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Introduction:

California’s welfare reform program, which gradually took shape during the early 1990’s, is designed to reduce welfare dependency and increase self-sufficiency among recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Taken as a whole, California’s welfare reform program can be characterized as two distinct, but related efforts to promote independence: first, to increase employment among AFDC recipients, and second, to encourage and enable teen parents to finish high school. As required by federal law, California will conduct a five-year statewide evaluation of each major provision of the welfare reform program in order to assess its effectiveness.

During the first phase of the welfare reform program, known as the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project (APDP), the state successfully implemented two work incentive provisions and the data collection system for the evaluation study. The first work incentive eliminated the limit on the number of hours an AFDC recipient may work, while the second allowed a recipient to increase monthly income through earnings. The APDP phase of the project ran from December 1992 to September 1993, when the implementation of additional policy changes marked a new stage of the project.

This interim report on the first phase of the welfare reform program is designed to provide preliminary information to the state, county, and university staff involved in its implementation. Ultimately, it will also provide documentation for the final process evaluation study, which will be used to assist researchers in evaluating the data collected for
the demonstration project. The report is organized into seven main sections: the first part provides a brief overview of the policy-making process, the second describes state-level implementation activities, the following four sections present case studies documenting implementation at the county level, and the final section compares the experiences of all the research counties.
The Policy-making Process:

Work Incentives in AFDC

Many of the work incentives currently being evaluated in California are reversals of policies that were mandated at the federal level in the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA '81). In that legislation the Reagan administration sought to tighten AFDC eligibility by eliminating many of the work incentive provisions that had been gradually added since the 1960’s. For example, OBRA '81 imposed time limits on the $30 and 1/3 earned income disregard, which allowed welfare recipients to keep $30 and one-third of the rest of their wages before their welfare grants were reduced dollar for dollar. In addition, OBRA '81 imposed a limit on the number of hours that an unemployed parent was allowed to work and remain eligible for AFDC, (known as the 100 hour rule).

While these policies enacted in OBRA '81 were designed to reduce welfare costs, the Reagan administration also argued that they would eliminate significant inequities between working families who did and did not receive welfare. As a result of OBRA '81, both AFDC caseloads and the proportion of recipients with earned income declined significantly across the country. In 1981, for example, 17 percent of California’s AFDC Family Group caseload had earned income, which averaged $540 per month. One year after OBRA was
implemented, only 5 percent of Family Group recipients had earned income and their average monthly earnings dropped to $295.¹

Since the late 1980's, many states have considered re-establishing these work incentives in the effort to reduce welfare dependency. Because states' discretion over AFDC is largely limited to setting grant levels and eligibility standards, states do not have the authority to unilaterally change most work incentive statutes. However, the Federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is allowed to grant limited waivers from the Social Security Act for demonstration projects.²

During the Bush administration, DHHS has followed two major principles in evaluating waiver requests: first, that demonstration projects should be evaluated rigorously, and second, that they be "cost neutral" to the federal government. In general, rigorous evaluation has come to mean an experimental study which randomly assigns a sample of recipients to treatment and control groups in order to assess the impact of the reforms. Thus, while states have been given the latitude to test a wide range of AFDC policies, the requirements of the waiver process have imposed considerable constraints on the experiments states can design. Despite these limitations, many states, including New York, Wisconsin,


² Demonstration project is the term given to the portion of the AFDC program which operates under different regulations for a defined period of time for the purpose of testing the effects of the change in regulations.
New Jersey, and California, are currently conducting demonstration projects on various work incentives.

**Legislative History**

California's welfare reform program has been shaped over the last few years by a policy-making process that has been marked by contentious budget negotiations, a state-wide referendum, and a series of court challenges. This highly uncertain policy-making process had considerable impact on both policy and implementation.

The state's financial crisis provided the initial impetus for welfare reform. Faced with significant revenue shortfall, Governor Wilson recommended several AFDC savings measures in his first budget proposal for the 1991-92 fiscal year. His two main recommendations were to reduce AFDC grant levels by 8.8 percent and to suspend the statutory Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA's) for most welfare programs, including AFDC. The grant reduction was structured to be a modest work incentive by allowing recipients who work part-time to make up the reduction in their AFDC grant, a mechanism the state calls "fill-the-gap budgeting."

The Legislature enacted a modified version of the Governor Wilson's proposals in the fiscal year 1991-92 budget legislation. This statute adopted "fill-the-gap budgeting" by lowering AFDC payment standards 4.4 percent, suspended the payment standard COLA for five years, and reduced the need standard COLA to 70 percent of the statutory requirement.
In order to provide additional work incentives to AFDC recipients, the statute directed the Department of Social Services to seek federal waivers from the 100 hour rule and the time limits on the $30 and 1/3 earned income disregard.\(^3\)

In his budget for the following year (fiscal year 1992-93), the Governor proposed a far more comprehensive welfare reform program. The major provisions of this plan included:

- **Grant Reductions**: reducing the payment standard an additional 10 percent.
- **Transitional Grants**: reducing the payment standard of families with an able-bodied adult another 15 percent after 6 months on AFDC.
- **Maximum Family Grants**: capping the grants of women who conceive additional children while on AFDC.
- **Cal Learn**: providing a cash incentive to teen parents who regularly attend school and imposing a cash penalty on those who do not.
- **Relocation Family Grants**: creating a residency requirement by calculating newcomers’ benefits with the grant level of their state of origin.
- **Job Search Services**: providing voluntary job search workshops to recipients before the Transitional Grant goes into effect.

In addition, the Governor recommended several new saving measures, including eliminating the AFDC benefits for pregnant women without children.\(^4\) Most of these reforms are not allowed under the Social Security Act and require waivers to be implemented.

---

\(^3\) Chapter 97, Sections 2, 3, 6, 9, 10.

\(^4\) Governor’s Budget Summary, 1992-93.
The Legislature scaled down this proposal considerably in the final fiscal year 1992-93 budget legislation. Although this statute did not incorporate the Governor's proposals for transitional grants, maximum family grants, or Cal Learn, it did reduce payment standards an additional 5.8 percent and directed SDSS to seek a federal waiver for the Relocation Family Grant initiative. Furthermore, the bill included a new proposal to adjust grant levels regionally on the basis of housing costs, with the provision that this policy would be implemented in place of the grant reduction if the state successfully obtained a waiver.⁵

The Governor pursued his welfare reform package by placing it on the November 1992 ballot as part of Proposition 165, the Government Accountability and Taxpayer Protection Act (GATPA). Introducing this initiative in December 1991, he campaigned for its passage while simultaneously advocating for his budget proposals. In addition to the proposals mentioned above, Proposition 165 also sought to require teen parents to live with their parents, eliminate AFDC COLAs permanently, and make AFDC grant levels subject to appropriation.⁶

Because of the uncertainty surrounding the budget negotiations and the fate of the referendum at the polls, the state successfully negotiated two separate waiver agreements with the federal government: one based on Proposition 165, the Welfare Reform Demonstration Project (WRDP), and the other based on the more limited reforms included in

---

⁵ Chapter 722, Sections 35, 36, and 37.5.
⁶ California Ballot Pamphlet, pp 46-49.
the previous two budgets, the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project (APDP). Both waivers were based on a common framework: each employed the same experimental study design, and each met federal cost neutrality requirements by imposing the grant reduction on the whole caseload rather than limiting it to the experimental sample alone. In the end, the Wilson administration chose not to seek a waiver for the regional grants, because they would have also affected the state's supplement to federal SSI benefits, which the Social Security Administration opposed.

When Proposition 165 failed at the polls on November 3, 1993, the State Department of Social Services rushed to implement all of the APDP reforms and the experimental study design by the December first effective date. The $30 and 1/3 earned income disregard was not implemented in this first phase, however, because the Legislature failed to fully fund the initiative in the fiscal year 1992-93 budget.

Court Cases

Two provisions of the APDP reforms were immediately challenged in court. In the Green v. Anderson suit, the plaintiffs challenged the residency requirement of the Relocation Family Grant policy on the grounds that it violated the constitutional right of travel or migration. The U.S. District Court issued a temporary restraining order halting implementation of the policy on December 22, 1992. This order was followed by a preliminary injunction on January 28, 1993. The state decided to pursue the case by filing
an appeal with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on February 4, 1993. Arguments will be heard on April 13, 1994.

In the Beno v. Sullivan suit, the plaintiffs claimed that the "fill the gap budgeting" method of reducing AFDC grants violated the American with Disabilities Act by discriminating against disabled recipients who are unable to work. The case was resolved on July 2, 1993, when the court found in favor of the state. However, the plaintiffs filed an appeal on January 20, 1993, which will also be heard on April 13, 1994.

Summary

Both the uncertainty of the policy-making process and the requirements of the federal waiver process shaped the first APDP phase of California's welfare reform program. Although the state received federal waivers for the administration's entire welfare reform plan, the interplay of legislative, initiative, and judicial politics dictated the actual scope and pace of reform. Thus, during the first phase of the project, the state was only able to implement a few of the policy changes proposed in Governor Wilson’s welfare reform plan: a 5.8 percent grant reduction and elimination of the 100 hour rule. Nevertheless, the Department of Social Services established the state’s first state-wide experimental evaluation study of welfare policies. Thus, at the close of the first year of the project, the state has laid the groundwork for implementation of more sweeping reforms during the second phase, including the $30 and 1/3 earned income disregard and Cal Learn.
State Level Planning, Implementation and Research

Implementation of California's welfare reform program began at the state level, with the Department of Social Services (DSS) serving as lead agency. DSS, one of eight departments within California's Health and Welfare Agency, administers welfare programs, including AFDC, Food Stamps, and GAIN, as well as various other child, family, and adult services. (see Appendix A) A university research organization, UC DATA, and a research advisory committee also had key roles in administrating the project with DSS. The following section describes the state-level planning, decisions, and activities which launched the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project.

Planning
Organizations and Staff Involved:

Planning for welfare reform began in December of 1991 with the formation of a task force composed of various state staff involved in welfare programs. This group took the language of Proposition 165 and put together a waiver proposal for the Federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in one month. The AFDC Program Branch within the state's Department of Social Services (DSS) was responsible for welfare reform policy development, but through this task force and other working groups gathered input from other areas of DSS as well as the counties.
In January 1992, DSS hired a manager to create a research organization within the Welfare Program Division, which had lacked a research unit for 15 years. The Planning and Research Branch (PRB) was established in June of 1992 with a staff of seven policy and data analysts. While the AFDC Program Branch was concerned with policy and regulation development, the Planning and Research Branch became responsible for all aspects of welfare reform evaluation.

As one of its first activities, Planning and Research Branch contracted with UC Data Archive and Technical Assistance (UC DATA) at University of California Berkeley to obtain background data on welfare. This initial contact led to a state-university partnership in the collection of data on welfare reform. In late June, UC DATA was awarded a contract to coordinate and administer data collection on the cases in the welfare reform evaluation study sample. A full-time Project Director for the DSS contract was hired by UC DATA in August 1992.

Very soon after the data collection contract was awarded, the Planning and Research Branch and UC DATA established a "Research Advisory Committee" (RAC) which includes state staff and academic experts in welfare policy from across the country. The RAC

---

7 This state-university partnership was the first step in building capacity for welfare research in California, through development of a comprehensive and high quality public use data base on California's AFDC population. The use of a public university organization to perform the data collection aspects of the evaluation, rather than contracting data collection to a private evaluation contractor, ensured that DSS and the policy community could use the data for their own research.
provides a forum to gather academic expertise with respect to the collection of quality welfare data. The first meeting of the RAC took place in July 1992, during which the Committee discussed possible sampling plans, research questions, and immediate and long term research goals. The RAC met a second time during the planning stage, in September 1992, to further discuss research design and data collection issues.

Decision-Making Process:

Generally, the decision-making during planning for welfare reform was well-defined by the different roles of the organizations involved. The AFDC Policy Development Bureau was concerned with developing the waiver application. The AFDC Policy Development Bureau, in conjunction with the Planning and Research Branch, negotiated the waiver Terms and Conditions with the Federal DHHS. The Planning and Research Branch, with the advice of UC DATA and the Research Advisory Committee, made all decisions with respect to the research design within the limits set by federal demonstration project policy. The Review and Evaluation Bureau (the quality control unit for the Welfare Programs Division) became involved with the data validation aspects of the evaluation, and later the Department’s Fiscal Policy and Procedures Bureau became the lead on the fiscal aspects of implementing the evaluation in the counties. The AFDC Policy Implementation Bureau, in consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association, was responsible for interpreting and defining the policy changes through regulations and other instructions to counties.
The inclusion of outside organizations, such as UC DATA and the Research Advisory Committee, enlarged the decision making-process. Efforts were made to discuss all aspects of planning through meetings and conference calls in order to make decisions which accounted for the needs of each organization's piece of the project. For example, the method for informing clients about the experiment was jointly decided by four of the organizations and the notices were reviewed by each as well.

**Waiver Applications:**

DSS (AFDC Policy Development Bureau) wrote the waiver request by modifying the standard format provided by the federal government. Negotiations for the waiver involved the Deputy Director of Welfare Programs, with assistance from AFDC Policy Development Bureau and Planning and Research Branch staff. The Welfare Reform Demonstration Project (WRDP) waiver took approximately 6 months from submission of the first version until approval of the final version was obtained, during which details were ironed out and certain aspects of the evaluation were negotiated. In contrast, the subsequent Assistance Payments Demonstration Project (APDP) waiver was approved in less than 45 days because the major issues had already been resolved.

Overall approval of the federal waiver was never a major concern, but some proposals for the evaluation were not approved or became points of negotiation. First of all, DSS proposed a non-experimental design which was rejected by DHHS. In addition, DSS
asked to be held harmless from federal quality control errors with respect to control cases, a request which was also rejected.

DSS did persuade DHHS to modify their plans for the scope of evaluation. DHHS was interested in migration of welfare recipients between counties and directed DSS to develop an eight county research design. The Planning and Research Branch had begun to collect background data and was able to provide evidence that inter-county migration was relatively low. After exploring the costs associated with tracking cases in eight counties, DSS convinced DHHS that the additional information to be gained about inter-county migration was not worth the cost, and DHHS agreed to an evaluation in just the four core counties.

**Dual Planning Process:**

When the APDP changes were passed in the fiscal year 1992-93 state budget, planning for welfare reform became a two-tier process. DSS was uncertain whether the more comprehensive policy changes of WRDP or the narrower changes of APDP would be implemented. Voters' response to Proposition 165, Governor Wilson's welfare reform initiative, would be the determining factor. Preparations for WRDP continued from December 1991 to the election in November 1992. In case the initiative failed, DSS also began planning implementation of the APDP version in September 1992.

In some cases, DSS was able to simply extract the portions of WRDP that pertained to APDP. For example, the APDP waiver and regulation packages were subsets of the
WRDP packages. However, DSS still had to submit a different waiver request to DHHS for APDP even after the original WRDP waiver request had been approved. The research design developed for WRDP did not require scaling down for evaluation of APDP. The sampling plan, experimental design, and data collection process went ahead as planned.

DSS instructed the 4 core research counties to go ahead with their planning for WRDP despite uncertainty about the fate of the initiative. The research counties generally had a two-tier planning process to implement either WRDP or APDP; however, at least two counties were not aware that the APDP policy changes would be accompanied by an evaluation study if Proposition 165 did not pass. The counties not only had to plan for welfare reform of uncertain scope, they also had to be ready to implement it in a very short time frame. Even the target date for implementation was unknown before the election, because the initiative, if passed, would have gone into effect immediately, allowing implementation as early as November. When the initiative failed, counties had less than one month to implement APDP.

Several other aspects of county participation were uncertain and contingent on the outcome of the election. Counties were very concerned in the early planning stages with the level of reimbursement for their welfare reform evaluation activities. The state anticipated great savings for counties in AFDC benefits under WRDP, and decided that the counties would not be reimbursed for their share of the control case grant differentials. However, DSS agreed to cover this extra grant cost under APDP, because APDP provided less
dramatic savings for counties. Counties were also uncertain what would be required to implement Cal Learn, a vaguely defined program included in Proposition 165.8

In the early stages, the Planning and Research Branch communicated with the research counties primarily through meetings. All of the original eight counties were invited to DSS in July of 1992 for a preliminary planning meeting, where many questions about the evaluation were raised. This meeting and subsequent correspondence produced one hundred questions about evaluation of welfare reform, which were discussed during later conference calls and meetings. UC DATA staff visited all the counties during the summer of 1992 to discuss data collection, and both DSS and UC DATA visited the four core counties in November to discuss implementation issues.

Development of Research Design:

To administer the project evaluation, the Planning and Research Branch had to coordinate their own activities with the activities of UC DATA, as well as plan the evaluation contract. APDP is different from most demonstration projects because the state chose to contract with separate entities for data collection and evaluation. UC DATA, the data collection contractor, began participating in the project during the early planning stages, and assisted with the development of the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the evaluation contractor. An early version of the RFP was completed, but selection of the evaluation contractor.

---

8 As proposed in Proposition 165, Cal Learn was a program to provide a cash incentive to teen parents who regularly attend school and to impose a cash penalty on those who do not.
contractor was delayed in anticipation of new programs being added to the demonstration project in following years.

