
Appendix Tables

Appendix table 1—Method of data collection by State

State	Phone survey only	Phone survey and State documents received in the mail
Alabama		✓
Alaska	✓	
Arizona		✓
Arkansas		✓
California		✓
Colorado	✓	
Connecticut	✓	
District of Columbia	✓	
Florida		✓
Georgia		✓
Hawaii		✓
Idaho	✓	
Illinois		✓
Indiana		✓
Iowa	✓	
Kansas		✓
Kentucky	✓	
Louisiana	✓	
Maine	✓	
Maryland		✓
Massachusetts		✓
Michigan	✓	
Minnesota		✓
Mississippi	✓	
Missouri		✓
Montana		✓
Nebraska		✓

—Continued

Appendix table 1—Method of data collection by State—Continued

State	Phone survey only	Phone survey and State documents received in the mail
Nevada		✓
New Hampshire		✓
New Jersey	✓	
New Mexico		✓
New York	✓	
North Carolina	✓	
North Dakota	✓	
Ohio	✓	
Oklahoma	✓	
Oregon		✓
Pennsylvania		✓
Rhode Island	✓	
South Carolina	✓	
South Dakota	✓	
Tennessee	✓	
Texas		✓
Utah	✓	
Vermont	✓	
Virginia	✓	
Washington	✓	
West Virginia	✓	
Wisconsin		✓
Wyoming		✓

Appendix table 2—State re-engineering efforts that occurred as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by category of change

State	Changes in organizational structures	Changes in the role of the case worker	Program accessibility and changes in certification systems	Changes in client tracking and accountability systems	Conforming the State food stamp program and TANF program	Increased program monitoring and evaluation
Alabama			✓	✓	✓	
Alaska		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Arizona		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Arkansas			✓		✓	
California	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Colorado	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Connecticut	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
District of Columbia			✓	✓	✓	
Florida			✓	✓	✓	✓
Georgia			✓	✓	✓	
Hawaii		✓		✓		
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Illinois				✓	✓	
Indiana			✓	✓		
Iowa			✓	✓	✓	✓
Kansas		✓	✓		✓	✓
Kentucky			✓		✓	
Louisiana		✓		✓	✓	
Maine			✓	✓	✓	✓
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Massachusetts			✓			✓
Michigan		✓			✓	
Minnesota			✓		✓	
Mississippi		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Missouri			✓	✓		✓
Montana			✓	✓	✓	
Nebraska			✓	✓	✓	
Nevada			✓	✓	✓	
New Hampshire			✓	✓	✓	
New Jersey			✓	✓	✓	✓
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

—Continued

Appendix table 2—State re-engineering efforts that occurred as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by category of change—Continued

State	Changes in organizational structures	Changes in the role of the case worker	Program accessibility and changes in certification systems	Changes in client tracking and accountability systems	Conforming the State food stamp program and TANF program	Increased program monitoring and evaluation
New York				✓	✓	✓
North Carolina			✓		✓	✓
North Dakota			✓	✓		
Ohio	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma				✓	✓	
Oregon			✓	✓		✓
Pennsylvania			✓	✓		✓
Rhode Island				✓		
South Carolina		✓	✓		✓	
South Dakota		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tennessee		✓		✓		
Texas			✓	✓	✓	✓
Utah			✓	✓		✓
Vermont				✓		
Virginia	✓	✓			✓	
Washington	✓					✓
West Virginia		✓		✓	✓	
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Wyoming			✓	✓		✓

Appendix table 3—State re-engineering efforts that occurred during FY 2000 by category of change

State	Changes in organizational structures	Changes in the role of the case worker	Program accessibility and changes in certification systems	Changes in client tracking and accountability systems	Conforming the State food stamp program and TANF program	Increased program monitoring and evaluation
Alabama						
Alaska		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Arizona			✓			✓
Arkansas	✓		✓			
California				✓		✓
Colorado						
Connecticut				✓		
District of Columbia			✓			
Florida				✓		
Georgia		✓	✓	✓		
Hawaii						
Idaho			✓			✓
Illinois			✓	✓		
Indiana			✓			✓
Iowa						✓
Kansas						
Kentucky				✓		
Louisiana			✓	✓		
Maine			✓		✓	
Maryland			✓			
Massachusetts			✓			
Michigan						
Minnesota			✓			
Mississippi						
Missouri			✓			✓
Montana			✓	✓		✓
Nebraska						
Nevada			✓			
New Hampshire						✓
New Jersey			✓			✓
New Mexico					✓	

