


**POLICY AND BUDGET ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA'S TEMPORARY  
ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)**



**AUTHORS:**

**TAMMY K. BECOAT  
WILLIAM N. FEDERSPIEL  
MATTHEW R. YOUNG**

**THOMAS JEFFERSON PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY  
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).....	3
<i>Legal Basis</i>	
<i>Purposes of TANF</i>	
<i>TANF Program Overview</i>	
<i>TANF Funding</i>	
<i>The Virginia Initiative for Employment Not Welfare Program</i>	
<i>Childcare Program Under TANF</i>	
<i>Activities Directed at the Third Statutory Purpose of TANF</i>	
<i>Programs and Activities Directed at the Fourth Statutory Purpose of TANF</i>	
TANF Changes Mandated By Congress.....	10
<i>Changes to TANF Work Participation Rate Requirement</i>	
<i>New Department of Health and Human Services Regulations</i>	
Institutional Recommendations.....	13
<i>VDSS Recommendations: Improving the Work Participation Rate</i>	
<i>JLARC Recommendations: Improving Self-Sufficiency</i>	
Themes from Other States.....	20
<i>Delaware’s “A Better Chance” Program</i>	
<i>South Carolina’s “Moving Up” Pilot Program</i>	
<i>Tennessee’s “Families First” Program</i>	
Statistical Description of Virginia TANF Programs.....	25
<i>Recipients by Program</i>	
<i>Recipients by Gender</i>	
<i>Recipients by Marital Status</i>	
<i>Recipients by Race and Ethnicity</i>	
<i>Recipients by Age</i>	
<i>Recipients’ Educational Attainment</i>	
<i>Monthly Recipient Income</i>	
<i>TANF Recipients by Region</i>	
Analysis of VDSS Recommendations.....	31
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	35
Appendices	
<i>Appendix A: All Statewide Descriptive Tables</i>	
<i>Appendix B: All Statewide Detailed Cross Tabs</i>	
<i>Appendix C: All Locality Descriptive Tables</i>	
<i>Appendix D: All Locality Cross Tabs</i>	
<i>Appendix E: JLARC Recommendations on Self-Sufficiency</i>	

# INTRODUCTION TO TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program is a block grant awarded to states to provide income assistance to poor families, to end dependency on welfare benefits, to prevent nonmarital births, and to encourage marriage. TANF also includes incentive funds for states that achieve the overall program goals of TANF and additional incentive funds for States that are successful in reducing nonmarital births. In most cases, TANF benefits are limited to individuals who work to maintain their eligibility.

## *Legal Basis*

The federal legal basis for TANF is Title IV-A of the Social Security Act as amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. PRWORA allows states to establish program requirements in any manner which will reasonably accomplish the purpose of TANF. The federal regulatory basis is 45 CFR parts 260-265. The Virginia legal base is the *Code of Virginia*, §§ 63.1-86.1, 63.1-105 through 63.1-133.1, 63.133.41 through 63.1-133.55. The *Code of Virginia*, §63.1, requires that the TANF program be administered in accordance with federal and state statutes and regulations and policies established by the State Board of Social Services. The *Code of Virginia*, §63.2, mandates a local Department of Social Services in every political subdivision of the State and specifies the responsibilities of the local social services board, as well as the methods of discharging these responsibilities.

## *The Purposes of TANF*

Virginia's TANF cash assistance program is based on its 1995 waiver-based welfare reform initiative which includes the Virginia Independence Program (VIP) and the Virginia Initiative for Employment not Welfare program (VIEW). Both programs are the centerpieces of Virginia's TANF assistance program, and emphasize personal responsibility. Participants may be provided with services such as job skills training, work experience, job readiness training, childcare assistance, transportation and other work related expenses.

The stated purposes of TANF are:

- Provide assistance to needy families so that children can be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives;
- End the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage;
- Prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock marriages; and
- Encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 2004 Commonwealth of Virginia TANF State Renewal Plan,  
[http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/reports/financial\\_assistance/tanf/2004/stateplan\\_2004.pdf](http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/reports/financial_assistance/tanf/2004/stateplan_2004.pdf)

## **TANF Program Overview**

State and federal law, as noted above, establish the right of any individual:

- To apply for financial assistance;
- To have his eligibility for assistance determined promptly and in conformity with law and established policy;
- If found eligible, to receive assistance promptly and in the amount determined according to established policy; and
- To appeal to the Commissioner of Social Services if s/he is dissatisfied with the decision of the local department on his/her case.<sup>2</sup>

The TANF program provides eligible families with a monthly cash payment to meet their basic needs. For a child to be eligible s/he must be:

- Under age 18, or if 18, will graduate from high school before age 19
- Going to school regularly if he is between the ages of five and 18
- Living with a parent or other relative
- A U.S. citizen or an eligible immigrant<sup>3</sup>

Additional eligibility requirements applicable to the family:

- To qualify for assistance, the assistance unit's countable income must pass screenings at 185 percent and 90 percent of the need standard based on the unit's size. Once the family is determined to be financially needy, the monthly payment is calculated. Income is counted prospectively in determining financial eligibility and the monthly payment amount.
- Clients who do not meet an exemption criterion are required to participate in a work activity.<sup>4</sup>

There are a number of Virginia TANF program components, which include:

- Diversionary Assistance -- provides a one-time cash payment worth up to four months of benefits to meet a family's needs during a crisis.
- Learnfare -- designed to keep children, including minor parents, in school.
- Minor Parent Residency Requirement -- provides a safe, nurturing environment for minor welfare mothers and their babies.
- Mandatory Paternity Identification -- designed to put the responsibility for providing for children on the parents.

