

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES

WEST VIRGINIA WORKS EVALUATION REVIEW

Development of Methodology
Should Not Be Delayed

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
Performance Evaluation and Research Division
Building 1, Room W-314
State Capitol Complex

CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25305
(304) 347-4890

PE 97-21-92

JOINT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Senate

Billy Wayne Bailey, Jr., Chair
Edwin J. Bowman
Martha Y. Walker
Sarah M. Minear
Oshel B. Craigo

House of Delegates

Vicki V. Douglas, Chair
David "O. B." Collins, Vice-Chair
Scott G. Varner
Douglas Stalnaker
James E. Willison

Citizen Members

Andy Gurtis
Jack McComas
W. Joseph McCoy
Phyllis Presley
Ronald Solomon

Aaron Allred, Legislative Auditor
Office of the Legislative Auditor

Antonio E. Jones, Ph.D., Director
Performance Evaluation and Research Division

John Sylvia, Research Manager
Russell Kitchen, Research Analyst

January 1998

WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE
Performance Evaluation and Research Division

Building 1, Room W-314
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0610
(304) 347-4890
(304) 347-4939 FAX



Antonio E. Jones, Ph.D.
Director

January 10, 1998

The Honorable Billy Wayne Bailey
State Senate
Drawer A
Covel, West Virginia 24719

The Honorable Vicki Douglas
House of Delegates
Building 1, Room E-213
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0470

Dear Chairs:

Pursuant to the West Virginia Sunset Law, we are transmitting a Works Evaluation Review, which will be presented to the Joint Committee on Government Operations on Saturday, January 10, 1998. The issue covered herein is "Methodology Should Not Be Delayed In Being Developed."

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Antonio E. Jones".

Antonio E. Jones

AEJ/wsc

Joint Committee on Government and Finance

Executive Summary

Senate Bill 430, passed by the Legislature in 1997, required the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Resources (DHHR) to establish a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness, efficiency, and fiscal impact of the West Virginia WORKS Program. Furthermore, the bill stated that the Performance Evaluation and Research Division, within the Legislative Auditor's Office, may review and make recommendations with respect to the agency's evaluation methodology. This report provides an assessment of DHHR's methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of the State's welfare reform program.

The Legislative Auditor's review and recommendations are limited because DHHR's methodology was not finalized. DHHR indicated that:

So that our efforts will be consistent with a national strategy for evaluating welfare reform, any methodology must be designed to conform to federally prescribed specifications for sampling, data collection, reporting, and priority areas for evaluation. However, the final ruling on reporting requirements will not be forthcoming until 1998. At that time, it will be necessary to determine whether all required sources of both qualitative and quantitative data have been identified and will be available.

Establishing a Final Methodology Should Not Be Delayed

It is the Legislative Auditor's opinion that the State can immediately begin the process of finalizing an evaluation methodology. The Legislative Auditor agrees that for the sake of efficiency, developing an evaluation methodology should not make efforts to comply with federal requirements more difficult or create unnecessary duplication. However, the State mandated evaluation should not be put on hold until the federal government releases its final rules on reporting requirements. There are aspects of the evaluation that can proceed immediately without interfering with meeting federal requirements. There are clearly certain data that can be identified and must be available to determine the effectiveness of the WORKS program and its fiscal impact. Some variables would include:

- ◆ The number of individuals that have received employment.
- ◆ The number of recipients who have not participated in a work activity.
- ◆ The length of time recipients have been on welfare.
- ◆ The number of recipients that have re-applied for welfare.
- ◆ The total reduction in benefit payments.

Furthermore, part of a good evaluation process will require the ability to track welfare recipients and former welfare recipients on an individual basis. This will also be essential management information. Management will need to identify individuals who are approaching the limit for receiving benefits in order to assist them in becoming employed. DHHR needs to be in a

position to answer certain questions not only for evaluation purposes, but also for management control. For example, it will eventually be important for DHHR and the Legislature to know the following information at any point in time:

- ◆ Will the State meet the federal work participation rates?
- ◆ How much time does each current or former welfare recipient have left of their five year lifetime limit of benefits?
- ◆ What number of individuals face the loss of benefits because they have not participated in a work activity in their first two years?
- ◆ What percent of the welfare population is exempt from the five year lifetime limit of benefits?
- ◆ What number of recipients have exhausted their five year lifetime benefits?