The general research design was dictated by federal demonstration project requirements. One major requirement of federal demonstration projects is an experimental design, which was strictly applied in APDP. Because the experimental design was implemented to test state-wide policy changes, the resulting study has a different structure from most other demonstration projects. In the past, many states requested waivers to test different rules in a local area, such as a county. Then a control group would be selected in that area as a comparison group to evaluate the effect of the treatment. In the case of APDP, the treatment is applied to the whole state rather than a small area, which creates a focus on the control groups which are localized in four counties. The control cases (the cases operating under the old rules) have the situation which is really "different".⁹

The sampling plan was developed through a combination of federal and state decisions. The four core counties were chosen based on demographics and geography; Los Angeles because of its critical importance to the state; San Bernardino because it is a large rural county adjacent to Los Angeles; Alameda for its ethnic diversity; San Joaquin to represent the Central Valley and because it is close to Alameda. The sample size was dictated by DHHS, but DSS and UC DATA were able to design the exact strategy across

---

⁹ In the language the experiment, all AFDC cases are in the "treatment group" except for the "control cases" in the four research counties. The "experimental group" is a sample of the treatment group, but selected from only these four counties.
counties, as well as the criteria for stratifying the sample. UC DATA and the affiliated Survey Research Center worked very closely with Planning and Research staff to devise a feasible and useful sampling plan. The goal was to select a sample that was both representative and random to ensure the integrity of the evaluation results. In addition, Planning and Research Branch began developing its own longitudinal data base of 10 percent of the AFDC population to use as a benchmark to assess the representativeness of the APDP sample.

The method of data collection required extensive planning by UC DATA, in consultation with the Research Advisory Committee, the Planning and Research Branch, and quality control staff at DSS. The Planning and Research Branch and UC DATA sent staff to the counties to assess the information available in automated systems and in case files. In addition to these administrative sources of data, DSS and UC DATA decided to gather more information through an in-depth telephone survey of 15 percent of the APDP sample. The details of these data collection methods and the data elements to be collected were carefully planned by UC DATA to minimize disruption to county operations.

Development of the research questions for the telephone survey began as a joint project of DSS, UC DATA and the Survey Research Center. DHHS required a certain core set of questions about the impact of the waiver, mostly relating to work incentives. Planning and Research Branch, interested in developing a better profile of the welfare population, added many sociodemographic questions. UC DATA contributed questions on other aspects
of the transition to work, such as child care. Research Advisory Committee members reviewed and provided input to the questionnaire as well, with a focus on questions that would advance research and knowledge about welfare recipients. UC DATA initially planned to field this questionnaire in mid-1993.

Just as the survey questionnaire was being finalized, state legislative staff requested more information about the research which was being conducted as part of state welfare reforms. As a result, a few interested legislative staff members were invited to participate on the Research Advisory Committee and to provide input into the content of the telephone survey instrument. Subsequently, UC DATA and the Survey Research Center dramatically revised the survey, both in tone and substance, while maintaining the methodological integrity of the instrument. In particular, more questions were added about the quality of life of welfare recipients, including their health, housing, and nutritional status. [See Appendix B.]

Implementation:

Regulations and Notices

All AFDC regulations, county instructions, and client notices are developed by the Policy Implementation Bureau (PIB) of the AFDC Program Branch. The PIB staff are divided into three sections; one is responsible for writing regulations, one develops forms and notices, and one clarifies details of new policies through publication of All County Letters, All County Information Notices, and Question and Answer documents. Each section
relies on input from the County Welfare Director’s Association (CWDA) during the process of developing various materials. In addition, forms and Notices of Action are reviewed by the "Turner Review Committee" which determines if the documents meet the requirements of the Turner court order with respect to readability and format.  

As APDP was California's first state-wide demonstration project, it was the first demonstration project requiring state regulations. Staff had to write regulations which applied to all AFDC recipients except a small group, the control group. Their solution was to create a section of the AFDC Handbook just for APDP; this section clarified control status and allowed future APDP changes to be incorporated in the same manner.

The policy changes in APDP also raised new issues for AFDC policy interpretation. For example, the 100 hour rule waiver only applies to recipients, not applicants, which raised concerns about handling cases that include both recipients and applicants. Policy interpretation staff compiled all the APDP policy questions raised by the counties and then developed a Question and Answer (Q & A) document which was distributed state-wide. Counties had considerable input into regulation development and policy interpretation through the CWDA and through ongoing collaboration with DSS staff. In fact, one county employee worked at DSS for several months and was responsible for writing the Q & A document.

---

10 A Notice of Action (NOA) is an official notice to a recipient, describing a change in his/her case.
APDP was implemented through emergency regulations which became effective on December 1, 1992. A public hearing was held on January 20, 1993. The regulations were implemented as planned, except for the Relocation Family Grant (RFG) section which was stopped by a temporary restraining order on December 22, 1992. The Policy Implementation Bureau immediately prepared an All County Letter, but because of the urgency they also called all 58 counties to inform them to stop implementing this new policy. When the preliminary injunction on the Relocation Family Grant was issued on January 28, 1993, the text of the court order was mailed to the counties.

Informing Counties and Clients

When the welfare reform provisions of APDP were passed in the state budget in September 1992, the AFDC Policy Implementation Bureau began informing counties of the upcoming changes which would go into effect if Proposition 165 did not pass. The 4.5 percent reduction in the maximum grant levels, which did not require a federal waiver, was implemented on October 1, 1992 with an All County Letter dated September 4, 1992. DSS then sent an All County Information Notice on September 21, 1992 which described the APDP policy changes and included draft regulations. After approval of the waiver, complete instructions for the budget changes were sent to counties on October 16, 1992, along with all required notices for clients and forms for implementing the Relocation Family Grant.

In these letters, the counties were given the language and format for individual Notices of Action describing exact grant changes and a mass informing notice explaining all
of the policy changes. [See Appendix C] DSS encouraged the counties to send the mass informing notice as early as possible in order to give advance warning of the grant rollback to clients, and to encourage clients to direct their questions to the state. Both notices contained a toll-free state telephone number that clients could call for further information about the policy changes. DSS was specifically concerned with reducing the impact of client questions on overworked county eligibility workers.\textsuperscript{11}

In the wake of the November 3 election, DSS rapidly made decisions on all the outstanding APDP implementation issues. An All County Letter dated November 6, 1992 directed counties to implement, by December 1, 1992, the 1.3 percent grant reduction, the Relocation Family Grant, and the 100 hour rule change. The letter notified counties that the state would not provide training, but a Question and Answer section was attached in order to address questions counties had already raised. The letter also included a second draft of the regulations which contained examples of how to apply the 100 hour rule change and Relocation Family Grant.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} The state’s public information line actually received very few calls in December about the policy changes or the evaluation study; possibly clients had called about the earlier grant reductions in 1991 and October 1992.

\textsuperscript{12} As discussed above, counties were informed through All County Letter’s and phone calls about the court orders which effectively stopped implementation of RFG. After the temporary restraining order, counties were informed to stop calculating the RFG grants and to restore the grants already issued to California levels, but to continue to track both established and new RFG cases. After the preliminary injunction, counties were informed to stop tracking RFG cases, but to continue collecting information on the state of origin and to maintain a list of original RFG cases for later recall.
For the four research counties, DSS had even more issues to resolve with respect to the evaluation of welfare reform. Letters sent before the election did not describe the evaluation study that would be implemented if Proposition 165 failed or address the fiscal concerns raised by the counties. Clarification about the study came on November 10, 1992 in a letter to the four counties. This research implementation letter provided information on reimbursement, explained the requirements of the evaluation, and instructed the counties on notification of study participants.\textsuperscript{13}

With respect to control and experimental cases, the research implementation letter gave explicit directions in converting and maintaining these cases. At the time, the counties were also informed that UC DATA would be coming to the county to select replacement cases; however, this selection method was never implemented. With the same letter, counties were given language for individual Notices of Action (NOA’s) and mass informing notices to send to control cases in order to explain their grant increase to prior levels, Food Stamp decrease, and possible selection for an interview. Counties were given a choice of a NOA or an informing notice to inform experimental cases of their possible selection for an interview. (See Appendix D)

\textsuperscript{13} Control status was defined as operating under the old rules: returning to the September 1992 grant levels, keeping the 100 hour work limit, exemption from the Relocation Family Grant, and not receiving future need standard cost-of-living increases. Treatment and experimental cases operate under the new rules.
This research implementation letter also described the data collection process and responsibilities of the counties. Counties were told the types of data elements they were responsible for downloading from their automated systems for the cases in the sample, as well as the types of information that data collectors might need to find in case files.

Counties were informed that they would be reimbursed for additional administrative costs associated with the evaluation, including data processing, project coordinators, eligibility work, and state hearings, and for additional grant costs associated with control cases. Instructions on how to claim reimbursement for these costs came in three letters from DSS's Fiscal Policy and Procedures Bureau sent in late November and early December.

In addition to official correspondence, counties in the study had continual contact with DSS and UC DATA through meetings and phone calls. The APDP coordinators in each county call Planning and Research Branch staff with questions pertaining to the evaluation sample, and county data processing staff exchange phone calls with UC DATA when data collection issues arise. County representatives also attended the March 1993 RAC meeting, and were invited to a smaller meeting in Berkeley in June 1993 to discuss implementation progress.

Sample Selection and Implementation

The Planning and Research Branch selected the initial case sample off the MEDS system as of October 26, 1992, and sent the lists of cases to the control counties on October
29, 1992.\textsuperscript{14} The sample design called for 1,000 control cases and 2,000 experimental cases each from Alameda, San Joaquin, and San Bernardino counties, and 2,000 control cases and 4,000 experimental cases from Los Angeles county, for a total of 15,000 cases. In addition, the sample was stratified so that there were two AFDC-Family Group (AFDC-FG) cases for every AFDC-Unemployed Parent (AFDC-U) case. In order to allow for errors and normal attrition between sample selection and implementation, state research staff oversampled by randomly selecting 15,769 cases. These cases were then randomly assigned to control and experimental status.

For the purposes of the evaluation, implementation of the initial sample was fairly smooth. Conversion to control status was accomplished fairly rapidly in the four counties. Alameda and San Bernardino Counties were able to issue the higher amounts to control cases in their December grants. Los Angeles was able to supplement the December grant by the end of December 1992, and San Joaquin was able to supplement the December grant in early January 1993.

Replenishing the sample through selection of replacement cases proved to be a more difficult task. Unlike the initial sample, the replacement cases were supposed to be cases newly approved in the month of selection. Initially UC DATA proposed travelling to each

\textsuperscript{14} The MEDS system is the state's Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System, which generates Medi-Cal cards for all Medi-Cal recipients. AFDC recipients are Medi-Cal eligible, so each county submits AFDC recipient information to the MEDS system at regular intervals. Therefore the MEDS system provides a centralized source of information on AFDC recipients in the state.
county to select cases at intake, but after exploring this option decided it was not feasible because of the number of offices and the small pool of applicants in each office. In March, UC DATA and DSS decided to use MEDS to select the replacement sample instead.

The first sample DSS selected was supposed to be cases newly approved in March; however, many of these cases were actually on AFDC for years but not on the MEDS system until March. When this was discovered, the state revised their method of selection from MEDS, and selected a new March sample. These problems resulted from inherent differences between county databases and the MEDS system. The most significant difference is that MEDS is person-based, while the county systems are case-based. As a result, individuals who are new to MEDS are not necessarily new AFDC cases, but may be simply added to an existing case. In addition, MEDS can not identify all the separate families attached to an AFDC case. Further discrepancies arise from delays in county submissions to MEDS and delays in correcting submissions which are rejected by MEDS.

DSS staff continued to improve sample selection for the following months to avoid this and other problems. After these improvements, the replacement samples were successfully integrated in the counties, except in Los Angeles where the MEDS/county database discrepancy is the most problematic. Los Angeles proposed that they select their own replacement sample, but were instructed to continue with the DSS sample while their

15 DSS instructed the counties to not integrate the first March sample; however, if they already had, the county was instructed to keep these additional cases in the sample.
sampling plan was considered in the context of the integrity of the entire sample. Their proposal was not approved by DSS, but by August the replacement samples sent to Los Angeles were more easily integrated.

Two policy issues were raised with respect to integrating the replacement sample. Because replacement cases were selected after they were approved for AFDC under the new regulations, it was possible that the principal wage earner had begun working more than 100 hours since approval and then could be selected as a control case and be discontinued from AFDC. When counties brought this issue to the attention of DSS, Planning and Research Branch staff instructed counties to drop such cases from the sample and reverse discontinuances already in progress. This policy was communicated to all four counties on June 9, 1992. Counties raised a similar concern when eligibility workers realized that conversion to control status after July could actually decrease the grant level for working recipients.\footnote{All AFDC recipients except control cases received a need standard cost-of-living increase on July 1, 1993, so the need standard decreased for cases converted to control status after that time.} DSS informed counties that control cases in this situation should not be assessed overpayments for higher grants received since the month of selection.

**Data Collection**

UC DATA began receiving automated data from all four counties in January 1993. Counties have been sending payment and case data for each month starting with the first month of the project, December 1992. Their tapes arrive 15-20 days after the end of the
month. UC DATA requested that counties extract specific data elements from their databases; however, three of the counties simply send all the data they have on each case because extracting the data is too labor intensive. Los Angeles does extract data in the general form UC DATA requested, but the extractions do not contain all the necessary data. For example, homeless assistance payments are not included in the extractions and are sent separately. In general, receipt of automated data has been smooth, but there is a tradeoff between very complete and extensive shipments and more manageable but less complete shipments.

Once the data arrived, UC DATA's first priority was to compile payment data for the cost neutrality reports prepared by DSS. The most difficult aspect of that project was determining what "payment" means in each county's system in order to extract the necessary information from the files. Beginning with the October-December 1992 quarter, UC DATA successfully submitted payment summaries to DSS.

Another major task for UC DATA is compiling data from the four counties into a "Uniform Data Base" for the evaluation contractor who will evaluate the impact of APDP. Early on, UC DATA staff discovered that the data elements and variable definitions are very different across counties. Before a standard set of variables could be compiled staff had to learn what different variables mean within each county database, which often requires in-depth knowledge of each county's welfare system. Staff started with documentation from each county, reviewed the data files, then called county data processing staff with questions.
Once all the elements were identified, staff were able to determine which data elements are the same and which are different across counties. UC DATA has completed a "variable matrix," containing all the relevant codes in each county, which staff can use to verify variable definitions.

In some cases, data collection was frustrated simply because data elements were not available. For example, in San Joaquin county budget computations are done on adding machines so there is no record in their automated systems. In three counties phone numbers were not recorded in computer or manual files, although computer fields often existed for them.

UC DATA is responsible for providing the names, most recent addresses, and phone numbers available from automated data to staff conducting the telephone survey. These critical data elements also suffered from incompleteness, inaccuracies, and differing formats. However, after extensive "clean up", UC DATA was able to provide accurate information to survey staff. Because phone numbers were mostly unavailable, UC DATA sent a "locator" mailing to clients offering $5 cash incentive for returning an enclosed postcard with their phone numbers. A letter accompanying the postcard also explained that $10 would sent to them if they were chosen and completed the interview.17

17 This $5 and $10 cash incentive created a policy issue for AFDC, as they had to determine whether to count the payment as income for the client. This issue was resolved in June 9, 1993 with a letter to APDP Coordinators stating that clients should report the interview payments.
Meanwhile UC DATA and Survey Research Center (SRC) staff programmed the questionnaire into the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview System. SRC staff then field tested the questionnaire in Alameda and San Joaquin and made subsequent revisions. The survey was finalized and interviews began in October 1993.

UC DATA worked closely with the Review and Evaluation Bureau, DSS's welfare programs quality control unit, to develop a system for collecting data from recipients' case files. Case files provide unique data as well as validate data from the county computer systems and the telephone survey. UC DATA developed a computer program for "case coding", while Review and Evaluation staff developed a instruction manual for their field staff to use while case coding. Sample programs and manuals were field tested in all counties, and after many revisions, the actual case coding began in February 1994.

**APDP Funding**

During implementation of APDP, two critical funding issues were raised: adequate reimbursement of counties and maintaining federal cost neutrality. Considerable effort has gone into making accurate cost neutrality computations. One difficulty in the cost neutrality computations has been collecting accurate data on the cost of eligibility work related to APDP. This problem results from the different time study methods used by the research counties, as well as the inability of any time study method to detect the actual number of hours spent on a small fraction of cases. DSS met with county fiscal staff to determine how these administrative cost figures might be improved.
Counties were naturally concerned with receiving adequate reimbursement for the costs associated with the evaluation, especially major computer programming costs. However, the actual reimbursement has been satisfactory to all parties, primarily because special project costs were allocated upfront, claiming instructions have been clear, and data processing bills have been covered. In general, lags in reimbursement result from the timing of the claims process.

**Monitoring Implementation**

The Planning and Research Branch has monitored implementation of the evaluation in the four research counties through meetings and frequent phone contact. Implementation issues and progress were discussed in March and June conferences attended by Planning and Research Branch staff, UC DATA staff, and the APDP Coordinators from the four counties. Planning and Research Branch staff have prepared quarterly progress reports for DHHS describing the status of project implementation, and have asked the counties to prepare comments for the progress report as well. In addition, UC DATA hired staff to document implementation of the demonstration project and complete a "process evaluation" as required by the federal waiver.

**Summary**

For the state Department of Social Services, the waiver negotiations and design of the evaluation study were the most challenging tasks accomplished during the first year of implementation. An early decision to make the waivers and research designs for both
WRDP and APDP parallel allowed department staff to prepare as much as possible before the election; however, the short time frame for issuing regulations and instructions to counties also made those tasks demanding.