—Continued

Appendix table 3—State re-engineering efforts that occurred during FY 2000 by category of change—Continued

State	Changes in organizational structures	Changes in the role of the case worker	Program accessibility and changes in certification systems	Changes in client tracking and accountability systems	Conforming the State food stamp program and TANF program	Increased program monitoring and evaluation
New York			✓	✓		✓
North Carolina				✓		
North Dakota		✓	✓			
Ohio			✓		✓	✓
Oklahoma			✓	✓		
Oregon			✓	✓		✓
Pennsylvania			✓	✓		
Rhode Island			✓		✓	
South Carolina		✓	✓		✓	
South Dakota				✓	✓	
Tennessee			✓			
Texas			✓			
Utah			✓	✓		
Vermont				✓		
Virginia				✓		✓
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						✓
Wyoming						

Appendix table 4—States by size of food stamp caseload

State	Size of food stamp caseload		
	Small	Medium	Large
Alabama		✓	
Alaska	✓		
Arizona		✓	
Arkansas		✓	
California			✓
Colorado		✓	
Connecticut		✓	
District of Columbia	✓		
Florida			✓
Georgia			✓
Hawaii		✓	
Idaho	✓		
Illinois			✓
Indiana		✓	
Iowa		✓	
Kansas		✓	
Kentucky		✓	
Louisiana			✓
Maine		✓	
Maryland		✓	
Massachusetts		✓	
Michigan			✓
Minnesota		✓	
Mississippi		✓	
Missouri		✓	
Montana	✓		
Nebraska	✓		
Nevada	✓		
New Hampshire	✓		
New Jersey		✓	
New Mexico		✓	
New York			✓
North Carolina			✓

—Continued

Appendix table 4—States by size of food stamp caseload—Continued

State	Size of food stamp caseload		
	Small	Medium	Large
North Dakota	✓		
Ohio			✓
Oklahoma		✓	
Oregon		✓	
Pennsylvania			✓
Rhode Island	✓		
South Carolina		✓	
South Dakota	✓		
Tennessee			✓
Texas			✓
Utah	✓		
Vermont	✓		
Virginia		✓	
Washington		✓	
West Virginia		✓	
Wisconsin		✓	
Wyoming	✓		

Appendix table 5—States making changes to the role of the caseworker as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by goal

State	Goal of re-engineering change				Other
	Increase coordination between FSP and TANF program	Reduce fragmentation in the provision of services	Increase efficiency in the operation of FSP	Increase coordination between FSP and programs other than TANF	
Alaska		✓			
Arizona	✓		✓	✓	
Connecticut					✓
Hawaii		✓	✓		
Idaho	✓		✓		
Kansas		✓			
Louisiana					✓
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan	✓	✓			✓
Mississippi	✓			✓	✓
New Mexico	✓				
New York	✓				
South Carolina	✓	✓		✓	
South Dakota					✓
Tennessee					✓
Virginia	✓	✓	✓		✓
West Virginia	✓	✓			✓
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓		

Appendix table 6—States making changes to the role of the caseworker as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by required level of approval

State	Level of approval				
	Civil Service Board or State personnel agency	Governor's office	State legislature	Labor unions or State employee agency	Other
Alaska					✓
Arizona	✓				
Connecticut	✓				
Idaho					✓
Kansas					
Louisiana	✓				
Maryland	✓	✓	✓		
Michigan	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Mississippi	✓				
New Mexico	✓				
New York	✓			✓	
South Carolina	✓	✓			
South Dakota		✓			
Virginia	✓			✓	
West Virginia	✓		✓		
Wisconsin		✓	✓		

Appendix table 7—States increasing access to their Food Stamp Program as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by type of change

State	Type of change		
	Certification process	Local office practices	Increasing outreach
Alabama	✓		
Alaska	✓		
Arizona	✓	✓	✓
Arkansas		✓	✓
California	✓	✓	✓
Colorado	✓	✓	✓
Connecticut	✓	✓	✓
District of Columbia	✓	✓	✓
Florida			✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓
Idaho	✓	✓	✓
Indiana	✓	✓	✓
Iowa			✓
Kansas		✓	✓
Kentucky	✓		
Maine	✓		
Maryland	✓	✓	✓
Massachusetts		✓	✓
Minnesota		✓	✓
Mississippi			✓
Missouri		✓	
Montana	✓	✓	
Nebraska	✓		
Nevada	✓	✓	✓
New Hampshire		✓	
New Jersey		✓	✓
New Mexico			✓