DHHR's Draft Methodology is Too Broad and Lacks Details

The Legislative Auditor's review of DHHR's draft evaluation methodology finds that it is broad and lacks details, although conceptually it would comply with the goals of Senate Bill 430. The methodology is divided into four parts consisting of: 1) baseline forecasting, 2) impact evaluation, 3) process study, and 4) cost-benefit analysis. The Department's evaluation design proposes to answer the following five questions:

- ◆ Does WV WORKS promote self-sufficiency?
- ◆ Does WV WORKS affect Food Stamp and Medicaid Participation?
- ◆ Does the program affect family structure and stability?
- ◆ Does the program affect the well being of children, including their long-term prospects for self-sufficiency?
- ◆ How has the application rate been affected and how does that affect the overall caseload?

The variables described in the methodology would attempt to use variables that will be difficult to measure and also would require an enormous amount of data to be collected which would be time consuming, and expensive. Although some of this information may be needed for federal reporting purposes, it is not critical to providing an adequate evaluation of WORKS for the State Legislature in compliance with SB 430. If federal reports provide interesting results, these should be made available to the State Legislature. Overall, the methodology is over-ambitious and needs to be scaled back to answer basic questions such as:

- ◆ How well is the program doing in getting people employed?
- ◆ How long are people remaining on welfare compared to the previous welfare system?
- ◆ How often are individuals re-applying for welfare?
- ◆ Has there been a drop in overall applications compared to the previous welfare system and what fiscal impact will that have?
- ◆ How will caseloads change during an economic downturn?

- ◆ How much are the net savings (if any) from caseload reductions and increases in day care, transportation expenditures, and other costs?

Recommendations

The Legislative Auditor recommends that DHHR begin the process of identifying the necessary data that will be necessary to evaluate the effectiveness and fiscal impact of the WORKS program. The methodology should be scaled back to address the basic issues previously mentioned. DHHR should also submit to the legislature an assessment of the RAPIDS system's ability to track, report, or calculate at least the following information:

- ◆ *Work participation rates.*
- ◆ *How much time each current or former welfare recipient has left of their five year lifetime limit of benefits.*
- ◆ *What percent of the welfare population is exempt from the five year lifetime limit of benefits.*
- ◆ *The total number of recipients whose five year lifetime benefits have been exhausted.*
- ◆ *The total number of recipients who have completed educational training.*
- ◆ *The total number of recipients who have become employed.*
- ◆ *The number of recipients required to work but have not participated in work activities.*
- ◆ *The length of time recipients are receiving assistance.*
- ◆ *The total number of individuals who have left the welfare rolls.*
- ◆ *The rate of recidivism.*

DHHR's assessment of the RAPIDS system should also include a needs-assessment which should specify any necessary modifications of RAPIDS to produce reports and track the essential information previously discussed regardless of the release of federal regulations.

Introduction and Background

The passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 replaced the previous welfare system with block grants to states through Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). TANF came into effect January 1, 1997. The new program was intended to encourage self-sufficiency and reduce dependence on government assistance. There is a lifetime limit of five years on receiving benefits and welfare recipients are required to work after 24 months of benefits or become ineligible for further assistance. West Virginia WORKS represents the State's welfare program designed to the specifications of TANF. WORKS' provisions are consistent with the basic requirements of TANF, but include features which are optional for each state. These options include eligibility guidelines and the approach to caseload management. Implementation of the WORKS program began in nine pilot counties and were phased in to the rest of the State by the end of 1997.

Senate Bill 430, passed by the Legislature in 1997, required the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Resources (DHHR) to establish a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness, efficiency, and fiscal impact of the West Virginia WORKS Program. Furthermore, the bill stated that the Performance Evaluation and Research Division, within the Legislative Auditor's Office, may review and make recommendations with respect to the agency's evaluation methodology to evaluate the impact of the pilot project prior to it being implemented statewide. However, the statewide implementation of the WORKS project began on October 1, 1997, prior to the agency's evaluation of the pilot project. Consequently, the evaluation methodology submitted to the Legislative Auditor's Office is designed to analyze the WORKS program after statewide implementation.