Since implementation in December 1992, the state and its data collection contractor, UC DATA, have established ongoing procedures for collecting data, preparing cost neutrality reports, and monitoring county implementation. For the Department of Social Services, the most difficult aspect of the project has been selecting the replacement sample; deciding on a sampling method and refining the selection criteria required several months before the system functioned smoothly. For UC DATA, the greatest challenge has been deciphering data from the counties so that it might be compiled into a uniform and useable form. For all research activities, open and continuous communication between the various state and county organizations has been the key determinant in resolving problems and accomplishing joint objectives.
County Level Planning and Implementation

The APDP policy changes were implemented in all fifty-eight counties in California, while evaluation research was only conducted in four counties: Alameda, Los Angeles, San Joaquin, and San Bernardino. This research provided an opportunity to study implementation of the APDP project in four very different sites. The following section includes in-depth case studies of the four counties' experiences with the early stages of welfare reform. The case studies are designed to provide a context for understanding implementation as well as describe some of the factors which explain the unique features of the demonstration project in each county. Following the case studies is a summary of county implementation highlighting the similarities and differences among the four counties in various aspects of the project.
Case Study I: Alameda County

County Background

Among the four counties participating in APDP, Alameda county ranks third in population size, with 1,279,182 residents in 1990. The county is quite ethnically diverse; approximately 17 percent of the residents are African-American, 15 percent are Asian or Pacific Islander, and 14 percent are of Hispanic origin.18

On several measures of economic conditions, Alameda county is the healthiest of the APDP counties. For instance, out of the four Alameda had the highest median household income in 1990 at $37,544.19 In addition, the county's 5.2 percent unemployment rate was the lowest of the four counties in April 1991.20 Lastly, at a rate of 10.6 percent, Alameda has the lowest proportion of its population living below the federal poverty line.21

Alameda ranks third among the APDP counties in the size of its welfare caseload, which totalled 35,325 in October 1992.22 Approximately 6.5 percent of the county

18 1990 Census of Population and Housing.
22 California Department of Social Services, AFDC Characteristics Survey, October 1992.

24 In Alameda, continuing cases are called district cases and eligibility workers are referred to as "Eligibility Technicians" or "ET's".
interviewed by an intake eligibility worker. Once eligibility is established, the client's case is transferred to a continuing worker, who carries the case throughout the client's time on AFDC and handles yearly redetermination interviews. Cases are usually kept in the district office closest to the client's home.

Eligibility workers have caseload standards, which are negotiated by their union. The caseload maximum for a district eligibility technician is 157; in addition to this, continuing units share unassigned cases, called "uncovered" cases, with each unit responsible for an average of 150 cases. Intake eligibility workers accept a maximum of 31 applications per month, in addition to any pending from the previous month. Eligibility units generally consist of seven workers, a clerk, and a supervisor.

The Alameda Social Services Agency serves clients with at least twenty-eight different primary languages. The Agency's policy is to provide translation for clients, so non-English speaking clients are assigned to appropriate bilingual workers when possible. In cases where workers who speak the client's primary language are not available, translators may be "borrowed" from other eligibility units.

25 Every twelve months AFDC recipients are required to go through redetermination to verify continued eligibility for AFDC. The process includes completing the regular AFDC application and a face-to-face interview.

26 Bilingual eligibility workers carry lower caseloads.

27 These cases are unassigned because all workers in the Agency have 157 cases assigned to them already.
Alameda’s eligibility determination process differs from other APDP counties primarily in its level of automation. Eligibility workers have computer terminals with access to the Case Data System (CDS), the county’s automated system for the AFDC, Food Stamps, Foster Care, and General Assistance programs. CDS automatically calculates AFDC and Food Stamp budgets, determines grant amounts, and provides eligibility workers with an on-line case index and 12-month case histories.

Eligibility workers can also view cases on-line in MEDS, the state-wide Medi-Cal database system. Like the other counties in the demonstration project, Alameda’s databases are significantly different from MEDS at any one time. In Alameda, eligibility workers are responsible for clearing up any discrepancies between the Case Data System (CDS) and MEDS. They are usually notified about any problems by "MEDS alerts" or by client complaints about not receiving a Medi-Cal card. Correcting these discrepancies can be a lengthy process. To meet client demands, issuing benefits may be completed before clearing MEDS alerts.

Alameda’s more advanced automated system requires more complex administrative management than the other APDP counties. Not only does Alameda have computer staff within the welfare agency and a separate county data processing agency, it also has a consortium of 18 other CDS counties and a third-party vendor Electronic Data Systems (EDS) involved. Because EDS does all the programming for the 19 counties that use CDS,
any major changes have to be cleared by both the Welfare Case Data System Directors Conference and EDS before they can be implemented.

**Early Planning: Welfare Reform Demonstration Project**

In July 1992, state DSS notified Alameda that it had been chosen as a "core" county for the Welfare Reform Demonstration Project (WRDP). The Agency’s AFDC program specialist was chosen to act as the county’s primary liaison to DSS for the project. Early concerns for Alameda SSA centered on the project’s timeline and cost, including timely receipt of specific regulations and evaluation criteria from DSS, the cost of automation changes required for control cases, and the cost of any additional staff that might be required.

County administrators strongly favored maintaining automation for control cases, noting that manual processing had the potential to be highly error prone, particularly in a county where eligibility workers are accustomed to automation. Additionally, they recognized that manual processing would create a situation in which the control cases would be handled in a significantly different manner than the treatment cases.

County administrators, as well as the Chair of the Welfare Case Data System Directors Conference, expressed concern that Alameda’s involvement in WRDP would disrupt other counties’ data processing because of the extensive programming changes required by the project. The county was also concerned whether full reimbursement for
programming and data processing costs incurred by the CDS vendor (EDS) would be provided.

Based on these issues, the Agency Director originally requested that Alameda be exempted from WRDP. DSS informed county administrators and the CDS Chair that Alameda was required to participate in WRDP, but also agreed to cover any costs "associated with necessary modifications or increases in operational costs of the EDP systems."28

Because of concerns about staffing costs, the county’s plan to centralize control cases took shape early in the process. In October, the AFDC Program Specialist recommended, and upper-level administrators supported, establishing specialized units to handle the continuing cases in "control" status. They argued that these units would need to be staffed by higher-level eligibility workers who would necessarily carry larger caseloads due to the increased demands of the job. Additionally, the county envisioned the need for specialized intake staff to process the applications of clients selected for the replacement sample.

Prior to November 1992, county staff knew that if the Governor’s initiative failed at the ballot box, the APDP policy changes included in the state budget would be implemented. However, while DSS and county representatives discussed the possibility of a "mini-waiver"

---

demonstration project if the Governor's initiative did not pass, the fact that this demonstration project would have a comprehensive evaluation component was still unclear to the county. Faced with the possibility that the initiative might fail—thereby leaving no means of reimbursement for the county's upfront planning costs—the Agency chose to limit early investment in WRDP. Initial reluctance to being involved in the project, the prospect of Proposition 165's failure, and lack of understanding that an alternative project might be put in place all shaped the early planning process.

**Implementation: Regulation Changes**

Implementation of APDP regulation changes and project evaluation began immediately after the elections in November of 1992. Instructions were issued to all staff through a November 19 agency bulletin and an AFDC handbook update regarding the MAP reduction and elimination of the 100 hour rule for AFDC-Unemployed Parent cases. Information on the Relocation Family Grant was provided in a November 30 Agency Bulletin.

The 1.3 percent MAP reduction was accomplished through a CDS programming change described by staff as "routine" and was effective December 1, 1992. Food Stamp budgets were automatically recalculated based on the new MAP amounts. Elimination of the 100 hour rule entailed informing staff of the new rules for determining eligibility.

Notices of Action describing the exact grant change for individual clients were sent in mid-November. To inform clients of all the AFDC regulation changes, the county used the
mass informing notice developed by DSS. [See Appendix X] These notices were mailed to clients with their grant checks in December 1992.

The Relocation Family Grant (RFG) also went into effect on December 1, 1992. By the time the Green v. Anderson temporary restraining order was issued on December 22, four cases had been subjected to the rule in Alameda county. After the temporary restraining order, instructions were immediately issued to eligibility supervisors regarding procedures for handling these specific cases. Later, an Agency bulletin informing staff of procedures for handling all potential RFG cases, including methods for continued tracking, was issued December 28. No Alameda county clients filed Relocation Family Grant appeals.

In addition to the written information eligibility staff received, Alameda county held a training session in January for all AFDC eligibility supervisors, Quality Assurance, Quality Control and Appeals staff covering application of the 100 hour rule, the Relocation Family Grant (RFG), and APDP control case requirements. At that time, eligibility workers were instructed to continue doing RFG determinations and identifying cases for future tracking. The county continued to track RFG cases until March 1993.

**Implementation: Research Component**

While the county put in place the mechanisms necessary to implement the December regulation changes, planning continued for treatment and tracking of control cases for research purposes. Quality Assurance staff worked overtime to assure that all control cases
were identified in the Case Data System by mid-November. The location of the control cases were identified on-line and district offices were instructed to pull the control case files and prepare them for transfer.

**During November, the APDP liaison worked with division directors, assistant agency directors and section supervisors to finalize logistical decisions about centralizing and tracking control cases. They decided to set up one APDP eligibility unit to work out of the Oakland Main office, as this office was centrally located and had space available. In order not to inconvenience clients, management decided that the APDP workers would travel to the district offices to do their eligibility and redetermination interviews.** To create the new unit, they chose to recruit only two workers from each district office, so as to minimize impact on the district offices. The management staff also decided to hire a full-time APDP Coordinator to take over all aspects of the APDP evaluation study.

**Although the control cases had been identified on-line, automating the control cases’ grant supplements could not be implemented in time for the December 1st target date because EDS required three months to complete the programming. Since agency administrators knew that DSS’s highest priority was timely implementation, they decided to have eligibility workers do manual overrides in the system to generate higher grants for control cases, despite concerns that this method was highly error-prone. Eligibility staff worked overtime to complete the process by the deadline.**
As expected, this manual process led to some budgeting errors. When the APDP unit was formed in January and February, one of their first tasks was to correct any errors to December control cases grants, including issuing supplements and adjusting for overpayments. This continued through February.

Clients were informed of their selection for the study through notices of action automatically generated as cases were identified in the Case Data System as "control" or "experimental." Control cases received two Notices of Action, one describing individual grant changes, and one with the informing notice language of the state. [See Appendix D.]

Staffing

In contrast to the other counties, Alameda’s APDP staff were selected through a competitive application process when the new unit was created. Recruitment for the APDP Coordinator began in November. Due to a county-wide hiring freeze, the Agency was required to gain Board of Supervisors’ approval to hire a full-time APDP coordinator, even though the position was funded completely by the state. Approval was granted by the Board in December, and the new APDP Coordinator began work on January 4, 1993. The APDP unit supervisor was also selected in January.

Negotiations with the eligibility workers’ union were required to exempt APDP eligibility workers from caseload limits, because APDP control caseloads could not be strictly controlled for individual workers. Agency administrators observed that the
negotiations were not difficult, because the number of workers affected was small, and because the workers had the possibility of a salary increase if their status was reclassified.

In recruiting staff, the supervisor and program administrators sought workers who were experienced and flexible, because the position requires travelling, handling both continuing and intake cases (for control cases returning to AFDC), communicating with clients who might otherwise have been served by bilingual staff, and interacting with researchers. Also, as mentioned above, workers in the APDP control unit are exempt from regular caseload standards and their caseloads range anywhere from 140 to 180 per worker. Thus, in many ways the position's requirements may have drawn staff with characteristics or abilities different than most eligibility workers.

Staff recruitment and hiring continued throughout the early implementation stage, with four workers brought on in January and the remaining two hired in February. The unit includes one bilingual Spanish worker who handles all Spanish-speaking cases; two workers cover each district office, while the bilingual worker covers all offices. Because no clerical workers volunteered to be transferred to the unit, one clerk received an involuntary lateral transfer.

One initial staffing problem arose due to late changes in the plan for drawing the replacement sample. The county initially hired six continuing eligibility workers and two intake workers to handle applications for the replacement cases. When UC DATA and DSS
decided to draw the replacement sample from MEDS, the county had to "unhire" these two workers. The county's AFDC management was concerned about this staffing turn-around, but they also recognized that the revised sampling method was less disruptive to normal AFDC operations.

Centralizing and Cleaning Cases

In January, while the Agency was still in the process of hiring line staff, the APDP unit supervisor began working with the clerk to organize the control case folders. These 900 plus folders had been boxed at the district offices and trucked into the Main Office, and putting them in order proved to be a major task.

With the addition of eligibility staff, "cleaning" of the control cases began. Staff estimated that some cleaning was necessary for 75-90 percent of the cases they had reviewed. It was estimated that 8-10 percent of the APDP control cases from this original sample were discontinued during the case cleaning process. Staff continue to clean cases as they come up for redetermination.

---

29 "Cleaning" refers to correcting errors or obtaining missing information in a case.

30 The cases in the control sample might have had more errors than other cases, because during the time between when workers were told to pull the cases for transfer (November) and the actual transfer (January), any changes to the case may not have been processed.
Replacement Sample

Alameda has had very little trouble integrating the replacement samples. Primarily, this is because the APDP coordinator looks at every case in the replacement samples on the CDS system to identify any problems with the cases, such as approval dates earlier than the month of selection, and then reports problems to DSS. In addition, Alameda had not yet integrated the first March sample when it was scrapped by DSS. Since the initial selection problems were resolved by DSS, the replacement samples have been relatively small in Alameda and the Coordinator is seeing fewer discrepancies with each sample.

One difficulty with the initial replacement samples for Alameda was issuing the correct number of supplemental grants for new control cases. Before EDS programming was complete for control cases, the CDS system had no mechanism to correctly determine in which month supplemental grants should begin. Programming was completed in April, and by May, Alameda had full automation of control case grants. This automation freed eligibility staff from doing manual overrides for budget computations, and allowed for correct generation of control case supplements.

As in the other counties, Alameda had some concern about the interaction between the 100 hour rule and the replacement sampling process; at issue was the equity of applying the 100 hour rule to clients already working more than 100 hours when chosen for the control case replacement sample. In order to not unfairly disadvantage clients, DSS Research and
Planning branch confirmed (via June 9, 1993 fax) that clients already working more than 100 hours should be exempted from the control case replacement sample.

**Data Collection**

Staff report that while the data processing requests have not been unduly difficult or time consuming, APDP competes with other AFDC and county needs for data processing staff time. While seven months of data processing time for APDP was funded upfront by DSS, limited data processing staff means that data processing requests continue to be filled slowly. Both the county data processing agency and EDS serve multiple customers, all competing for attention. The lag time in processing APDP data has also resulted in delay of internal status reports requested by the APDP Coordinator to assist her in management of and planning for the project.

**Impact on Clients**

When clients were first informed about their selection for the evaluation study, many called their worker seeking clarification. Their most common concern was the transfer of their case to the Oakland Main office. APDP eligibility workers explained to their new clients that they would travel to the district offices so as not to inconvenience them. Staff reported that there was some early difficulties in routing these clients’ calls; apparently calls were being "bounced" from office to office, because clients had not been informed of their

---

31 There appeared to be some confusion over whether this allocation was for a new data processing position or simply funding of current staff’s time.
new worker’s name and phone number. Staff also reported receiving some complaints about
the differences among clients’ grant levels.

Finally, centralizing control cases had a significant impact on clients whose primary
language is not English. Because the APDP unit only has one bilingual (Spanish-speaking)
worker, many non-English speaking clients who previously had bilingual workers were
reassigned to workers who do not speak their language. Communication in this situation
requires extra time to locate an interpreter within the Agency and to translate between
worker and client.

Summary

Implementation of APDP in Alameda county differs from the other counties in three
major ways. First of all, Alameda’s highly automated AFDC eligibility process provided
unique challenges as well as advantages in implementing the project. Secondly, Alameda
chose to hire a full-time project coordinator to manage all aspects of the research component.
Thirdly, the Agency centralized all control cases into one specialized eligibility unit, where
control cases were thoroughly reviewed and cleaned, while experimental cases received no
extra scrutiny. Overall, Alameda county was able to implement the project successfully
under considerable time and resource limits, primarily through a focused and centralized
effort by Social Services Agency management.
Case Study II: Los Angeles County

County Background:

In terms of population, Los Angeles county is by far the largest county in California, with 8,863,164 residents in 1990. In some ways, it is difficult to compare Los Angeles to the other counties in this study because of its sheer size. For example, Los Angeles’s population is over six times as large as San Bernardino’s and over 18 times the size of San Joaquin’s. The county’s residents are ethnically diverse. Over one third (37 percent) of Los Angeles county’s residents are of Hispanic origin; approximately 10 percent of the residents are African-American and about 10 percent are Asian or Pacific Islander.32

The economy of Los Angeles county has suffered during the recession. The unemployment rate was at 7.2 percent in April 1991.33 Household median income in Los Angeles was $34,965 in 1990. Over 15 percent of the county’s population had incomes below the Federal poverty level in 1990, a poverty rate comparable to that of San Joaquin county.34

Like its population, Los Angeles county’s AFDC caseload is also relatively large, with 285,869 cases in October 1992. This caseload dwarfs that of the other counties, as it

32 1990 Census of Population and Housing.
33 California State Association of Counties, California County Fact Book, 1992
34 California Department of Finance, California Statistical Abstract, 1992
was 5 times the caseload of San Bernardino and over 13 times the caseload of San Joaquin.\textsuperscript{35} However, Los Angeles had only 6.5 percent of its population on AFDC in 1990, the lowest portion of the four counties.\textsuperscript{36} The cost of the county’s AFDC program comes to more than $160 million for benefits per month and approximately $49 million for eligibility costs per quarter.

