Approved	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Mailed Recertifications Approved	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Total Applications Approved	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	No	No
Percent of Complete Applications Denied	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	No	No
Percent of Complete Recertifications Denied	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	No	No
Percent of Initial Applications Denied	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	No	No
Percent of Recertifications Denied	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	No	No
Number of Applications Denied: Paper Submissions to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Denied: Paper Submissions to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Denied: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Online Recertifications Denied for Failure to Submit Documentation	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Denied: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Online Applications Denied for Failure to Submit Documentation	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Percent of One-page/Requests for Assistance Denied	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Denied: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Denied: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Denied: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Denied: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications Denied: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications Denied: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applicants that Appear Eligible for Expedited Benefits	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Cases with Complete Verification Submitted	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Total Number of Applications Completed	Statewide	Program Access, Efficiency, Customer Service	Not reported	No
Total Number of Applications To Be Processed	Statewide	Program Access, Efficiency, Customer Service	Not reported	No
Total Number of Recertifications Completed	Statewide	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Recertifications: Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Recertifications: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Recertifications: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Number of Requests for Assistance/One-page Applications	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications: Online	Locally	Not reported	No	No
Number of Applications: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Recertifications: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Recertifications: Faxed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Total Number of Applications Started	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Total Number of Recertifications Started	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications: Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications: Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications: Online	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications Not Completed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications: Paper Submission to Local Office	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Percent of Applications: Community Partner	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Applications: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Number of Recertifications: Mailed	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

California (continued)

Measure or Aggregate Data Collected	Measure Implemented Statewide or Locally	Modernization Goal(s)	Performance Standards and Benchmarks	Performance Incentives
Percent of Applications Approved Timely	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	State: All applications should be approved timely Local: Internal performance measures track whether individual workers approve 90 to 95 percent of applications timely.	No
Percent of Recertifications Approved Timely	Statewide	Program Access, Accuracy & Integrity, Efficiency, Customer Service	All recertifications should be approved timely	No
Average Processing Time of Application Decision	Locally	Not reported	Within 15 days—applies to all applications.	No
Average Processing Time of Recertification Decision	Locally	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

Notes: State collects mandatory accuracy data through QC reviews.

Table includes all measures indicated as calculated by state and local offices. If the local office indicated the same measure as a state, the local response was deleted and performance data are listed as "Statewide."

If a local office reported that they use a measure they receive from a statewide system, the measure is reported as statewide.

Description:

General: California counties are responsible for administering SNAP with state oversight (typically, counties work in consortia to purchase and maintain eligibility systems). As a result, modernization and measurement are implemented variably across the state. The state office collects reports from the counties on the status of their application and recertification processes. It also allocates funding to the counties for its major initiatives.

California local offices have faced a few challenges with capturing and reporting data accurately during the development and refinement of their systems. Offices facing these problems have addressed them through system reprogramming or manual data counts.

Measurement Goals: A few of California's performance measures touch on all FNS goals for modernization. Counties also pursued performance measurement in order to: meet FNS and grant requirements, meet a legal services agreement, identify trends, maximize programs, measure the success of outreach efforts, determine needed staff and equipment, and track the outreach provided.

California (continued)

Call Center: The state office reported that, while there is no statewide call center, some county offices have call centers of their own. However, none of the county offices we interviewed for the study had a call center in place.

Online System: The presence or absence of an online application system varies by county. Each consortium with an online application has its own vendor to operate it. As such, functionality of the system and the measures collected differ among offices. All California local offices surveyed that have an online application system track the percent of total applications received online.

Document Imaging: A few California local offices we interviewed have established document imaging. These offices track aggregate data only.

Kiosks: Neither the state nor local offices interviewed have implemented kiosks.

Waiver of Face-to-Face Interview: Two California counties interviewed have a waiver of face-to-face interviews in place. They both track performance measures and data on the volume and type of interview provided (telephone interview or face-to-face interview) and on notices of missed interviews.

Shortened Interviews: No counties participating in the study have implemented a shortened interview process.

Online Expedited Applications: Some California county offices interviewed review the percentage and the number of online expedited applications approved. County offices report the number of expedited applications processed to the state office on a quarterly basis. Further reporting capabilities, such as summarizing demographic or other characteristics of online expedited applications, vary by county.

Application Tracking: State staff reported that application tracking typically occurs at the local level, as no applications are delivered to the state office. Most local offices responding to the survey focus on application accuracy, application approvals/denials, and application receipt (though other areas of application tracking are monitored by some local offices).

Changes Over Time: Some counties reported they have redesigned or implemented new initiatives within the past ten years, such as a call center, document imaging, or an online application system. They are working on developing data and adding measures or reports.

Desired or Planned Future Measures: State and local offices expressed a desire to collect more information. Specifically, they would like to track: percent of applications approved and denied (by online versus paper submission), accuracy measures on phone versus face-to-face recertifications, measures that compare the current approval rate of recertifications to the rate prior to the implementation of a waiver of face-to-face interviews, number of people completing their

Partnering:

California's partners work on outreach, screening, and application assistance. Some partners operate under an interagency agreement (M.O.U.) with the California Department of Public Health, and some partners are compensated for their services. One office we surveyed has specified standards on the number of applications and screenings their partner must meet per month.

Two local offices we surveyed reported that they collect performance data on partnerships. They monitor data, such as the percent of partners providing application assistance and some aggregate data.

Measures Collected by Partners:

One county we surveyed stated that the purpose of tracking performance measure data for their partnering initiative is to provide the data to their partner. The county provides the partner the information required to submit grant applications and the partner provides the county with the number of applicants they assisted. Another county's partner also tracks the number of applications submitted to the county office. Partners also collect numerous measures on outreach, trainings, volume and efficiency of application assistance.

California *(continued)*

recertification, number of people submitting their quarterly report online, number of abandoned applications, number of people submitting their application from a particular screen of the online application, and additional data on the online application system.