The Legislative Auditor's review and recommendations are limited because DHHR's methodology was not finalized. A draft copy of the methodology is contained in Appendix A. DHHR has federal reporting requirements as well as the State's evaluation mandate. In order to be consistent in state and federal evaluation and reporting, DHHR indicated that "any methodology must be designed to conform to federally prescribed specifications for sampling, data collection, reporting, and priority areas for evaluation." However, Federal specifications are expected to be released sometime in 1998. DHHR indicated that once federal specifications are available, the agency will determine if all sources of data have been identified or will be available. Additional reporting capabilities may need to be developed for current information systems.

It is the Legislative Auditor's opinion that the State mandate does not have to comply with federal specifications because they are two separate requirements. The Legislative Auditor agrees that for the sake of efficiency, procedures established for the State evaluation should not make efforts to comply with federal requirements more difficult or create unnecessary duplication. However, the State mandated evaluation should not be put on hold until the federal government releases its final rules on reporting requirements. There are aspects of the State methodology that can proceed immediately without interfering with meeting federal requirements.

Senate Bill 430 outlines the goals of the WORKS program.

1. The first is “to achieve more efficient and effective use of public assistance funds.”
2. The second is “to reduce dependency on public programs by promoting self-sufficiency.”
3. The program should be structured “to emphasize employment and personal responsibility.”
4. After five years, there is expected to be a decrease in the number of persons receiving public assistance, and a decrease in the amount of time an individual remains on public assistance.
5. Finally, the agency’s evaluation should include measures for “*the increase in employment rates in program areas; the completion of educational and training programs; the increased compliance in preventive health activities, including immunizations; and a decrease in the case-load of division of personnel.*”

DHHR’s Evaluation Methodology is Too Broad and Lacks Details

The Legislative Auditor’s review of DHHR’s draft evaluation methodology finds that it is broad and lacks details, although conceptually it would comply with the goals of Senate Bill 430. The methodology is divided into four parts consisting of: 1) baseline forecasting, 2) impact evaluation, 3) process study, and 4) cost-benefit analysis. The Department’s evaluation design proposes to answer the following five questions:

- ◆ **Does WV WORKS promote self-sufficiency?**
- ◆ **Does WV WORKS affect Food Stamp and Medicaid Participation?**
- ◆ **Does the program affect family structure and stability?**
- ◆ **Does the program affect the well being of children, including their long-term prospects for self-sufficiency?**
- ◆ **How has the application rate been affected and how does that affect the overall caseload?**

The variables described in the methodology would attempt to use variables that will be difficult to measure, difficult to develop an adequate time-series, and also would require an enormous amount of data to be collected which would be time consuming, and expensive. Although some of this information may be needed for federal reporting purposes, it is not critical to providing an adequate evaluation of WORKS for the State Legislature in compliance with SB 430. If federal reports provide interesting results, these should be made available to the State Legislature. Overall, the methodology is over-ambitious and needs to be scaled back to answer basic questions such as:

- ◆ How well is the program doing in getting people employed?
- ◆ How long are people remaining on welfare compared to the previous welfare system?
- ◆ How often are individuals re-applying for welfare?

- ◆ Has there been a drop in overall applications compared to the previous welfare system and what fiscal impact will that have?
- ◆ How will caseloads change during an economic downturn and what would be the fiscal impact?
- ◆ How much are the net savings (if any) from caseload reductions and increases in day care, transportation expenditures, and other costs?