The AFDC staff of the Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) includes over 4000 eligibility workers working in 23 district offices.\textsuperscript{37} These offices are organized regionally into four divisions, each headed by a division chief. Most day-to-day management of eligibility work has been delegated to the district offices, each of which is headed by a district director and several deputy directors. All administrative services, however, are centralized and housed in several office buildings spread throughout the county. In contrast to the other counties in this study, Los Angeles DPSS has considerable independent administrative capacity, including its own Computer Services Division and Research and Statistics Section.

\textsuperscript{35} California Department of Social Services, \textit{AFDC Characteristics Survey}, October 1992.


\textsuperscript{37} Because two district offices have branches, there are actually 25 different sites where AFDC staff are located.
Eligibility Procedures:

In contrast to the other counties in this study, Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services specializes each worker beyond the basic distinction between intake and continuing case work. Each continuing eligibility worker specializes in one type of case (referred to as "casefiles"), such as Unemployed, Stepfather, or Earned Income cases. Eligibility workers in Los Angeles are represented by an open shop union, which has negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding setting caseload standards for each casefile specialty, as well as for intake workers. In contrast to Alameda county, however, these standards are guidelines rather than maximum limits. Because of hiring freezes, average caseloads have greatly exceeded these standards in recent years. In addition to these functional specialties, the Department of Public Social Services has over 1400 certified bilingual eligibility workers who speak 12 different languages.

With the increasing caseload, district offices have adopted a variety of strategies to manage their workload. All offices in the county have limited call-in hours and some offices have voice mail as well. Like other counties, many Los Angeles district offices have adopted appointment systems and group eligibility redetermination interviews. In addition, some offices have set up screening procedures to help eligibility workers manage their workloads. Specialized intake workers meet with clients to determine if there is a possibility

38 Continuing eligibility workers are referred to as "approved" workers in Los Angeles.

39 The MOU caseloads for approved workers range from 94 for high-risk casefiles to 170 for FG/no income casefiles. In contrast to the no-income cases, the MOU for FG/earned income casefiles is 101. For intake workers the MOU is 37 applications.
they might be eligible for AFDC or other programs. If so, the eligibility worker gives them the full application, makes a list of verification documents required, and sets up an appointment for a full intake interview. Monthly eligibility reports (CA7s) are also screened and sorted by teams of clerks for the continuing case workers.

The Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services has not automated as many eligibility work functions as Alameda county. The agency has automated grant calculations, benefits, and some client notices on the Integrated Benefit Payment System (IBPS), but eligibility determination is still done entirely by the workers. Because computer terminals are scarce, most eligibility workers have relatively limited access to the automated systems. Data entry is centralized and eligibility workers input and check case information through forms and printed reports.

Compared to the other counties in the demonstration project, Los Angeles's database on IBPS has even more discrepancies from MEDS at any one time, in part due to the size of the caseload. Eligibility workers are primarily responsible for clearing up any discrepancies between the county system and MEDS. They are usually notified about any problems by "Alerts" sent from MEDS or when clients complain about not receiving a Medi-Cal card. Correcting these discrepancies can be a lengthy process requiring the worker to track down the source of the error, submit forms to correct the problem, and finally check printed reports to see if the change was made. Unless clients complain that they haven't received a
Medi-Cal card, correcting MEDS information is usually not as high a priority for eligibility workers as issuing benefits or completing eligibility redeterminations.

**Early Planning: Welfare Reform Demonstration Project**

The Department of Public Social Services began planning for the Welfare Reform Demonstration Project in the summer of 1992. The Department formed a planning team, headed by the Chief of the Program Planning and Development Division, which included staff from that division as well as from the Research and Statistics, Computer Services, and District Divisions. The county’s primary concerns at that point centered on handling a separate set of regulations for the control group and completing all the IBPS computer programming changes involved in such a big project.

The decision to centralize control cases into a few district offices and to assign them to designated eligibility workers was made early in the process. Given the county’s specialized approach to eligibility work, this arrangement was a natural outgrowth of their concerns about keeping error rates low when faced with two sets of regulations. In contrast to Alameda and San Bernardino counties, Los Angeles never considered requiring eligibility workers to travel to other district offices to see control case clients.

Los Angeles county decided that experimental cases would not be centralized or even labelled as experimental, and therefore that eligibility workers would not be aware of which
cases were in the experimental group. The administrators made this decision because of the state’s emphasis on not treating experimental cases differently from the rest of the caseload.

During the fall of 1992 Los Angeles worked closely with the state Department of Social Services to divide the county into five regions based on caseload demographics. These regions cut across the agency’s four district divisions. They were designed with UC DATA’s original replacement sampling plan in mind and would have allowed random, stratified sampling to take place at intake in each of the five regions. In early November, the Division Chiefs selected one district office for each region to house the control cases.

Although planning for the Welfare Reform Demonstration Project proceeded, county staff were not informed until late October that an evaluation study would be implemented if the Governor’s initiative failed at the polls on November 3. The short lead-time made it difficult to meet the December 1 implementation date for the evaluation component of the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project.

**Implementation: Regulation Changes**

Los Angeles informed its AFDC staff about the APDP regulation changes on November 13, 1992 with an "AFDC Implementation Letter" which described the grant reduction, elimination of the 100 hour rule, Relocation Family Grants, and the demonstration project. In addition, AFDC program staff produced a half-hour training video which was
shown in each district office; the video covered questions pertaining to the three regulation changes.

County staff understood the grant reductions were the state’s highest priority and made correctly recalculating and issuing the grants on time their first concern. The 1.3 percent grant reductions were done centrally through the Department’s IBPS automated system and were effective December 1, 1992. The agency sent all clients Notices of Action describing their grant changes on November 20th, and then sent clients a mass informing notice describing all of the APDP changes with their December grants. The county chose to use the sample notices written by DSS. (See Appendix C.)

While the agency’s computer staff had begun analyzing the programming changes required to automate the Relocation Family Grant, intake workers were initially required to implement the regulations manually. Before the December 22, 1992 temporary restraining order was issued, 111 cases were affected by the residency requirement. After the temporary restraining order, those 111 cases were given the full grant and the central office continued to track them. Eligibility workers were instructed to continue to complete all the paperwork and identify RFG cases, but not take any action on the information. In response to the preliminary injunction issued January 28, 1993, the Department sent an administrative directive to all AFDC staff on April 9 instructing them to stop collecting the RFG information and tracking RFG-eligible cases. The county continued to maintain its tracking list of the original cases affected by the statute pending final adjudication of the suit.
Implementation: Research Component

For the county, implementing the experimental research design for the evaluation study was the least familiar and most complicated aspect of the project. Maintaining and tracking cases under two different sets of regulations is a significant departure from the normal operations of the AFDC program.

The first step in the process was to identify the 2,089 control cases in the county’s IBPS payroll system, which the Department’s data processing staff did by identifying them with a special code. Then an indicator for control status was put in the "fair hearing field" of the IBPS payment system for those cases, so that they would automatically receive the September 1992 grant. During the week of December 19, the control cases were sent notices of action, special informing notices, and supplemental checks. Almost all the control cases received the correct amount in December; a few cases that had been suspended by eligibility workers during the course of these programming changes had to be adjusted later. The control group informing notices were based on the examples provided by DSS, with an added warning that their cases might be transferred. Clients in the experimental group were sent informing notices in mid-January that were also based on the language drafted by the state. [See Appendix D.]

---

40 The fair hearing field automatically changes clients grants to the previous level when they appeal a grant reduction, so it was appropriate to use for control status as well.
The biggest problem that arose during this process was identifying all of the separate families\textsuperscript{41} associated with control cases. The original sample selected from MEDS identified at most one separate family for each control case. County staff recognized the problem in December and had to ensure identification of all separate families for every case. In January they did a complete reconciliation and ultimately added 80 to 90 separate families that had been dropped from the original sample in December.

A few minor problems also cropped up during the early stages of implementation. For example, 11 cases were incorrectly identified as APDP control cases in the county's IBPS computer system when the initial sample was processed. These cases were identified in May, at which point the county reduced their grants to the treatment group level and instituted a monthly reconciliation process to ensure that the problem did not recur.

**Staffing**

Beyond instructing the regional offices to create specialized casefiles for the control cases, the central administrative staff delegated all management issues to the district offices. In each office, the district director and the deputy directors designated one unit or part of one unit as an "APDP control unit", based largely on the experience of the supervisor. The deputy directors and supervisor then selected the staff who would handle the APDP cases. As in Alameda county, the APDP workers were generally the most experienced workers in

\textsuperscript{41} Separate families within a case are also know as "Assistant Units."
the unit. Unlike Alameda county, APDP workers in Los Angeles were assigned, rather than recruited, to work on APDP cases.

The major management issue proved to be language; offices that served predominantly English-speaking or Spanish-speaking clients received a wide range of clients who speak many other languages. Another management issue was the relative complexity of the APDP casefiles: each eligibility worker had to deal with the full range of case types, such as earned income, unearned income, stepfather, etc. Thus, the deputy directors and APDP supervisors selected eligibility workers for their language abilities and skill. In all five offices, there are a total of eleven workers with APDP control cases, and eight of these workers are bilingual.

The district managers planned their APDP staffing needs based on the estimates provided by the state Department of Social Services, which proved to be slightly higher than the actual sample in some district offices. As a result, the average caseloads for the APDP control case workers in those offices were lower than regular workers at first. While this compensates for the greater variety of cases, some supervisors have begun assigning regular cases to APDP workers to better balance the workload within their offices. Other than handling a wider range of cases (both in terms of type and language) the APDP workers’ jobs have not changed significantly.
Centralizing and Cleaning Cases

The control clients' case folders were centralized in December. The Department administrators began the process by sending all AFDC staff instructions on transferring cases on December 4, 1992. Los Angeles district offices used their regular case transfer system, in contrast to Alameda county which organized a one-time mass transfer of all APDP cases. By and large, the process was successful: the majority of the case folders were transferred within the five districts by the end of the month.

One difficulty with centralizing cases stemmed from control case recipients moving between districts or re-applying for AFDC. Until May, when the IBPS computer system staff created a control case alert in the main computer system used by eligibility workers\(^{42}\), the district offices had no simple method to determine a case's status at intake and transfer it to the proper regional office.

In order to ensure that research cases were treated like other cases, DPSS central administrators did not require that control cases be "cleaned". However, some offices, units, and individual workers chose to clean their cases on their own initiative, as they normally would have with any newly assigned cases.

\(^{42}\) Known as WCMIS: the Welfare Case Management Information System.
Replacement Sample

Integrating the replacement sample was more difficult in Los Angeles than the other counties for several reasons. First, the sample size is twice as large as the other counties. Second, the county data bases have a fairly low congruence rate with MEDS. As a result, a higher proportion of Los Angeles replacement cases did not fit the sample selection criteria for APDP, primarily because they were not new approvals to AFDC.

After the research staff of the Department of Public Social Services devoted considerable time to straightening out the replacement sample, they proposed their own program to select the replacement sample from the county computer systems. However, the state Department of Social Services decided to continuing doing all sample selection and further refine its programming to overcome some of the problems inherent in MEDS. By August the samples sent from the state had many fewer problems, and Los Angeles was able to integrate them into the larger sample with little difficulty.

Computer programming to produce supplements for replacement control cases was also a challenge for Los Angeles. In an effort to avoid cases receiving supplements for months prior to December, a default date of 12/1/92 was programmed on IBPS, because the county had been informed that only new approvals would be selected as replacement cases. However, the replacement sample actually contained cases with earlier approval dates, so these cases were supplemented back to December instead of the month of selection for APDP, which resulted in the county having to issue overpayments.
In contrast to the other APDP counties, Los Angeles did not contact the state about exempting clients working more than 100 hours from the control case replacement sample. Prior to receiving a letter from the state in June 1993 which instructed the APDP counties to drop these cases from the study, Los Angeles had been discontinuing clients working over 100 hours if they were selected for the control group.

**Data Collection**

The Department's Research and Statistics staff are responsible for collecting and sending data on the APDP cases to UC DATA. The data is taken from the county's statistical database, FOCUS, which has a "snapshot" of data from the payment system for the current month. Because FOCUS does not contain childcare and homeless data, a Department research programmer had to run an index of APDP cases through other systems to obtain all the information needed by UC DATA. Department staff also had to set up a special program to track Food Stamps-only cases, as requested by UC DATA. For their own management of the project, the Department uses FOCUS and Research and Statistics Section’s internal computer system to track APDP cases and generate reports which indicate the monthly AFDC status of the cases.

**Impact on Clients**

When clients were first informed about their selection for APDP, many clients in the control group called to express concern about their cases being transferred to another office.
In contrast to the other demonstration counties that centralized APDP cases, Los Angeles expects control group recipients to travel to the regional offices for their interviews.

Summary

Los Angeles county’s implementation of APDP differs from the other three counties in several respects. The most significant feature is that control cases were centralized into five district offices, so that their treatment was different from other cases, but also varied between offices. Furthermore, the process of centralizing cases was complex and challenging because so many individuals and separate units were involved. Finally, Los Angeles had difficulty completing extensive programming needed to implement the study, as well as integrating the cases selected by the state in the original and replacement samples. Because of Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services’ great size and complexity of operations, they experienced more problems with the task given to them by the state than the other counties, and consequently took several months longer to ensure smooth operation of the project.
Case Study III: San Bernardino

County Background

Stretching from Los Angeles to Arizona, San Bernardino is by far the largest county in the demonstration project in terms of geographic size. San Bernardino's 1990 population of 1,418,380, however, ranks a distant second behind Los Angeles and is only modestly larger than Alameda.\(^{43}\) Not surprisingly, 23 percent of San Bernardino’s population lives in unincorporated areas, most similar to the San Joaquin’s rural population.\(^{44}\) Like Los Angeles, San Bernardino has a large Hispanic population, comprising 26 percent of the total. In addition, close to 8 percent of the residents are African-American and 4 percent of the residents are Asian or Pacific Islander.\(^{45}\)

In comparison to the other research counties, San Bernardino’s economy has not weathered the recession very well. In 1990, median household income in the county was $33,443. At the same time, 12.7 percent of county residents lived below the federal poverty level.\(^{46}\) In addition, the unemployment rate grew to 7.9 percent by April of 1991.\(^{47}\) In comparison to Alameda county, which has a comparable population, San Bernardino has

\(^{43}\) 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

\(^{44}\) California State Association of Counties, *California County Fact Book*, 1992

\(^{45}\) 1990 Census of Population and Housing


lower median income, higher unemployment, and greater proportion of poor residents. Only San Joaquin ranked lower on these three measures of economic health.

Reflecting these general conditions, San Bernardino ranked second among these four counties for the proportion of its population receiving AFDC, which was approximately 9 percent in 1990. The county's October 1992 AFDC caseload of 57,012 is also the second largest of the research counties.

San Bernardino's Department of Public Social Services employs approximately 1,000 eligibility workers working in eleven district offices spread throughout the county. These local offices are organized into four regions, each headed by a regional manager. Administrative functions such as fiscal, auditing, and computer services, are all centralized and located in the city of San Bernardino. San Bernardino's AFDC program costs approximately $39 million to operate, and provides over $417 million in benefits.

Eligibility Procedures

Like the other counties, San Bernardino specializes its eligibility workers by two main functions: intake and continuing case work. One small difference from the other three counties is that San Bernardino organizes its eligibility staff into slightly larger units of ten

---


49 California Department of Social Services, AFDC Characteristics Survey, October 1992.
workers, each headed by a supervisor and a lead worker. These lead workers are classified as Eligibility Worker III's and assist the other workers in the unit in addition to carrying their own caseloads. The eligibility workers are represented by an employees' association, which has negotiated caseload targets of 156 cases per worker. Like both Los Angeles and San Joaquin counties, these caseload targets are guidelines rather than strict limits. At this point, average caseloads have reached 175-210 per worker.

San Bernardino has placed fewer restrictions on client contact compared to the other APDP counties. At intake, for example, applicants are taken on a first come, first serve basis rather than by appointment. In addition, the county has no restrictions or screening procedures for client telephone calls. Like the other counties, however, some continuing units have adopted group redetermination interviews.

San Bernardino's type of automation is similar to Los Angeles county, in that many eligibility functions are automated and EW's access the computer system through forms and printed reports. The county's main computer system issues benefits, most notices of action, and updates MEDS electronically. The county also maintains separate GAIN and child welfare systems. Currently, congruence between San Bernardino's system and MEDS is running approximately 80 percent. In contrast to the other counties, the Department has assigned two staff in the central Management Information unit the responsibility of tracking down and resolving MEDS discrepancies.
Data entry into the county computer system is centralized, so eligibility workers input and check case information through forms and printed reports. Because this data entry system requires attention to detail, skill at filling out these forms is an important aspect of eligibility workers’ jobs. On occasion, eligibility determination and budget calculations must be done manually by the eligibility workers, and for this purpose workers share programmable calculators.