—Continued

Appendix table 7—States increasing access to their Food Stamp Program as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by type of change—Continued

State	Type of change		
	Certification process	Local office practices	Increasing outreach
New York	✓		
North Carolina		✓	
North Dakota	✓		
Ohio		✓	✓
Oregon	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania		✓	
South Carolina		✓	
South Dakota		✓	✓
Texas		✓	
Utah	✓	✓	✓
Wisconsin		✓	✓
Wyoming	✓	✓	

Appendix table 8—States changing local office practices as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by type of change

State	Type of change						
	Provide child care at FS offices	Improve transportation to FS offices	Establish satellite offices to take FS applications and provide re-certifications	Establish satellite offices to only take FS applications	Outstation workers at other agencies	Provide weekend and/or evening hours	Use "private partners" to assist clients applying for FS
Arizona	✓				✓	✓	✓
Arkansas			✓		✓	✓	✓
California					✓	✓	✓
Colorado		✓				✓	
Connecticut			✓				✓
District of Columbia					✓		✓
Georgia						✓	
Idaho		✓		✓	✓	✓	
Indiana			✓				
Kansas						✓	
Maryland		✓				✓	
Massachusetts							✓
Minnesota				✓	✓		
Missouri			✓		✓		✓
Montana			✓		✓	✓	

—Continued

Appendix table 8—States changing local office practices as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by type of change—Continued

State	Type of change							
	Provide child care at FS offices	Improve transportation to FS offices	Establish satellite offices to take FS applications and provide re-certifications	Establish satellite offices to only take FS applications	Outstation workers at other agencies	Provide weekend and/or evening hours	Use "private partners" to assist clients applying for FS	
Nevada	✓		✓		✓	✓		
New Hampshire						✓	✓	
New Jersey					✓	✓		
North Carolina					✓	✓		
Ohio	✓		✓		✓	✓		
Oregon			✓		✓	✓		
Pennsylvania					✓	✓		
South Carolina					✓	✓		
South Dakota					✓	✓		
Texas					✓			
Utah	✓					✓		
Wisconsin	✓	✓			✓		✓	
Wyoming						✓		

Appendix table 9—States planning to change local office practices during FY 2000 by type of a change

State	Type of change						
	Provide child care at FS offices	Improve transportation to FS offices	Establish satellite offices to take FS applications and provide re-certifications	Establish satellite offices to only take FS applications	Outstation workers at other agencies	Provide weekend and/or evening hours	Use "private partners" to assist clients applying for FS
Arizona						✓	
Arkansas					✓	✓	✓
Indiana						✓	
Maryland		✓				✓	
Massachusetts						✓	
Montana	✓				✓		
Nevada		✓					
New York		✓				✓	✓
Ohio		✓					✓
South Carolina		✓			✓		
Texas						✓	✓

Appendix table 10—States making changes to improve outreach as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by method of outreach

State	Method of outreach				
	Distribute printed materials	PSAs or notices on TV or radio	Referrals from other social service programs	Distribute food stamp applications	Other
Arizona	✓				
Arkansas	✓				
California	✓				
Colorado		✓	✓		
Connecticut					✓
District of Columbia	✓	✓			
Florida					✓
Georgia					✓
Idaho		✓	✓	✓	
Indiana				✓	
Iowa					✓
Kansas	✓				
Maryland					✓
Massachusetts	✓				
Minnesota					✓
Mississippi	✓				
Nevada	✓			✓	
New Jersey	✓		✓		
New Mexico	✓				
Ohio		✓	✓		
Oregon	✓				
South Dakota	✓				
Utah	✓		✓		
Wisconsin		✓			

Appendix table 11—States increasing their use of databases for client record matching as a result of welfare reform prior to FY 2000 by type of database

State	Type of Database		
	New hire	Criminal records	Social Security Administration
Alabama	✓		
Arizona	✓	✓	
Colorado	✓	✓	✓
Connecticut	✓		
Georgia	✓	✓	
Illinois	✓		
Indiana	✓	✓	
Louisiana		✓	
Maryland	✓		
Mississippi			✓
Montana	✓		✓
New Hampshire	✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	✓	✓	
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓
North Dakota		✓	✓
Ohio		✓	
Oklahoma	✓		
Pennsylvania		✓	✓
Tennessee		✓	✓
Texas		✓	
Utah	✓		
Vermont	✓		
Wisconsin	✓		
Wyoming	✓		