Baseline Data Analysis

The baseline analysis is similar to the approach used by the Legislative Auditor in his study required by SB 430. A major difference is that DHHR intends to use 1996 data for the baseline, while the Legislative Auditor's Office used the 1993-1996 period as the baseline. The baseline data will be collected from 1993 to 1995 and will use 1996 as a base year for comparison purposes. A forecasting mechanism will be used to examine trends and determine which variables may have been affected by program-specific influences in future periods under the WORKS program; The analysis will be conducted by county. DHHR does not indicate what program variables will be evaluated in the baseline analysis. This is a serious problem because defining the following variables is a formidable task: self-sufficiency; Food Stamp and Medicaid participation; family structure and stability; "well being" of children and long-term "prospects" for self-sufficiency; application rate and caseload. Furthermore, DHHR's baseline does not indicate whether and how economic conditions will be accounted for in its analysis.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

A cost-benefit analysis is planned by the Department of Health and Human Resources in order to weigh the costs of the program against its benefits. Such factors as administrative costs, transportation costs, Food Stamp payments, and education and training expenses will be examined. This will include an analysis of the impact of the program on communities, day care costs, among other factors. The cost-benefit analysis should be used to obtain a complete picture of the impact that WORKS has, not only on cash assistance payments, but also on other services and the resulting fiscal impact.

Process Study

DHHR intends to complete a process study to "*document the implementation of WORKS and its operations and practices.*" The study will focus on all aspects of services provided including:

- ◆ Organizational aspects, such as the planning process, staffing structure, funding committed, field staff acceptance of the program, and methods of project implementation at different organizational levels.

- ◆ Service aspects, such as the characteristics, roles and training of field staff. This will also consider the type, duration, and scheduling of services.
- ◆ Contextual factors including the social, economic, and political forces affecting the implementation and effectiveness of the program.
- ◆ Differences among service delivery sites. This includes resources, service provision, and staffing.

The goal of the process study is to examine any differences in the services provided, the sequence of services offered to clients, and relationships with other agencies. The study will serve as a management tool for allocating resources and to expose aspects of the program requiring management attention.

Impact Evaluation

The agency's evaluation design includes the development of a model to determine the factors leading to successful outcomes. Its major objectives are to establish baseline data and to conduct impact evaluations. The impact evaluations will include, but not be limited to the following factors:

- marriage and separation rates
- homelessness
- rate and use of Foster Care
- status changes between WORKS and other programs
- reported cases of child abuse and neglect
- health and insurance status
- number and percent of persons employed
- the length of time people are employed
- amount of earned income
- hours worked per month
- total family income
- accumulated savings
- number and percent of persons receiving a cash benefit
- number and percent of persons receiving Food Stamps
- cash assistance and Food Stamp benefit amounts
- length of time on assistance
- exit and recidivism rates for WORKS
- length of time receiving Day Care and Medicaid benefits
- amount of Day Care and Medicaid benefits
- number of Day Care placements and days of service provided
- sanction rates
- age and race of those subject to sanctions
- active cases on implementation date
- new WORKS applications
- age and race characteristics

- characteristics of families who leave assistance roles

The long-term effectiveness of WORKS should largely be measured by the amount of time individuals remain employed after leaving public assistance. In order to remain employed and become self-sufficient, recipients must be placed in jobs which will keep them from returning to public assistance.

Proposed Federal TANF Regulations

Proposed TANF Regulations are currently available for public comment. They describe the Administration for Children and Families' (ACF) interpretation of the PWORA as it applies to the states. One of the Department of Health and Human Resources' most immediate concerns is meeting federal data reporting requirements. In order to minimize data reporting as required by Section 411 of the PWORA, the ACF proposes to limit reports to a quarterly TANF Data Report, a quarterly TANF Financial Report, an annual program and performance report, and an annual addendum to the fourth quarter Financial Report. Quarterly aggregated caseload data will be required. The ACF also proposes to require States to report only on the demographic and financial characteristics of families who successfully apply for assistance. The proposed disaggregated case data collection requirements include data on both families receiving TANF assistance and families no longer receiving TANF assistance. The ACF proposed regulations have outlined the possible fiscal penalties against States. These penalties include a penalty of four percent of the adjusted State Family Assistance Grant (SFAG) for "failure to submit an accurate, complete and timely required report."

Data must also be maintained on specific services received by the family: subsidized housing, medical assistance, Food Stamps or subsidized child care. The number of months the family spends on each form of assistance is another important data category. The number of hours per week adults participated in various work activities is a key measure required by the federal legislation for the purposes of determining participation rates. These work activities include education, subsidized employment, unsubsidized employment, work experience, job search, job skills training or on-the-job training, and vocational education. A sample of closed cases is to be examined and the reason for case closure is to be determined according to three categories. These are employment, marriage, and the five-year limit on benefit eligibility.