**Early Planning: Welfare Reform Demonstration Project**

The Department of Public Social Services began planning to implement the Welfare Reform Demonstration Project in the summer of 1992. In contrast to some of the other counties involved, by early fall staff in San Bernardino understood that the APDP policy changes mandated in the budget would be implemented as a demonstration project even if Proposition 165 failed at the polls. As a result, San Bernardino developed parallel plans for both the WRDP and APDP research components much earlier than the other research counties.

The Department designated one of its AFDC program specialists as the APDP Coordinator, responsible for acting as a liaison between the state Department of Social Services and the various divisions of the county department affected by the project. The Department’s planning team was drawn from the senior staff of the Income Maintenance division, including the deputy director, regional managers, and APDP Coordinator.
These managers decided early in the planning process to centralize both control and experimental cases. The main considerations were ease of access for researchers and reducing the possibilities for errors due to maintaining two sets of regulations. They decided to consolidate the 1,000 control cases into the Redlands office and to split the 2,000 experimental cases between the Redlands, Fontana, and Victorville district offices. These offices were chosen in order to make the casefiles easily accessible, rather than to facilitate random replacement sampling, as in Los Angeles. To ease the impact of centralizing cases on clients, the managers decided that APDP eligibility workers would be responsible for travelling to the other district offices to meet with clients. In addition, they also authorized clients to call their eligibility workers collect.

Unlike the other research counties, managers in San Bernardino clearly understood that a evaluation research would be conducted regardless of whether Proposition 165 passed at the polls. Still, the scale of the case file transfer within such a large county made implementation in the short time frame between the election and the legally mandated effective dates extremely difficult. Before the election, the Department’s Director requested from DSS in writing all the information and approvals necessary for implementing both demonstration projects. Consequently, San Bernardino staff began implementing APDP the day after the election.
Implementation: Regulation Changes

AFDC staff were informed about the change in the 100 hour rule and the Relocation Family Grant in written material distributed on November 11, 1992. Revised budget worksheets and application forms were also distributed to all AFDC staff later in the month. In addition, San Bernardino provided its supervisors and lead workers with a short training program on the APDP policy changes on November 17 and 19, 1992. The training primarily focused on the intricacies of interpreting the Relocation Family Grant regulations.

The 1.3 percent grant reduction was implemented centrally using the automated payroll system. The programming to accomplish this proved to be more expensive and time consuming than previous grant reductions because the October and December reductions occurred so close together, requiring the county to add the capacity to maintain three different grant tables simultaneously. All treatment group clients, however, received their reduced grants on time in December.

Clients were informed about the regulation changes in November, when the Department mailed all clients a mass informing notice and individual notices of action detailing the exact changes in their grants. In both cases, the Department chose to use the sample notices supplied by DSS. [See Appendix C.]

The Relocation Family Grant (RFG), by far the most complicated of the three APDP policy changes, was initially implemented manually by the intake workers while the systems
staff worked on automating the complicated grant calculations. When the Green v. Anderson temporary restraining order was issued December 22, 1992, approximately 90 cases had been affected by the residency requirement. On January 4, 1993 the Department informed eligibility workers of the temporary restraining order and instructed them to continue collecting residency information, but to apply the California payment standards to all recipients.

Implementation: Research Component

Implementing the experimental research design for the evaluation study proved to be the most complicated aspect of the demonstration project. Separating the control group and supplementing their grants involved extensive computer programming, data entry, transfer of case files, notification of affected clients, and reorganization of the eligibility staff. The Department's Automated System's Unit was responsible for managing the programming and data entry required for the project. The responsibility of coordinating the case file transfer fell to the Corrective Action Panel (CAP) task force, an elite unit of eligibility workers who conduct in-house quality control reviews.

The Department began to transfer cases to the Fontana, Redlands, and Victorville district offices on November 4. The entire process took approximately two weeks. The CAP task force separated and organized the control and experimental case files, filled out the paperwork to convert all the control cases to new aid codes, and recalculated grants for
everyone with income. These staff members had to work overtime to complete the task before the December first effective date.

The clients in the control group were given one monthly check (as opposed to the usual bimonthly checks) for the first three months of the project in order to reduce the administrative workload. While the majority of the control cases received the correct grant in the month of December, some control grants were delayed because of various computer problems. For example, conversion of 67 control cases did not go through because unrelated changes to their data files had already been entered in the computer system, which only accommodates one action at a time. Other delays stemmed from late monthly income reports, which had to be sent separately from the case files through interoffice mail. The CAP unit handled each problem individually, authorizing manually-issued checks and food stamp certificates for all the clients involved.

The Department notified clients of their selection for the APDP evaluation study in December, 1992. Clients received either control or experimental informing notices, based on the examples provided by DSS. [See Appendix D.] Control clients also received notices of action which specified the exact increase in their grants. However, the Department did not notify clients of their case transfer until January. In December, many clients called their old workers about their selection for the study and were then referred to the CAP task force. As a result, the CAP unit was kept busy handling an unusually large volume of client phone calls in December.
Staffing

The regional managers and the APDP coordinator began selecting supervisors for the new APDP units in November. The supervisors and central administrators chose eligibility workers from district offices throughout the county on the basis of their skill and flexibility. All of these staffing changes were accomplished through involuntary lateral transfers and the four new APDP units were established during the month of December. The control unit, which includes eight workers, was placed in the Fontana office, while the three experimental units, each with six APDP workers, were established in the Fontana, Redlands, and Victorville offices. There were no significant differences between the control and experimental units either in terms of the management or the workers. The new units gradually took over the APDP caseload from the CAP workers, who returned to their usual tasks in January.

The APDP workers' caseload average of 135 cases per worker has been below the planning target of 156 cases/worker because the replacement sample has not been as large as the county expected. Their workload, however, has been heavier than non-APDP workers for several reasons. The main ongoing difference is that these workers are required to travel to other district offices to meet with clients. For the first six months of the project, however, the biggest task has been a thorough review of every APDP case file, including both controls and experimentals.
Centralizing and Cleaning Cases

This case-by-case review, known in the county as "case cleaning," was designed to ensure that the data being handed over to the evaluation researchers would be accurate. The APDP workers reviewed all the documentation and budget calculations in each case file and corrected every error they discovered. In January, the Department temporarily assigned additional staff to the APDP units to assist them in this undertaking.

In the course of this review, the APDP workers found approximately 100 control cases with delinquent redeterminations, which they immediately conducted. In addition, approximately 25 cases were discontinued as a result of the case cleaning process. CAP workers reported that since the review was finished the APDP cases have had lower error rates than the rest of the caseload.

Replacement Sample

Like the other research counties, San Bernardino supported UC DATA's decision to retroactively select the replacement sample from MEDS rather than at the point of intake. The logistical problems of sending research staff out into the district offices were magnified in San Bernardino, where offices are not only separated by long distances, but also have widely different application rates. Because this decision was made in January after all of the staffing changes had already been made, a few intake workers who had been assigned to APDP units were retrained as continuing workers.
As in the other research counties, integrating the first replacement sample was delayed in San Bernardino because of the faulty March sample. Fortunately, San Bernardino county had not notified any clients before that sample was integrated and thus was able to scrap the list without any complications. The Department established regular procedures for integrating replacement cases and then distributed the second March replacement sample to eligibility staff on May 14, 1993. That sample was transferred and converted by July. The subsequent April, May, and June replacement cases were integrated into the sample as a group in August.

For all these replacement samples, the clients in the control group received supplemental checks for the period between their application date and their case conversion. County staff moved to a monthly schedule for integrating the replacement sample on September 10, 1993. At that point, clients in the control group were converted an average of six weeks after their application date.

Like other APDP counties, San Bernardino staff became concerned about the fairness of selecting clients who were already working over 100 hours as control cases in the replacement sample. Because these clients had been legally working under the treatment group rules, discontinuing them because they were randomly selected to participate in the study seemed unfair to the county staff. After seeking clarification of the state’s policy, the Department of Public Social Services chose not to include these clients in the control group.
To date, approximately six clients in San Bernardino have been exempted from the control group because they were already working 100 hours.

During the replacement sample phase of implementation, the Department’s original APDP coordinator was promoted to the position of regional manager and was replaced by another AFDC program specialist. Although the new coordinator later received a promotion as well, she continued to serve as the Department’s APDP Coordinator.

Data Collection

Because UC DATA’s original request for data on the APDP sample would have required expensive reprogramming, San Bernardino decided to ship all of their monthly computer files instead. Since UC DATA staff filter out the information necessary for the cost neutrality reports and integrated databases, preparing these monthly computer tapes has not been difficult for San Bernardino staff.

Impact on Clients

At this point, clients have primarily expressed frustration about the transfer of their cases. Most of the phone calls received in December and January from APDP clients were complaints and worries about the possibility of having to travel long distances. Since then the complaints have subsided. A few workers reported that clients objected to being scrutinized by the state and threatened to leave the county rather than participate in the evaluation study.
Summary

San Bernardino's implementation of APDP differs from the other counties on several dimensions. The most significant differences lie in the administrative treatment of the APDP cases. First, San Bernardino chose to centralize both control and experimental cases into specialized units located in three district offices. Second, the APDP eligibility workers systematically cleaned every case in both samples. Thus, in contrast to both Alameda and Los Angeles, San Bernardino has given both the control and experimental groups comparable treatments. Unlike San Joaquin's APDP clients, however, the experience of all the APDP clients in San Bernardino is substantially different from that of the treatment group as a whole.
Case Study IV: San Joaquin County

County Background

San Joaquin county has the smallest population of the four APDP counties, with 480,628 residents in 1990. Over 40 percent of the county’s population lives in the city of Stockton, the rest living in smaller towns or unincorporated areas (which contain about 26 percent of the population). The population is predominately white (59.1 percent) and Hispanic (22.7 percent). Almost 12 percent of the residents are Asian or Pacific Islander and 5 percent are African-American. San Joaquin county’s population is unique among the four APDP counties, because it has the highest percentage (5.7 percent) of residents from the Southeast Asian countries.

The economic situation in this small rural county is relatively depressed. In 1990, the median household income in San Joaquin was $30,635, the lowest of the four counties. In 1990, 15.7 percent of San Joaquin’s residents had incomes below the federal poverty line, the highest percentage of the four counties. Unemployment in San Joaquin is dramatically higher than in the other three counties at 12.7 percent in April of 1991.
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50 1990 Census of Population and Housing.
51 California State Association of Counties, California County Fact Book, 1992
52 1990 Census of Population and Housing.
53 California Department of Finance, California Statistical Abstract, 1992
54 California State Association of Counties, California County Fact Book, 1992
San Joaquin county’s economic situation is reflected in the welfare caseloads. In October 1992, this small county’s AFDC caseload totalled 20,786. Over 12 percent of San Joaquin’s population was receiving AFDC in 1990, while the other three counties had less than 10 percent of their population on welfare. In 1992, 19 percent of the AFDC cases were unemployed parent cases, whereas the other counties had from 10-15 percent unemployed parent cases. Clearly, San Joaquin has a very different welfare population with distinctly different problems than the other four counties. Higher unemployment as well as seasonal employment fluctuations are just two factors distinguishing San Joaquin county.

Like all California counties, San Joaquin county has suffered from reductions in state funding and shortfalls in anticipated tax revenues over the last several years. San Joaquin’s Human Services Agency has steadily reduced filled positions by 200 in recent years. In anticipation of the 93-94 shortfall, the Agency chose to eliminate 44 positions this past June, and laid off a total of 60 people. No eligibility worker positions were eliminated; however, like most welfare departments the Agency is understaffed.

The Agency employs approximately 940 FTE’s, including about 360 positions in the Income Maintenance Bureau, which determines eligibility for AFDC, Food Stamps, General Relief, Medi-Cal, refugee assistance, and GAIN. Within the AFDC Program alone, there
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are 150 eligibility workers as well as their unit supervisors and clerks. All AFDC eligibility staff are located in downtown Stockton, except for one unit outstationed in South Stockton. San Joaquin’s AFDC Program costs approximately $10 million to operate, and provides over $170 million in benefits.

Eligibility Procedures

As in other counties, San Joaquin’s eligibility workers are specialized as either intake or continuing workers. Unlike other counties, the workers are rarely specialized further, and they are located in one office. In 1993, the Agency employed about 30 intake workers, and 120 continuing workers to handle AFDC cases. Many workers belong to an employees’ association, but there is no union which limits their caseload as in Alameda county. Currently, continuing workers carry an average of 200 cases. Intake workers take a minimum of 35 applications per month.

San Joaquin’s AFDC intake procedure varies from other counties in that they have developed a "Rights and Responsibilities Video" to show applicants before the face-to-face interview, so that the eligibility worker need not cover these rights and responsibilities in detail at the interview. The 20 minute tape is played in English and Spanish; for Asian clients, the information is covered in their interview. As needed, the Agency provides Spanish-speaking intake workers and some Asian-speaking workers, but the Southeast Asian clients almost always bring their own translators.

57 Except for the 7 workers outstationed in South Stockton, as discussed above.
Eligibility determinations and grant calculations are not automated in San Joaquin as in some other counties. Eligibility workers calculate budgets and grants on adding machines, then their arithmetic is later checked by the audit department. If all is correct, data entry staff input information into the county’s welfare payroll system which generates grant checks. Audit staff complete and send Notices of Action describing all changes to individual cases. Eligibility workers currently have limited access to computer terminals, but they can look up cases on MEDS or OASIS (the county welfare data base) to check if a client has ever been on welfare.

Discrepancies between MEDS and the county system exist in San Joaquin as in the other APDP counties. The county welfare data submitted to MEDS comes from the payroll system and is sent daily to Sacramento. Differences between this file and MEDS occur when MEDS rejects cases with incorrect information. Like San Bernardino, San Joaquin used to have a unit that checked and fixed MEDS discrepancies, but those staff were recently laid off.

**Early Planning: Welfare Reform Demonstration Project**

By July 1992, the Agency was aware that it had been chosen as a control county for WRDP and began planning for implementation of the demonstration project. The Policies and Procedures Coordinator for the Agency was then the Coordinator of the LINK-UP Demonstration Project and was chosen as the lead on WRDP as well. The Coordinator
worked closely with her staff, computer systems staff, and others in the Agency to develop necessary materials and procedures for implementing the new regulation changes and the evaluation study. By October, new aid codes were created and complete instructions were ready. With uncertainty about the fate of WRDP in the election, instructions were prepared to cover either WRDP or the scaled down version in the budget (APDP).

One of the first internal issues to be resolved was how to organize eligibility work on control cases. The Agency management, with input from operations staff, made their decisions in September and October. At first management considered centralizing the control cases into one eligibility unit, so that only seven workers would have to learn different rules. One impetus for this approach was that it made tracking costs much easier for the fiscal staff. Line supervisors raised the concern that having only seven workers trained in the different regulations would create a problem if any of these workers left. With the support of Income Maintenance Bureau management, the decision was made to not centralize or move control cases from their original placement. This resulted in each worker having some control cases, although unit supervisors could reassign control cases at their discretion.

The next set of issues to resolve was the integration of LINK-UP with the welfare reform package. It was clear by September, after the state budget passed, that the 100 hour rule was going to be eliminated for continuing AFDC clients. The LINK-UP demonstration project had already been testing waiver of the 100 hour rule in San Joaquin and seven other Central Valley Counties since January 1992.
The first LINK-UP-related issue involved a discrepancy in the 100 hour rule regulations for LINK-UP and the new statewide change.\(^ {58} \) As a result, in late November San Joaquin changed its procedure with regard to LINK-UP. This subtle but complex change in regulations for Unemployed Parent cases actually made the eligibility worker's job easier in San Joaquin, but at the same time slightly changed the impact on certain types of cases of the 100 hour rule.

The next and more significant LINK-UP-related issue was how to integrate LINK-UP and the new demonstration project, especially how to handle the LINK-UP control cases. At first DSS considered continuing both demonstration projects, but soon decided LINK-UP had to be subsumed under the new project. San Joaquin HSA then requested that they keep the same control group; however, DSS decided that the LINK-UP sample would not be an adequate sample for the new project. By early December, San Joaquin had officially dropped out of LINK-UP (with effective date of November 30, 1992).

One complication relating to integration of LINK-UP stemmed from the fact that during November San Joaquin was in negotiations about their participation in the demonstration project. Uncertainty about their participation made integrating LINK-UP more complicated, as the LINK-UP control group had to be maintained in the event that the county was not included in APDP. Staff and clients continued to received notices about LINK-UP
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\(^ {58} \) The discrepancy involved the definition of unemployed parent and affected mixed family cases.
as though it would continue. At the end of November LINK-UP control case recipients were mailed a notice informing them that the 100 hour rule still applied to them even though there was a state-wide lifting of the rule. A little over a week later these same clients were mailed notices explaining that they were no longer a part of LINK-UP.

By December 1, planning for APDP was complete and Agency staff were ready to implement the demonstration project. However, the Director of the Agency had put a hold on implementing the study while he conducted further negotiations with DSS. By December 7 an agreement between DSS and San Joaquin was reached, giving the Agency the green light to implement and inform eligibility workers about the study. Although prepared, the staff had a very short time frame to implement the project, which was effective retroactively on December 1.

Implementation: Regulation Changes

During the month of November staff were instructed to implement the MAP reduction, 100 hour rule change, and Relocation Family Grant by December 1. The day after the election a summary of the three policies and the new MAP table was published for staff, and was followed a week later by further materials needed to implement RFG. The Policies and Procedures unit conducted a training for eligibility supervisors at this time in order to review the instructions.
Implementation of the grant reduction was accomplished partially by computer programming and partially by eligibility workers and audit staff. The reduction was programmed into the payroll system for all AFDC cases without income. Eligibility workers manually recalculated the budgets and grants for cases which receive less than the maximum grant.

Systems and audit staff carefully planned implementation of these changes throughout the month of November, with November 24 as the target date to "mass adjust grant levels." However, another automated change being made around the same time made timely and accurate implementation more difficult. For eligibility workers the only barrier to implementation was time. Normally workers only need to do budgets for cases with changes, so doing budgets for all income cases naturally increased their workload for that month.\textsuperscript{59} Workers have from the 1st to the 20th to complete all budgets for the following month, and (as a result of the election) they were notified to implement the change for December several days into this 20 day period.

Clients received Notices of Action (NOA's), between November 5th and 19th, which showed the exact decrease in their grants. By the end of November, all clients were mailed the informing notice created by DSS which describes the policy changes. [See Appendix C.]

\textsuperscript{59} One eligibility worker estimated that she had 25 percent more cases for which to do budgets as a result of the December grant reduction.
Eligibility workers also received, in their instructions in early November, a copy of this informing notice sent to recipients.

Implementation of the Relocation Family Grant (RFG) went ahead on December 1. San Joaquin developed explicit instructions as well as their own table. Approximately 15 cases were approved at lower grant levels. On December 28, staff were instructed, pursuant to the Green v. Anderson Temporary Restraining Order, to stop calculating the RFG grants, to supplement December grants of the 15 cases already receiving lower amounts, and to continue to label old and new cases as "RFG". On February 16, eligibility staff were notified of the preliminary injunction in the Green case and instructed to stop labelling cases, but to continue to have applicants complete the RFG portion of the application.

Implementation: Research Component

Despite the uncertainty of the election and negotiations, processing the initial sample of research cases proceeded smoothly in San Joaquin. Early in November, the Coordinator identified the cases chosen as controls who were already working 100 hours or more to eliminate these from the sample. Then she located each case and printed lists for each continuing eligibility worker of the control and experimental cases in their caseload. By

---

60 San Joaquin had such cases because the 100 hour rule was already waived under LINK-UP. Nineteen cases were dropped from the original control case sample for this reason.
December 7, complete instructions on processing control and experimental cases were published and sent to eligibility staff.61

For control cases receiving exactly the MAP, their grant was increased automatically. This change occurred in mid-December and produced higher grants in January as well as supplements for December. For the rest of the cases, eligibility workers had to recalculate grants manually. For all control cases, eligibility workers changed aid codes and labelled files to reflect control status. For experimental cases, files were simply labelled. Intake workers were given similar instructions for "reapplications" of previously selected control and experimental cases.

Between December 8th and 21st, control case clients were sent individual Notices of Actions (NOA's) in the format suggested by DSS, which detailed their grant increase, selection as part of the control group, and possible selection for interview. The mass informing notice written by DSS was included with the control cases NOA's. If applicable, control cases received a third notice as well, which listed the maximum Food Stamp reduction they may receive. Experimental cases received a Notice of Action, with the language provided by the state. (See Appendix D.) Staff were also informed that clients would be receiving these notices.

61 In mid-December, the APDP Coordinator was notified by the state that all AU’s in a case were supposed to be in control status, so she tracked down the casefiles for the additional AU’s. These were often handled by the same eligibility worker as the original case, but not always. In the initial sample, 4 control and 8 experimental cases had multiple AU’s.
All control cases received higher grants on January 1, and were mailed December supplements by January 8. Although staff did not begin converting control cases until December, the delay did not seem to produce any major problems. Supplementing December grants in January had an added benefit for eligibility workers, as it eliminated the need to correct overissuance of Food Stamps in December.

Replacement Sample

Integration of replacement cases also went smoothly. In the first instructions to staff in December, they were told that a research analyst would come to the Agency every six days starting in February to select intake applications for the replacement sample. Consequently it was anticipated that intake workers would have a larger role; however, in April staff were informed that the replacement cases would be selected from MEDS, requiring action by continuing eligibility workers only. Continuing workers were told that they would receive a list of their cases that were newly selected as control or experimental shortly after the first of the month. Because of the need to supplement grants from the month of selection, Food Stamps adjustments did require some "double-handling" by workers, in order to make up for overissuances in earlier months.

An April memo instructed staff on integrating the 90 cases in the first March replacement, which was accomplished before DSS decided to select a different March sample. When the second March sample came, San Joaquin integrated that as well, with DSS permission to leave the original cases in the sample. Staff were notified in May of the
additional March replacement cases, which they needed to supplement back 3-4 months. Integration of April and May replacement samples was completed closer to those months, requiring less supplements to be issued.

For the APDP coordinator, there was minimal difficulty in processing the first replacement samples. After a call from the Alameda APDP coordinator, she discovered that San Joaquin's March sample included long-term cases, presumably because of the lag time with MEDS. However, all cases in the current samples seem to be new approvals. A greater difficulty was loss of the systems analyst assigned to APDP, who was laid-off in mid-June but had previously helped with processing the replacement samples.

Integration of the replacement samples in San Joaquin raised two issues relating to the policy changes. The first issue concerned families with principal earners that work over 100 hours per week and are subsequently selected as a control case. When a worker reported that one of her clients had just gone to work and she would have to discontinue his case after converting it to control status, San Joaquin staff notified DSS. The state told San Joaquin to drop these types of cases from the sample. On May 24, eligibility staff were instructed to not discontinue these cases and to notify the APDP coordinator so she could have the cases dropped from the sample. There were three such cases in the March replacement sample.

The second issue concerned control cases selected after July 1, 1995 when all new cases were qualified at a higher need standard. When converted to control status at the
lower need standard, cases with income were likely to have lower grants. Concerned about this issue, the APDP Coordinator contacted DSS, and was told to keep such cases in the sample, but not to calculate overpayments for the months before selection. On June 21, staff were instructed to not compute these overpayments when converting control cases after July. Lowering of a grant for control status did occur in at least one case.

Data Collection

Collection of data for UC Data has also gone smoothly. Systems staff wrote programs to filter out data on experimental and control cases, and currently send five files to UC every month. This is a manageable task for the systems staff, who deal directly with UC DATA. Involvement of the APDP Coordinator and DSS is minimal.

Impact on Staff and Clients

San Joaquin’s implementation of APDP differs the most from other counties because there was no major reorganization of cases or staff. As discussed earlier, conversion of cases to control and experimental status was accomplished by the eligibility units that already had the cases. This resulted in each worker having an average of 8 control cases in their caseload. However, each unit supervisor had the discretion to reassign control cases in their unit. In at least one unit, the supervisor reassigned all control cases to one worker, in order to reduce the errors associated with using two set of rules. Other than movement within units or combining separate assistance units, there was no movement of casefiles as in the
other counties. In addition there was no organized effort or directive by management to "clean" cases for the study as in the other counties.

For eligibility workers, handling control cases, which account for 6 percent or less of their caseload, was not a major change in the content of their work. Eligibility workers were accustomed to having LINK-UP control cases, which function like APDP control cases in terms of the 100 hour rule.\textsuperscript{62} Using two different tables to calculate grants, one for control cases and one for other cases, did not seem to present a problem either. As one worker said, "It is just a different chart." In the case of the eligibility worker who handles all the control cases for her unit, some adjustment was required when non-English speaking clients were transferred to her. To the extent these clients had bilingual workers, the transfer required some adjustment for them as well. Otherwise clients in general did not experience "side effects" from implementation of the study in San Joaquin.

Budgetary pressures and the resulting Agency lay offs increased the pressures of APDP implementation on the Agency. Most notably, all four computer systems analysts were laid off in June, including one who was responsible for APDP and completed all necessary planning and requests to implement the computer aspects of the project until that time.\textsuperscript{63} Systems-related work then fell into the lap of the data entry and data management

\textsuperscript{62} The was no specialization for or centralization of LINK-UP control cases as well.

\textsuperscript{63} San Joaquin county has a central data processing agency which programs all the county systems.
staff and their supervisor, who are responsible for all ongoing computer input and management for the Agency.

Future Issues

San Joaquin has been chosen as an "interim SAWS county," and eventually will have an automated eligibility system. Implementation of SAWS may require a change in the Agency's arrangement with regard to APDP control cases, because interim SAWS will not do control case budgets. Workers who are learning the automated system would have to maintain a manual system for control cases, so the Agency may decide at that time to centralize control cases into one unit.

Summary

San Joaquin county's implementation of the first APDP phase of the welfare reform program differed from the other counties in three major ways: the control cases were not centralized among eligibility staff, implementation was delayed because of county-state negotiations, and the county had an existing demonstration project (LINK-UP) to incorporate into APDP. Because San Joaquin county has a small centralized welfare department, administrative staff were able to implement and manage the regulation changes and evaluation study without some of the complications encountered in other counties.

---

64 SAWS is the Statewide Automated Welfare System which was developed in Napa county.
Patterns of County Implementation

The four counties chosen as research counties for the welfare reform evaluation study have distinct characteristics relating to their geography, populations, welfare caseload, and welfare departments.

Los Angeles and Alameda counties contain major urban centers of California, and San Joaquin and San Bernardino counties are neighboring rural areas. San Joaquin represents the agricultural region known as the Central Valley, while San Bernardino is part of Southern California’s vast desert region and is the largest of the four counties in geographic size.

With almost 9 million residents in 1990, Los Angeles county has the largest population of any California county. San Bernardino and Alameda, with approximately 1.2 to 1.5 million residents each, have less than one-sixth of the population of Los Angeles. San Joaquin, with about half a million residents, has less than one-eighteenth of Los Angeles’s population.

It is not surprising that Los Angeles has the highest welfare caseload as well, with over 285,000 cases in 1992; the other three counties range from 30,000 to 60,000 cases, with San Joaquin’s caseload being the smallest. However, San Joaquin had the highest percentage of its population on AFDC of all three counties in 1990. In addition San Joaquin
is unique because it has close to 20 percent unemployed parent cases, while the other counties have from 10 to 15 percent unemployed parent cases.

Because of sheer size, the AFDC staff of Los Angeles's Department of Public Social Services are spread out over 24 district offices, and San Bernardino's Department of Public Social Services has AFDC staff in 11 district offices. The Social Services Agency in Alameda has AFDC staff in four offices, and San Joaquin's Human Services Agency has one central office. Eligibility functions for AFDC are generally automated in all the counties except San Joaquin. In Alameda, workers conduct eligibility processing on-line, whereas in Los Angeles and San Bernardino workers access the computer primarily through forms and printed reports.

Planning for Welfare Reform

By July of 1992, all four counties had been notified by DSS that they had been chosen as research counties for the demonstration project. County planning primarily revolved around staffing for the project, management of control cases, and changing automated systems. As counties did not know what welfare reform package would be implemented until the November 3 election, they had to prepare for both the WRDP and the APDP policy changes.

The first task of each county was to designate a project coordinator, for which the state later allocated full funding. Generally the county's AFDC program specialist was chosen, with exception of Alameda county which created an APDP Coordinator position,
filled in January 1993. Alameda county was unique in having an APDP Coordinator devoted exclusively to management of the research component of the project.

All four counties decided very early whether or not to centralize the control and experimental case files. Alameda, Los Angeles and San Bernardino chose to centralize cases for several reasons, such as using the best workers, reducing errors associated with two sets of regulations, and ease of access for research staff. Alameda and Los Angeles centralized control cases only, while San Bernardino centralized both control and experimental cases. For its 1,000 control cases, Alameda was able to use one eligibility unit located in one office, while San Bernardino centralized all 3,000 research cases into four offices around the county. Both counties planned for eligibility workers to travel to clients in their closest district office. Los Angeles centralized control cases into five district offices, which represented five sociodemographic regions designed to assist evaluation research. Los Angeles decided to require clients to travel to the five APDP offices.

San Joaquin county considered centralizing cases, but decided against it because of concerns over replacing specialized workers who leave their positions. In addition, San Joaquin’s Human Services Agency is small and centralized, and the eligibility workers already had experience with a related demonstration project, LINK-UP. In contrast to Los Angeles which specializes its 4,000 eligibility workers by type of case, San Joaquin typically trains all of their 150 eligibility workers to handle all types of cases. Because San Joaquin already had control cases for the LINK-UP demonstration project, planning time was devoted
to discontinuing participation in that project in preparation for the new demonstration project.\textsuperscript{65}

All four counties had to plan changes to their automated systems in order to reduce grant levels and to identify cases selected for the study as control or experimental. For the highly automated counties this was a major concern. For instance, Alameda county’s Case Data System (CDS) required extensive programming changes, which were done by a private vendor, Electronic Data Systems (EDS). Because CDS is also used by other counties, Alameda’s APDP programming delayed the work of eighteen other counties. Alameda needed adequate lead time to make these changes as well as assurances of full state reimbursement for its relatively expensive programming costs. Los Angeles also spent considerable time planning and programming complex changes to its various automated systems.

Several other issues were discussed and negotiated with DSS during the planning stages, primarily relating to funding. Several counties requested state reimbursement for the county cost of the increase in control case grants, to which the state eventually agreed. In general, the state agreed to cover APDP-related administrative costs, and where necessary agreed to specific allocations before implementation began.

\textsuperscript{65} LINK-UP is testing the effect of waiving the 100 hour rule, a provision which is in the welfare reform package as well. DSS decided rather than keep San Joaquin in two projects, that San Joaquin should discontinue the research status of cases in LINK-UP and start with a fresh sample in the new demonstration project.
Implementation of the Policy Changes

All four counties implemented the grant reduction centrally through their automated benefit issuance systems. For most counties this was a routine change, especially because it was the third grant reduction in the last year and a half. Both San Bernardino and San Joaquin could only automate the change for cases without income, so that for cases with income the reduction required manual budget and grant recalculations. This resulted in an increased workload for continuing eligibility workers for the month of November. In addition, the time frame for completing this process was shorter than usual since the size of the grant reduction was not known until the November 3 election.

Eligibility staff were informed about the policy changes and given implementation instructions in early to mid-November in all four counties. The instructions explained how to process cases that were affected by the changes, and included appropriate forms, tables, and notices. San Joaquin, San Bernardino, and Alameda also provided training for supervisory staff to review the state regulations and discuss how to handle special situations, especially with respect to the 100-Hour Rule and the Relocation Family Grant. Los Angeles produced a training video covering questions about the policy changes which was shown in all district offices.

Before the Relocation Family Grant was stopped by the temporary restraining order, 111 new cases were affected in Los Angeles, 90 cases in San Bernardino, 15 cases in San Joaquin, and 4 cases in Alameda. After the temporary restraining order, eligibility workers
were instructed to supplement these cases to California levels. After the preliminary injunction, the counties instructed eligibility workers to stop identifying RFG cases as well. However, each county kept a central list of the original RFG cases.

The counties informed clients of the policy changes through two sets of notices, as required by the state. Individual Notices of Actions were mailed in mid-November to give clients timely notice of the exact change in their grant levels. By December 1, counties sent all clients an informational notice provided by the state which briefly described the policy changes. [See Appendix C.]

Implementation of the Evaluation Study

When the counties received the initial sample in late October, their first task was to identify the cases in their automated systems for the purposes of converting cases to research status, increasing control case grant levels, and transferring cases to centralized units. All counties were successful in finding a record of each case, however for some cases the actual case folders were not found.

A more challenging process was identifying the additional Assistance Units (AU) associated with the cases in the sample, as MEDS selected only one AU for each case. This process was generally undertaken in December after the cases had been converted. In San Joaquin, only 12 research cases had multiple AU’s, in contrast to Los Angeles which eventually found over 80 AU’s associated with the sample. Identifying these cases in Los
Angeles required a special programming effort to match the records in different computer systems.

All counties converted cases to control status by changing aid codes or using the fair hearing field in their automated payment systems. In San Joaquin and San Bernardino, this process generated increased grants for cases without income, while manual recalculations were done for cases with income. Alameda county, waiting for programming from EDS, was not able to complete automation of control case grants until April, so the initial grant increase was accomplished through manual overrides of the system.

Although the method of adjusting December grants varied in each county, all counties were able to increase control case grants effective December 1, 1992. Alameda and San Bernardino issued the higher amount to recipients with their December grant, while Los Angeles and San Joaquin issued later supplements to the original December grant. Los Angeles issued the supplements in mid-December, while San Joaquin issued December supplements in January, thus eliminating the need to correct overissuance of December Food Stamps. Although the counties completed the mass conversion of control cases by the deadline, they still encountered programming and logistical difficulties requiring further adjusting of cases. For example, in one county conversion of 67 cases was delayed because other changes to the cases had already been entered in the system which only accommodates one action at a time; in another county, several cases had been temporarily suspended by eligibility workers during the programming change.
The transfer of case folders was another major task in the three counties that centralized cases. Workers throughout the counties were notified to pull cases, which were then transported to the central offices, reorganized, and reassigned to new workers.

Handling of experimental cases varied across counties. San Joaquin required eligibility workers to label case folders; whereas Los Angeles and Alameda tracked experimental cases only at the administrative level. In San Bernardino experimental cases were centralized.

Notification of clients in the sample followed the instructions of the state. Control cases were sent a Notice of Action describing their grant increase and selection for the study and a mass notice explaining the content and purpose of the study. Experimental cases were sent either a Notice of Action or a mass notice informing them of their selection and possible interview. Notices of Action were sent in November or December before the first increased grant or supplement; while the mass notices were sent in December or January.