In addition to the data that must be collected and is specified in the federal legislation, the ACF's proposed TANF regulations describes new data elements that must be maintained by States. These include data on clients relating to Zip Codes, family affiliation, Social Security Numbers, and gender. Five data elements related to the administration of a data collection system are proposed, including State FIPS Code, the reporting month, sampling stratum, family case number, and sample case disposition. "Break-outs" of existing data elements are proposed as well. These include data on earned income, unearned income, subsidized housing, and Food Stamp assistance type. Other data elements are proposed because they are necessary to implement the requirements of other statutes. These include cooperation with child support, time limits for receipt of assistance, new

applicants, and the amount of a family's cash resources. The ACF also proposes new data elements relating to child care.

Sampling may be used by States to meet disaggregated data collection and reporting requirements. It may not be used to collect aggregated data. A sampling and statistical manual will be issued at a later date and will contain instructions on procedures and specifications for sampling methods.

Conclusions

It is the Legislative Auditor's opinion that the State can immediately begin the process of finalizing an evaluation methodology. The Legislative Auditor agrees that for the sake of efficiency, developing an evaluation methodology should not make efforts to comply with federal requirements more difficult or create unnecessary duplication. However, the State mandated evaluation should not be put on hold until the federal government releases its final rules on reporting requirements. There are aspects of the evaluation that can proceed immediately without interfering with meeting federal requirements. There are clearly certain data that can be identified and must be available to determine the effectiveness of the WORKS program and its fiscal impact. Some variables would include:

- ◆ The number of individuals that have received employment.
- ◆ The number of recipients who have not participated in a work activity.
- ◆ The length of time recipients have been on welfare.
- ◆ The recidivism rate.
- ◆ The total reduction in benefit payments.

Furthermore, part of a good evaluation process will require the ability to track welfare recipients and former welfare recipients on an individual basis. This will also be essential management information. Management will need to identify individuals who are approaching the limit for receiving benefits in order to assist them in becoming employed. DHHR needs to be in a position to answer certain questions not only for evaluation purposes, but also for management control. For example, it will eventually be important for DHHR and the Legislature to know at least the following information at any point in time:

- ◆ Will the State meet the federal work participation rates?
- ◆ How much time does each current or former welfare recipient have left of their five year lifetime limit of benefits?
- ◆ What number of individuals face the loss of benefits because they have not participated in a work activity in their first two years?
- ◆ What percent of the welfare population is exempt from the five year lifetime limit of benefits?
- ◆ What number of recipients have exhausted their five year lifetime benefits?

The agency's plan assumes that RAPIDS will be sufficient for the data collection requirements of WORKS. Most WORKS cases have recently been converted to the RAPIDS system, which was not originally designed for WORKS, but the system is being upgraded to accommodate WORKS cases. The current data collection methods used by the Department of Health and Human Resources utilize multiple data systems which are in different locations. Employment placement and financial data for different benefit programs are currently maintained separately. This creates difficulties in accessing all the data that are relevant for evaluating the net fiscal impact and effectiveness of the program. The agency's goal is to incorporate data that have been stored in older data systems into RAPIDS. The establishment of one central location for the storage of WORKS-related data would facilitate future analysis. The ability of RAPIDS to collect all of the data required has yet to be developed.

The following recommendations are made.

Recommendation 1

The Legislative Auditor recommends that DHHR begin the process of identifying the necessary data that will be necessary to evaluate the effectiveness and fiscal impact of the WORKS program. The draft methodology should be scaled back to address the basic issues previously mentioned.