One concern of the counties was identifying APDP cases which move from research county to research county, otherwise known as Inter-County Transfers (ICT's). The four counties must determine if ICT's are either control or experimental, so that this status might be maintained. Until the state labelled APDP cases in MEDS at the end of April 1993, the counties had no simple method to check if ICT's were in the APDP sample. The state
expected that the research county of origin would label a casefolder when packaging it to send to a new county; however, several counties reported that this did not occur.

**Staffing for Centralized Units**

In the three counties with centralized APDP cases, eligibility workers were chosen for their skills, experience, flexibility, and language capacity. In Alameda, a unit of six workers and a supervisor were recruited through a competitive application process. In San Bernardino workers were selected and transferred from throughout the county. In Los Angeles, deputy directors in the five district offices had the discretion to assign workers to the APDP cases, and often designated one unit with an experienced supervisor as the APDP unit.

APDP caseloads vary across counties. In Alameda, APDP workers’ caseloads are higher than those of other workers, because APDP workers are exempt from the union’s strict caseload limit of 157. In San Bernardino caseloads are lower than regular workers because the sample is smaller than originally planned. However, San Bernardino workers must travel extensively to see their clients, which increases their workload. Alameda’s APDP workers must travel as well, but the distances are relatively smaller than in San Bernardino. In some of the five Los Angeles offices with control cases, APDP workers’ caseloads started out lower than average, but were gradually filled in with non-control cases.
Centralizing cases necessarily reduces language availability for clients, because the language capacity of APDP staff is less than in the whole agency or office. In Alameda, the unit has one bilingual Spanish-speaking worker and must call other workers in the office to help with translating other languages. In Los Angeles, the regionalization has brought new languages to the central offices, but managers are trying to coordinate language assistance across all APDP workers in the county.

Counties varied in whether they required increased scrutiny and special review of control or experimental cases. In both Alameda and San Bernardino, all cases in the centralized APDP units were thoroughly reviewed and "cleaned", which entailed correcting errors and collecting missing information. Common types of errors included incorrectly calculated budgets, missing documentation, overdue redeterminations, and unprocessed income reports. In each of the two counties, 25-90 cases were discontinued during this review process. The major difference in this process was that Alameda reviewed only control cases, while San Bernardino reviewed both control and experimental cases. San Bernardino expressed a particular concern with providing accurate case file data for the evaluation research. Los Angeles, also responding to research concerns, wanted to ensure that research cases would be treated like other cases in the county. Consequently, Los Angeles’ DPSS did not have a county-wide directive to review APDP cases; however, some district offices, supervisors, or individual workers chose to review their own cases. San Joaquin had no special treatment of APDP cases.
Integration of the Replacement Sample

The integration of replacement cases into the sample is proceeding smoothly at the county level, but the process generated various problems for the counties in the initial stages. Primarily these problems stemmed from the discrepancy between MEDS (from which the samples were selected) and county automated records. In Los Angeles, where the MEDS and county systems are the most inconsistent, many of the replacement sample cases did not fit the sample selection criteria. Los Angeles, with a sample twice as large as the other counties, stands in contrast to Alameda and San Joaquin, where the APDP Coordinators are able to review the records of their few replacement cases to identify any problems. Facing so many difficulties with the MEDS sample, Los Angeles proposed their own procedure to select cases off the county system. Instead of adopting this procedure, the state was eventually able to improve the Los Angeles replacement samples selected off MEDS.

Another initial difficulty was supplementing the control case grants back to the month of selection when the integration took place in later months. For example, a March replacement case converted to control status in May needed supplements for March, April, and May if the first increased grant was generated in June. For San Bernardino and San Joaquin these supplements were generated manually. Los Angeles and Alameda automated the process and initially had difficulty issuing correct supplements. In Los Angeles, several cases were automatically supplemented back to December resulting in overpayments to clients. Until programming for control cases was completed in April, Alameda's system
automatically generated supplements for a four month period rather than from the date of approval.

During integration of the initial replacement samples, some of the counties discovered that they would have to discontinue unemployed parent cases who were working 100 hours or more when they were selected as replacement control cases. These counties notified DSS that these cases were being unfairly penalized for working, which was allowed under the new statewide rules. In June, DSS sent a letter to the four counties instructing them to drop these cases from the sample; however, several counties were already doing this with verbal permission from the state.

Summary

The patterns of implementation discussed above depict the key differences between the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project in the four research counties. These differences can be explained as functions of each county's welfare population, welfare department structure, management style, and interpretation of the state's mandate. Each county adapted to the requirements of the demonstration project in the manner which best balanced state priorities with their own operational needs and limited resources. These contextual and organizational factors highlight the unique challenges each county faced in getting the demonstration project off the ground.
For all the counties, implementation of the first APDP phase of welfare reform was a strain simply because waiting for the outcome of the November 1992 election gave them very little lead time. Since the policy changes were the highest priority, all the counties were able to give instructions to staff, notify clients, and reduce grants by the target date. The county welfare departments' extensive experience in implementing these kinds of regulation and grant changes was an important factor in their success. Implementation of the research component in such a short period proved to be more difficult. In contrast to the policy changes, most counties had little experience in setting up demonstration projects, especially with a control group operating under a different set of regulations. Several months were required before all the counties were able to complete the entire process of identifying and separating control cases, supplementing grants, transferring case files, and reorganizing eligibility staff.

In terms of treatment of the APDP recipients, implementation of the 100 hour rule and the grant reduction were remarkably standard across the counties: the clients all had their grants reduced on time and received virtually the same notices describing the policy changes. Implementation of the research project, on the other hand, varied considerably from county to county. To summarize briefly, San Joaquin did not treat APDP research cases in any way different from other AFDC cases, while the other three counties chose to move case files to central offices and assign specialized workers to manage them. Alameda and Los Angeles centralized only control cases and San Bernardino centralized both control and experimental cases. In general, these centralized research cases have received a somewhat
different treatment than the rest of the caseload. For instance, the eligibility workers in these units are highly competent and in some instances have reduced caseloads. Most importantly, these centralized cases generally have been subject to much higher scrutiny than the rest of the caseload.
Conclusion:

Both the uncertainty of the policy-making process and the requirements of the federal waiver process shaped the first APDP phase of California's welfare reform initiative. Although the state and counties implemented limited policy changes, they also laid the groundwork for a major evaluation study. The major constraints to implementation of APDP were uncertainty of the scope of the reforms, a short time frame, and the complexity of the computer programming requirements. Despite these constraints, the state and the counties were able to rapidly implement the policy changes and the evaluation study.

The APDP evaluation study was unique project which challenged state and county welfare organizations in many ways. Implementing a state-wide demonstration project with a rigorous experimental design required that new procedures be developed for many aspects of state AFDC administration. Contracting with a public university for data collection added more complexity to the project, but also created the opportunity for development of a high quality public use data base on California's welfare population. Frequent communication between the many organizations involved in the project facilitated resolution of implementation problems at the state level.

The four research counties also faced new and challenging tasks when implementing the APDP evaluation study. As the case studies reveal, each county adapted in distinctly different ways to the requirements of the evaluation study. These differences can be explained in terms of each welfare department's size, organizational structure, management,
and resources. Key factors influencing implementation decisions included the level of AFDC automation, the number of district offices involved, and management's interpretation of state requirements. Within the limits of time and resources, each county's implementation of the evaluation study was a considerable accomplishment.

While the policy changes were implemented in a standard manner across the counties, the structure of the evaluation study varied significantly. As a result, the treatment of the research cases varies between and within counties in two important respects: the quality of the eligibility workers and level of case review. Since the policy changes implemented during the first APDP phase of the demonstration project are likely to produce relatively small effects, these variations in treatment have the potential to significantly affect comparability of data and should be considered in future evaluation research.
Appendix A:

Organization Charts
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY
AGENCY OVERVIEW SHEET

Function & Organization Chart
October 1, 1992

- Provide Economic Benefits, Human Services, Services to Seniors, Employment and Refugee Services for all eligible County residents

1 - Director, Social Services Agency

SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY 349

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT 349
1 - Admin. Assistant (SSA)
1 - Social Services Agency Planner (Unfunded)

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT 352
1 - Assistant Agency Director
1 - Program Development Manager - (Homeless Program Manager)
1 - Department Personnel Officer - (Affirmative Action Officer)

DEPARTMENT ON AGING (359)
Refer to Page 24.19

10.33 Budgeted Positions

SECRETARIAL
1 - Administrative Secretary (349)
1 - Secretary II (352)
1 - Clerk II (352)

BUDGET, COST CONTAINMENT & STATISTICS
* Refer to Page 24.9A
10.00 Budgeted Positions

PERSONNEL (352)
1 - Senior Dept. Personnel Officer
3 - Dept. Personnel Officer (.75 Unfunded)
1 - Admin. Services Aast.
1 - Secretary II
1 - Personnel Tech.
5 - Payroll Records Clerk
3 - Clerk II
3 - Specialist Clerk
1 - Supv. Clerk II
1 - Staff Development Specialist

ECONOMIC BENEFITS DEPT. (350)
Refer to Pages 24.2 - 24.6

8220.50 Budgeted Positions

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT (352)
Refer to Pages 24.7 - 24.11

159.62 Budgeted Positions

HUMAN SERVICES DEPT. (351/357)
Refer to Pages 24.12 - 24.16

426.21 Budgeted Positions

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS (355/356)
Refer to Page 24.17

111.82 Budgeted Positions

PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL (366)
Refer to Page 24.18

29.50 Budgeted Positions
Provides Income Maintenance and Social Services to Eligible Recipients

1.0 Director - Human Services Agency A

SECRETARIAL
1.0 Secretary B

Finance, Legislation, Contracts
1.0 Mgt. Serv. Admin. C
1.0 Admin. Asst. II D

Building Maintenance
1.0 Human Services Facility Manager
1.0 Crafts Worker III

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, FAIR HEARINGS
1.0 Program Manager E

PUBLISHES POLICY AND PROCEDURE E1
5.0 Program Asst. II
1.0 Clerk Typist II

PREPARES FAIR HEARINGS E2
5.0 Program Asst. II
1.0 E.U.
1.0 Clerk Typlst

STAFF DEVELOPMENT
QUALITY CONTROL, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION F

Provides Training, Quality Control System and Affirmative Action Resources

1/ 1.0 Program Manager
4.0 Program Assistant II
1.0 Program Assistant I
1.0 Clerk Typlst II
1.0 Clerk I

2/ 4.0 Program Assistant II perform Staff Development activities

AGING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES BUREAU
Refer to Pages 15.2 and 15.3

ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF SERVICES BUREAU
Refer to Pages 15.4 and 15.5

INCOME MAINTENANCE BUREAU
Refer to Page 15.6

FOOTNOTES:
1/ Split certification - Staff Development/Administrative (manual split)
2/ 4.0 Program Assistant II perform Staff Development activities
Footnotes:

1/ Acts in the absence of the Department Head
2/ Time studies to eligibility - other Program Assistants time certify
3/ Time studies to employment services for 1.0 (of the 77.0) (FSET)
Appendix B:

Overview of Survey Instrument
OVERVIEW OF THE DSS SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Enumeration of people living with respondent

Name, gender, age, relationship of each person living with respondent

Respondent's AFDC history

Date first received
Most recent spell
Factors associated with going on AFDC

Respondent's background

Race
Birthplace
Length of time in California

Respondent's current housing situation and quality of life

Financial arrangement for current living situation
Problems with paying rent and utilities
Other types of places R may have stayed during last 12 months
Use of free food programs
Amount of time children or respondent went hungry during last 12 months

Respondent's health

Insurance status
Use of health care facilities
Limiting health conditions

Respondent's children's health

Any children with limiting health conditions
Insurance status of randomly selected child
Use of health care facilities by randomly selected child

Enumeration of respondent's children who do not live with her/him

Name, gender, age, current residence of each child

Pregnancy history for each of respondent's children

Number of children each child has had
Current pregnancy status
Respondent's current pregnancy status
Has respondent ever had a tubal ligation
Respondent's education and job history

- Education
- Participation in job training programs
- Hours worked in month preceding the interview
- Current employment status
- Information about current or last job
- Employment status for preceding quarter
- Access to transportation

Spouse's education and job history

- Parallels the series for respondents

Sources of income for preceding month

Child support

- Nature of child support arrangements
- Amount received

Child care

- Use and knowledge of specific child care programs
- Use of day care facilities to care for youngest child
- Use of sitters to care for youngest child
- Potential access to child care if needed

Knowledge of AFDC rules

Information to assist us with future contacts
Appendix C:

Client Notices-APDP Policy Changes
NOTICE OF ACTION

As of December 1, 1992, the County is changing your cash aid from $__________ to $__________.

Here's why:

As of December 1, 1992, a change in State law will lower the Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) that you can get by 1.3 percent.

Your new cash aid amount is figured on this notice.

If you want to know more about this State law change, or want to ask for a State Hearing only on the law change, the fastest way is to call toll-free:

1-800 925-8960

TDD for hearing impaired:

1-800 952-8349

Rules: These rules apply; you may review them at your welfare office. MPP 44-315; W & I Code Section 11450
ATTACHMENT I

IMPORTANT NOTICE FOR CASH AID RECIPIENTS

PLEASE READ

A CHANGE IN STATE LAW

As of December 1, 1992, State law changes the rules for cash aid. The new rules lower the maximum amount of cash aid a family can get, limit the amount of cash aid for applicants who have not lived in California for the last 12 months, and remove the limit on the number of hours a recipient can work and still be eligible for cash aid.

MAXIMUM AID PAYMENT (MAP) CHANGE

State law lowers the Maximum Aid Payment that a family can get by 1.3 percent. See the table to the right to find out the most your cash aid may change. This change will take effect December 1, 1992. If we are not able to lower your December cash aid right away, you will be overpaid and will have to pay this money back. You will get another notice if you are overpaid.

You need to plan for this change. If cash aid is your only income, you will have less money to meet your family’s needs. But if you go to work, even part-time, or have other income you can keep more money to meet your family’s needs.

TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Please call toll free: 1-800-925-8960

or

TTD for hearing impaired: 1-800-952-8349

FOOD STAMP CHANGE

Most families will get more Food Stamps when their cash aid goes down.

RELOCATION FAMILY GRANT

The Relocation Family Grant applies to applicants who have not lived in California for the last 12 months. The Relocation Family Grant limits the amount of cash aid a family can get to the lesser of:

- the MAP from the State where they last lived; or
- the cash aid figured for California.

The Relocation Family Grant can apply for up to 12 months.

CASH AID MAP TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS ON AID</th>
<th>OLD MAP</th>
<th>NEW MAP</th>
<th>DECREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$307</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELIMINATION OF THE 100-HOUR RULE

The change in State law allows a recipient to work more hours. There is no longer a limit on the number of hours a recipient can work and still be eligible for cash aid. There is only a limit on the amount of income you can earn and still remain eligible.
Appendix D:

Client Notices-APDP Evaluation Study
MESSAGE: As of December 1, 1992 State law changed the rules for Cash Aid. The County is changing your cash aid from $ __________ to $ __________.

Here's why:

The law says we must check to see how the changes to the rules work. To do this, some Cash Aid recipients who live in Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernardino Counties will keep the rules in effect before the law change while others will have new rules to figure cash aid payments. You and others were picked by chance to keep the rules in effect before the law change. In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the rules are working.

If you move to a county other than Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin or San Bernardino, or become part of a new or different case the new rules will apply to you. If so, your Cash Aid will go down. The new county will let you know what the new rules are if you move to a different county.

INSTRUCTIONS: Use to inform ongoing cash aid recipients that they have been selected to be part of the control group for the Assistance Payments Demonstration Project and that their cash aid amount is increased.

Fill in the old and new cash aid amounts.
As of December 1, 1992, State law changed the rules for Cash Aid recipients. In Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernadino counties Cash Aid recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to be in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to be under the current law. This lets the State gather information to see how the changes in the law are working. Most of the Cash Aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

You have been selected, by chance, to be part of the group that will have the rules used before the law change applied to them.

The way these two groups work is explained below.

**MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT**

The maximum grant amount that was in effect on September 1, 1992 applies to you. The maximum aid payment will go down for the new rule group by 5.6 percent.

**RELOCATION FAMILY GRANT (RFG)**

The relocation family grant applies only to new rule applicants who have moved to California within the last 12 months. It limits the amount of Cash Aid a family can get to either the cash aid amount from the State where they last lived or to the cash aid figured for California, whichever is less. This rule will not apply to you.

**THE 100-HOUR RULE**

As in the past, if you are the principal wage earner and work 100 hours or more in a month, your cash aid will be stopped. The new rule group participants are not limited to 100 hours of work per month. But, if their income is larger than the State’s basic need standard, their cash aid will be stopped.

**FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS**

In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the rules are working.

Temp APDF-C Informing (12/91)
MESSAGE: As of December 1, 1992 State law changed the rules for Cash Aid. Because your Cash Aid is figured based on new rules, your case has been selected to be part of a new rule test group. In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the new rules are working.

Here's why:

The law says we must check to see how the new rules work. Your family was one of the families whose aid is figured on the new rules and whom we are asking to help us check how the new rules are working.