Recommendation 2:

DHHR should submit to the Joint Committee on Government Operations an assessment of the RAPIDS system's ability to track, report, or calculate at least the following information:

- ◆ *Work participation rates.*
- ◆ *How much time each current or former welfare recipient have left of their five year lifetime limit of benefits.*
- ◆ *What percent of the welfare population is exempt from the five year lifetime limit of benefits.*
- ◆ *The total number of recipients whose five year lifetime benefits have been exhausted.*
- ◆ *The total number of recipients who have completed educational training.*
- ◆ *The total number of recipients who have become employed.*
- ◆ *The number of recipients required to work but have not participated in work activities.*
- ◆ *The length of time recipients are receiving assistance.*
- ◆ *The total number of individuals who have left the welfare rolls.*
- ◆ *The rate of recidivism.*

DHHR's assessment of the RAPIDS system should also include a needs-assessment which should specify any necessary modifications of RAPIDS to produce reports and track the essential information previously discussed regardless of the release of federal regulations.

APPENDIX A

WORKS Evaluation Methodology from the Department of Health and Human Resources

DRAFT

Several factors will dictate the timing of finalization for the WV Works evaluation model. So that our efforts will be consistent with a national strategy for evaluating welfare reform, any methodology must be designed to conform to federally proscribed specifications for sampling, data collection, reporting, and priority areas for evaluation. However, the final ruling on reporting requirements will not be forthcoming until 1998. At that time, it will be necessary to determine whether all required sources of both qualitative and quantitative data have been identified and will be available. It may be necessary to develop additional reporting capability for current information systems and, in view of the priority of issues related to child care, it will be necessary to establish linkage between the RAPIDS and FACTS information systems. While a definitive model and methodology cannot be finalized, a combined approach—baseline forecasting, impact evaluation, process study, and cost-benefit analysis—appears to be indicated.

The purpose of WV Works is to enable recipients to move off public assistance and to remain self-sufficient. It is anticipated that as a result of WV Works, net savings will be achieved when savings from all publicly funded programs serving recipients are taken into consideration. Evaluation will necessarily focus on the effects of policies that help recipients to find jobs and activities that support individuals in the work force and increase their employment stability. Analysis must be sufficient to address, at a minimum, the following research questions:

- Does WV Works promote self-sufficiency?
- Does WV Works affect Food Stamp and Medicaid participation?
- Does the program affect family structure and stability?
- Does the program affect the well being of children, including their long-term prospects for self-sufficiency?

- How has the application rate been affected and how does that affect the overall caseload?

However, within the context of significant changes in policy and delivery of services brought about by WV Works, an entirely common practice of treatments does not exist before and after implementation. Therefore, the evaluation design and methodology will require a combination of the historical approach with an impact evaluation, a process study and a cost-benefit analysis.

The major objectives and requirements of the evaluation are:

1.) Establish baseline data. Using 1996 as a base year, historical data will be collected from periods 1993 through 1995. From various periods, trends will establish a forecasting mechanism to determine which outcomes in later, on-going periods could have been predicted with accuracy and which variables may have been affected by program-specific influences. Because WV Works is being "phased in" by groups of counties, comparisons must be tested on a county-by-county basis as well as on the state as a whole. Due to the conversion of data to a different information system, care must also be taken to assure that that historical and current data are comparable.

2.) Conduct Impact Evaluations. A model will be developed to determine which factors contribute to successful outcomes. On an on-going basis, WV Works participants and groups of participants must be monitored for statistically significant differences in selected outcome measures such as increased/decreased economic self-sufficiency and increased/decreased welfare dependency. Outcomes will include but not be limited to:

- marriage and separation rates
- homelessness
- rate and use of Foster Care
- status changes between WV Works and other programs
- reported cases of child abuse and neglect
- health and insurance status
- number and percent of persons employed

- length of employment
- amount of earned income
- hours worked per month
- total family income
- accumulated savings
- number and percent of persons receiving a cash benefit
- number and percent of persons receiving Food Stamps
- cash assistance and Food Stamp benefit amounts
- length of time on assistance
- exit and recidivism rates for WV Works
- length of time receiving Day Care and Medicaid benefits
- amount of Day Care and Medicaid benefits
- number of Day Care placements and days of service provided
- sanction rates
- age and race of those subject to sanctions
- active cases on implementation date
- new WV Works applications
- age and race characteristics.
- characteristics of families who leave assistance roles

3.) Conduct a process study. The Process Study should document the implementation of WV Works and its operations and practices. This must include the implementation of the program as well as the operation of the mature program. All aspects of the services provided should be examined to document the extent to which there are differences in the in the way in which services are offered, the sequence of services (client flow), relationships with other agencies, and to identify where additional resources or management attention may be required. This study should examine the following aspects of the demonstration:

- The organizational aspects, such as the planning process; staffing structure; funding committed; level of acceptance by field staff; and methods of project implementation at various organizational levels including ongoing monitoring, oversight, and problem resolution.
- The service aspects, such as the characteristics, roles, and training of the field staff, type and duration of services provided; and timeliness and scheduling in the provision of program components and services.
- The contextual factors, such as the social, economic, and political forces that may have a bearing on the implementation or effectiveness of the program.
- The differences among service delivery sites with regard to comparable resources, services, activities, staffing, timeliness and scheduling in the provision of program components and services, etc.

4.) **Determine the Cost-Benefit.** The evaluation should include a cost-benefit analysis to determine whether the costs of the program are justified by the benefits produced. Comparisons should be made from the viewpoint of the program participants, the various levels of government, and society as a whole. The evaluation should also include a model for quantifying program outcomes and projecting both costs and benefits into the future. Costs for all pertinent programs should be included. At a minimum, the following factors should be included:

- Administrative costs
- Administrative savings from work simplification
- Increased tax payments
- Social/Community impacts
- Education and training-related expenses
- Day Care costs
- Cash assistance payments
- Food Stamp payments
- Transportation costs
- Support services
- Employment/earnings

Programming Completed for Baseline Data — C-219

WVLEGS WWORKS All Cases in Pilot Counties (Excluding Transitional Medicaid) Broken Down by Converted to Works and Not Converted to Works.

WWORKS	Cases Closed This Month by Reason Code
n-WWORKS	Cases Closed This Month by Reason Code
WWORKS	Cases by Disposition Code, Cases Open and Approved This Month
n-WWORKS	Cases by Disposition Code, Cases Open and Approved This Month
WWORKS	Cases by Disposition Code, All Open and Approved Cases
n-WWORKS	Cases by Disposition Code, All Open and Approved Cases
WWORKS	Average Food Stamps, Average Food Stamp Budget Group, Total Food Stamps, Total Food Stamp Budget Group (Cases Approved This Month). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
n-WWORKS	Average Food Stamps, Average Food Stamp Budget Group, Total Food Stamps, Total Food Stamp Budget Group (Cases Approved This Month). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
WWORKS	Average Food Stamps, Average Food Stamp Budget Group, Total Food Stamps, Total Food Stamp Budget Group (All Open and Approved Cases). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
n-WWORKS	Average Food Stamps, Average Food Stamp Budget Group, Total Food Stamps, Total Food Stamp Budget Group (All Open and Approved Cases). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
WWORKS	Average Cash Assistance, Average PA Budget Group, Total Cash Assistance, Total PA Budget Group (Cases Approved this Month). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
n-WWORKS	Average Cash Assistance, Average PA Budget Group, Total Cash Assistance, Total PA Budget Group (Cases Approved this Month). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
WWORKS	Average Cash Assistance, Average PA Budget Group, Total Cash Assistance, Total PA Budget Group (All Open and Approved Cases). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
n-WWORKS	Average Cash Assistance, Average PA Budget Group, Total Cash Assistance, Total PA Budget Group (All Open and Approved Cases). Averages include Prorated Benefits.
WWORKS	Average and Total Income (Cases Approved This Month).
n-WWORKS	Average and Total Income (Cases Approved This Month).
WWORKS	Average and Total Income (All Open and Approved Cases).
n-WWORKS	Average and Total Income (All Open and Approved Cases).

FDCWIN) All Cases in WVWORKS Pilot Counties (Excluding Transitional Medicaid) Broken Down by Converted to Works and Not Converted to Works, By Type of Head of Household, and Work Mandatory Switch.

VWORKS Single Parent, Two Parent, No Parents — Work Mandatory Status

Non-VVWORKS Single Parent, Two Parent, No Parents — Work Mandatory Status