INSTRUCTIONS: Use to inform "experimental" new rule ongoing recipients that they are part of a test group and may be selected for an interview.
As of December 1, 1992, State law changed the rules for Cash Aid recipients. In Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernadino counties Cash Aid recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to participate in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to participate under the current law. This lets the State gather information to see how the changes in the law are working. Most of the Cash Aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

You have been selected, by chance, to be part of the group that will have the current law applied to them. Your worker told you about the cash aid rules under the current law.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the current rules are working.

Temp APDP-E Informing (12/91)
02 STATE LAW CHANGED THE RULES FOR CASH AID.
03 THE COUNTY IS CHANGING YOUR CASH AID TO FFFFFFF.
04 * 
05 HERE'S WHY:
06 * 
07 THE LAW SAYS WE MUST CHECK TO SEE HOW THE CHANGES TO THE RULES WORK.
08 TO DO THIS, SOME CASH AID RECIPIENTS WHO LIVE IN LOS ANGELES, ALAMEDA, 
09 SAN JOAQUIN AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES WILL KEEP THE RULES IN EFFECT 
10 BEFORE THE LAW CHANGE WHILE OTHERS WILL HAVE NEW RULES TO FIGURE CASH 
11 AID PAYMENTS. YOU AND OTHERS WERE PICKED BY CHANCE TO KEEP THE RULES 
12 IN EFFECT BEFORE THE LAW CHANGE, IN THE FUTURE AN INTERVIEWER MAY WANT 
13 TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW THE RULES ARE WORKING.
14 * 
15 IF YOU MOVE TO A COUNTY OTHER THAN LOS ANGELES, ALAMEDA, SAN JOAQUIN, 
16 OR SAN BERNARDINO, OR BECOME PART OF A NEW OR DIFFERENT CASE THE NEW 
17 RULES WILL APPLY TO YOU. IF SO, YOUR CASH AID WILL GO DOWN. THE NEW 
18 COUNTY WILL LET YOU KNOW WHAT THE NEW RULES ARE IF YOU MOVE TO A 
19 DIFFERENT COUNTY.
87 MPP 89-101.2
99 AFDC WRT-3T CHANGE: CONTROL GROUP RECIPIENTS
As of December 1, 1992, state law changed the rules for cash aid recipients in Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin, and San Bernardino Counties. Cash aid recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to be in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to be under the current law. This lets the state gather information to see how the changes in the law are working. Most of the cash aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

* You have been selected, by chance, to be part of the group that will have the rules used before the law change applied to them.

The way these two groups work is explained below.

* Maximum Grant Amount

The maximum grant amount that was in effect on September 1, 1992 applies to you. The maximum aid payment will go down for the new group by 5.8%.

* Relocation Family Grant (RFG)

The relocation family grant applies only to new rule applicants who have moved to California within the last 12 months. It limits the amount of cash aid a family can get to either the cash aid amount from the state where they last lived or to the cash aid figured in California, whichever is less. This rule will not apply to you.

* The 100-hour Rule

As in the past, if you are the principal wage earner and work 100 hours or more in a month, your cash aid is stopped. The new rule group participants are not limited to 100 hours of work per month. But, if their income is larger than the state's basic need standard, their cash aid will be stopped.

* Follow-up Interviews

In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the rules are working.

AFDF TEMP APDF-C INFORMING (12/92)
| CD | SEQ | SEQ | TYPE | CODE | LINE | CHK | A | B | C | D | E | COMP | PRT | VALID AID TYPES | TYPE | CHNG |
|----|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----|-----------------|      |      |
| 239 | 0 | 01 | N | M | E | X | 3** |

**STATE LAW CHANGED THE RULES FOR CASH AID.**

**BECAUSE YOUR CASH AID IS FIGURED ON NEW RULES, YOUR CASE HAS BEEN SELECTED TO BE PART OF A NEW RULE TEST GROUP. IN THE FUTURE AN INTERVIEWER MAY WANT TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW THE NEW RULES ARE WORKING.**

**HERE’S WHY:**

THE LAW SAYS WE MUST CHECK TO SEE HOW THE NEW RULES WORK. YOUR FAMILY WAS ONE OF THE FAMILIES WHOSE AID IS FIGURED ON THE NEW RULES AND WHOM WE ARE ASKING TO HELP US CHECK HOW THE NEW RULES ARE WORKING.
IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT CONTROL GROUP PARTICIPANTS

As of December 1, 1992, State law changed the rules for Cash Aid recipients. In Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernardino counties Cash Aid recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to be in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to be under the current law. This lets the State gather information to see how the changes in the law are working. Most of the Cash Aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

You have been selected, by chance, to be part of the group that will have the rules used before the law changed applied to them.

The way these two groups work is explained below.

MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT

The maximum grant amount that was in effect on September 1, 1992 applies to you. The maximum aid payment will go down for the new rule group by 5.8 percent.

RELOCATION FAMILY GRANT (RFG)

The relocation family grant applies only to new rule applicants who have moved to California within the last 12 months. It limits the amount of Cash Aid a family can get to either the cash aid amount from the State where they last lived or to the cash aid figured for California, whichever is less. This rule will not apply to you.

THE 100-HOUR RULE

As in the past, if you are the principal wage earner and work 100 hours or more in a month, your cash aid will be stopped. The new rule group participants are not limited to 100 hours of work per month. But, if their income is larger than the State's basic need standard, their cash aid will be stopped.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the rules are working.

OFFICE CHANGE

Since your case must be handled in a special way we may have to transfer your case to another office. If that happens, we will let you know.
Los Angeles: Experimental Case Informing Notice

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PARTICIPANTS

As of December 1, 1992, State law changed the rules for Cash Aid recipients. In Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernardino counties Cash Aid recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to participate in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to participate under the current law. This lets the State gather information to see how the changes in the law are working. Most of the Cash Aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

You have been selected, by chance, to be part of the group that will have the current law applied to them. Your worker told you about the Cash Aid rules under the current law.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the current rules are working.

Temp APDP-E Informing (12/92)
IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT CONTROL GROUP PARTICIPANTS

As of December 1, 1992, State law changed the rules for Cash Aid recipients. In Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernardino Counties, recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to be in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to be under the current law. This lets the State gather information to see how the rules are working. Most of the Cash Aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

You have been randomly selected to be part of the rules used before the law changed. If you move to another county other than Los Angeles, Alameda or San Joaquin, the new rules will apply to you. If so, your Cash Aid may be lower. The new county will let you know what the new rules are.

How the old and new rules work are explained below.

MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT

The maximum grant amount that was in effect on September 1, 1992 applies to you. The maximum aid payment will go down for the new rule group by 1.3 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance Unit Size</th>
<th>Maximum Aid Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective 9/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELOCATION FAMILY GRANT (RFG)

The relocation family grant applies only to "current rule" applicants who have moved to California within the last 12 months. It limits the amount of Cash Aid a family can get to either the cash aid amount from the State where they last lived or to the cash aid figured for California, whichever is less. This rule will not apply to you.

THE 100-HOUR RULE

As in the past, if you are the principal wage earner and work over 100 hours in a month, your cash aid will be stopped. The "current rule" or participants are not limited to 100 hours of work per month. But, if their income is larger than the State’s basic need standard, their cash aid will be stopped.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

In the future a reviewer may ask you some questions about how the rules are working.

APDP 1292 (11/92)
NOTICE OF ACTION

As of December 1, 1992 State Law changed the rules for Cash Aid. The County is changing your cash aid from $624.00 to $663.00.

Here's why:

We owe you $39.00 for December, 1992. We will send you a check for this amount in January, 1993.

This law says we must check to see how the changes to the rules work. To do this, some Cash Aid recipients who live in Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin and San Bernardino Counties will keep the rules in effect before the law change while others will have new rules to figure cash aid payments. You and others were picked by chance to keep the rules in effect before the law change. This group is called the Control Group. In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the rules are working.

If you move to a county other than Los Angeles, Alameda, San Joaquin or San Bernardino, or become part of a new or different case the new rules will apply to you. If so, your Cash Aid will go down. The new county will let you know what the new rules are if you move to a different county.

Rules: These rules apply. You may review them at your welfare office; 1992 Welfare Reform, MPP89-010.2

Monthly Cash Aid Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Cash Aid Amount</th>
<th>Your Cash Aid in 12/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Aid for ___</td>
<td>$703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special Needs +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Net Countable Income -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subtotal A</td>
<td>= 703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maximum Aid for ___</td>
<td>$663.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Needs +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Subtotal B</td>
<td>$563.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cash Aid Amount</td>
<td>$563.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lesser of Subtotal A or B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overpayment Adjustment -</td>
<td>(separate page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Monthly Cash Aid Amount</td>
<td>$663.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR
ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
CONTROL GROUP PARTICIPANTS

As of December 1, 1992, State law changed the rules for Cash Aid recipients. In Los Angeles, Alameda, San Bernardino and San Joaquin Counties Cash Aid recipients are divided into two groups, those selected to be in a group under the rules used before the law changed and the second group of those selected to be under the current law. This lets the State gather information to see how the changes in the law are working. Most of the Cash Aid recipients in California will have the current rules applied to them.

You have been selected, by chance, to be part of the group that will have the rules used before the law change applied to them.

The way these two groups work is explained below.

MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT
The maximum grant amount that was in effect on September 1, 1992 applies to you. The maximum aid payment went down for the new rule group by 5.8 percent.

RELOCATION FAMILY GRANT (RFG)
The relocation family grant applies only to new rule applicants who have moved to California within the last 12 months. It limits the amount of Cash Aid a family can get to either the cash aid amount from the State where they last lived or to the cash aid figured for California, whichever is less. This rule will not apply to you.

THE 100-HOUR RULE
As in the past, if you are the principal wage earner and work 100 hours or more in a month, your cash aid will be stopped. The new rule group participants are not limited to 100 hours of work per month. But, if their income is larger than the State's basic need standard, their cash aid will be stopped.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS
In the future an interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the rules are working.
NOTICE TO FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS
RECEIVING CONTROL GROUP CASH ASSISTANCE

If you are receiving Control Group cash assistance you will receive an increase in your grant in January 1993. This increase in your grant may reduce your food stamp benefits. This action is required by Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) Section 63-504.392.

If you have had no other changes in your food stamp case, your food stamp benefits will be reduced by no more than the amount listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Maximum Reduction</th>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Maximum Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you had other changes in your food stamp case, you may have received a separate notice which included this reduction.

12/92
As of 12/01/92 State law changed the rules for Cash Aid. Because your Cash Aid is figured based on new rules, your case has been selected to be part of a new rule test group. An interviewer may want to ask you some questions about how the new rules are working.

Here's why:

The law says we must check to see how the new rules work. Your family was one of the families whose aid is figured on the new rules and whom are asking to help check how the new rules are working.

Rules: These rules apply. You may review them at your welfare office: 1992 Welfare Reform, MPP89-010.2
Appendix E:

Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Number of AFDC Workers</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of AFDC Offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Level of Automation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Number of AFDC Cases</td>
<td>285.869</td>
<td>35.325</td>
<td>7.012</td>
<td>20.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Number of ADP Cases</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1. Assistance Payments Demonstration Project: County Characteristics

San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Alameda, San Diego, and San Joaquin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Centralized Case Files</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. ADP Workers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ADP Case Cleaning</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Source of Staff</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caseload Size</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff Level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transient</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experimental</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involuntary</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. District Office</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Control &amp; Control E</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Type of Case</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of Offices</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Type of Case</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Source of Staff</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Caseload Size</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Staff Level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Transient</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Experimental</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Involuntary</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. District Office</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
<td>Some Decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Control &amp; Control E</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Type of Case</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Number of Offices</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. The Assistance Payments Demonstration Project: Implementation Characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Joaquin  Los Angeles  Alameda  San Bernardino

TABLE III: Assistance Payments Demonstration Project: Process Evaluation Interviews
Table IV. AFDC Maximum Grant Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons on Aid</th>
<th>Sept. '92</th>
<th>Oct. &amp; Nov. '92</th>
<th>Dec. '92</th>
<th>Control Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F:

Interview Schedule for Continuing Eligibility Workers
Interview Schedule for Continuing Eligibility Workers

(Introduction)

I. Job History & Perceptions

How is your unit specialized?

How long have you worked as an eligibility worker?
   a) where were you working previously (type of work & agency)?

What type of training did you receive when you first started working as an eligibility worker?

I want to get a sense of the different types of things you do in your job every day; for example, what kinds of contact do you have with clients?
   a) how much time out of your day would you say all these activities together take?

How much time do you spend processing forms?

What kinds of contact do you have with other staff or supervisors?
   a) how much time out of your day would you say all these activities together take?

Of all these activities, which one is the most important?

When you are really busy, what do you wish you could cut back on?
   Do you have any control over this now?

How are you evaluated? (on what?)
   how are your interactions with clients evaluated?
What happens around here when eligibility workers do a good job?

What happens when eligibility workers keep making errors?

**Clients:**

(transition: now I want to ask a bit more about your clients/caseload…)

What is your caseload now? ______

Is that unusual or pretty typical? ______

What do clients usually call you about?

How often do clients usually call?

For what reasons would you call a client?

Do you have any clients who speak English as a second language or who don’t speak English in your caseload?

IF NO… skip to

IF YES…

a) you speak _____ ?

or if not, how do you handle these cases?

Are redetermination interviews done individually or in a group?

What do you cover in redetermination interviews?

Do you ever talk about issues related to work?

In what situations would you talk about these issues?

What would you talk about in these cases?

If you wanted to give clients information about job services or childcare, how would you find out about resources? (possible prompts: do you have a list, get info. from supervisor…)
What is the most important information to give to the client?

What types of redeterminations are the most difficult?
   What do you do in these cases?

**APDP**
In December there was another grant reduction and the 100 hour rule changed...how did you find out about these changes? (follow up: written notices; training)

   What were you told to do?

When the grant and work rules changed, did clients have questions?

   What specifically did they ask about?

   About what percent of your caseload contacted you with questions?

(lead something about evaluation...) Tell me about how your job has changed as a result of the study.

**Wrap Up**
(Lead with something like: The last few questions I have are a little more general -- about your opinions. We're interested in hearing the views of different people who work in the welfare system).

In your view, what was the purpose of the changes that happened in December?

   Do you think this will work?

What are the most major problems in the welfare system today?
   a) what is the best solution for these problems?

Comments to add?

   (Thanks so much for all your time, etc. etc.)
Appendix G:

Glossary
# Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIN</td>
<td>All-County Information Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>All-County Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC</td>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC-FC</td>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Foster Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC-FG</td>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Family Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC-MN</td>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medically Needy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC-U</td>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Unemployed Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDP</td>
<td>Assistance Payments Demonstration Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Authorized To Purchase (Food Stamp authorization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Assistance Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Statement of Facts: annual redetermination form for AFDC &amp; Food Stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA7</td>
<td>Monthly Eligibility Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Case Data System (Alameda County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSS</td>
<td>California Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFL</td>
<td>County Fiscal Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>Cost of Living Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWD</td>
<td>County Welfare Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWDA</td>
<td>California Welfare Directors’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHHS</td>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSS</td>
<td>Department of Public Social Services (Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Department of Social Services (California)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>Electronic Data Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Eligibility Technician (Alameda County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW</td>
<td>Eligibility Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP</td>
<td>Federal Financial Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>Family Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Food Stamp program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>Greater Avenues for Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATPA</td>
<td>Government Accountability and Taxpayers Protection Act (Proposition 165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>Human Services Agency (San Joaquin County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWA</td>
<td>Health and Welfare Agency (California)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBPS</td>
<td>Integrated Benefit Payment System (Los Angeles County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Inter-County Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEVS</td>
<td>Income and Eligibility Verification System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>Intentional Program Violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRCA</td>
<td>Immigration Reform and Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA2</td>
<td>Statement of Facts: AFDC &amp; Food Stamp application form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTPA</td>
<td>Job Training Partnership Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDB</td>
<td>Longitudinal Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINK-UP</td>
<td>Demonstration project on the effect of eliminating the 100-Hour rule, currently being conducted in 8 central valley counties. Included San Joaquin County until APDP began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Maximum Assistance Payment: AFDC payment standard, used to calculate monthly grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSAC</td>
<td>Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care: AFDC need standard, used to determine eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDS</td>
<td>Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Medically Needy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>Notice of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Principal Earner (in an AFDC-U case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDB</td>
<td>Policy Development Bureau, Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIB</td>
<td>Policy Implementation Bureau, Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRB</td>
<td>Planning and Research Branch, Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Research Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Review and Evaluation Branch, Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFG</td>
<td>Relocation Family Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request For Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>State-wide Automated Welfare System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWS1</td>
<td>Application for Cash Aid, Food Stamps, and/or Medical Assistance: preliminary application form for AFDC, Food Stamps, and Medicaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSS</td>
<td>State Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Special Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Social Security Administration (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Social Services Agency (Alameda County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSI  Supplemental Security Income (Federal)
SSN  Social Security Number
SSP  State Supplemental Program (to SSI)
SSI/SSP  A combination of the two above and the customary designation of the program as administered by the Social Security Administration
TCC  Transitional Child Care
TIC  Transfer Into County
TMC  Transitional Medi-Cal
TOC  Transfer Out of County
U  Unemployed- AFDC for a two-parent family with children in which the principal earner (PE) is unemployed
UC DATA  University of California Data Archive and Technical Assistance
UI  Unemployment Insurance
UIB  Unemployment Insurance Benefits
U/P  Unemployed Parent
WCMIS  Welfare Case Management Information System (Los Angeles County)
WIN  Work Incentive Program
WRDP  Welfare Reform Demonstration Project