---

<sup>2</sup> Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), <http://www.dss.virginia.gov/benefit/tanf/>, last accessed 11/30/06.

<sup>3</sup> Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), <http://www.dss.virginia.gov/benefit/tanf/>, last accessed 11/30/06.

<sup>4</sup> 2004 Commonwealth of Virginia TANF State Renewal Plan, [http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/reports/financial\\_assistance/tanf/2004/stateplan\\_2004.pdf](http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/reports/financial_assistance/tanf/2004/stateplan_2004.pdf)

- Family Cap -- Virginia disallows additional cash payments for children born 10 months after a mother begins receiving cash TANF benefits. The mother will receive the full amount of child support collected for this child.
- Immunization Requirement -- Parents are required to provide their children with all necessary immunizations in order to receive full benefits.<sup>5</sup>

### ***TANF Funding***<sup>6</sup>

The TANF program is funded through a federal block grant and from State funds authorized by the General Assembly of Virginia. Total Virginia expenditures for the TANF program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$62,113,159 (this includes IDA, non-recurring assistance, administration and systems costs, in addition to on-going cash assistance). Total state expenditures claimed as Maintenance of Effort (MOE) under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$62,113,159. The total number of families served under the program with MOE Funds was 31,305.

### ***The Virginia Initiative for Employment Not Welfare Program (VIEW)***<sup>7</sup>

VIEW is a program providing temporary employment, education, and training opportunities to TANF recipients. Total Virginia expenditures for the program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$18,902,072. Total state expenditures claimed as Maintenance of Effort (MOE) under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$18,902,072. The total number of families served under VIEW with MOE Funds was 25,293.

VIEW is based on the conviction that all citizens deserve the opportunity to progress to self-sufficiency. This program offers impoverished Virginians the opportunity to obtain work experience and skills necessary for maintaining self-sufficiency and achieving economic independence. In order to maintain federal block grant funding for TANF, the Virginia Department of Social Services (DSS) and local agencies must meet federal requirements regarding the types and intensity of client participation in VIEW. The VIEW program offers a number of education, training, and work components designed to meet the individual needs of TANF recipients, who are required to participate in VIEW in accordance with federal regulation. These components are generally referred to as work activities and are divided into two categories: core and non-core.

To count a client's hours of participation in Virginia's work participation rate calculation, each client referred to VIEW must be assigned to a minimum of 35 hours per week, for a single-parent family, or 40 hours per week, for TANF-UP families when only one parent is working. The first 20 of these hours must be in either one or a combination of core work activities. Additional hours, to meet the requirement, can be made up in any core or non-core activity. Core

<sup>5</sup> 2004 Commonwealth of Virginia TANF State Renewal Plan,

[http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/reports/financial\\_assistance/tanf/2004/stateplan\\_2004.pdf](http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/reports/financial_assistance/tanf/2004/stateplan_2004.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> The information from this section comes from: Annual Report on State TANF and MOE Programs – 2005 Virginia, Department of Health & Human Services, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/MOE-05/virginia.htm>

<sup>7</sup> The information from this section comes from: Annual Report on State TANF and MOE Programs – 2005 Virginia, Department of Health & Human Services, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/MOE-05/virginia.htm>

work activities include job search or job readiness, unsubsidized employment, subsidized employment, Community Work Experience Program (CWEP), Public Service Program (PSP), On-the-Job-Training (OJT), and vocational education and training. Non-core activities include job skills training and education below post-secondary.

The federal participation rate is a ratio of the number of individuals participating in work activities out of all those expected to participate. States must calculate two separate participation rates:

- The two-parent rate—based on how well it succeeds in helping adults in TANF-UP families participate in work activities
- The overall rate—based on how well it succeeds in placing adults in both TANF and TANF-UP families in work activities.

Presently, each state must achieve an overall participation rate of 50 percent and a two-parent rate of 90 percent.

### ***Childcare Program under TANF<sup>8</sup>***

The childcare program is provided to ensure supervised, healthy, and safe placement for children of recipients who are working or participating in an assigned education or training activity. Childcare services are those activities that assist eligible families in the arrangement and purchase of childcare for children. It also includes activities that promote parental choice, consumer education to help parents make informed choices about childcare, activities to enhance health and safety standards, and activities that increase and enhance childcare and early childhood resources in the community. Parents remain eligible for childcare services during the first 12 consecutive months after their TANF case has been closed.

Total Virginia expenditures for the program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$21,328,766. Total expenditures claimed as MOE under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$21,328,766. The total number of families served under the program with MOE Funds was 11,861.

### ***Activities Directed at the Third Statutory Purpose of TANF<sup>9</sup>***

Virginia currently funds several initiatives designed to reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock births and teen pregnancy and to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families, which include:

*Partners in Prevention (Community-Based Out-of-Wedlock Pregnancy Prevention Program)* – Under the direction of the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Resources and various agencies of the Commonwealth, including the Departments of Health and Social Services, the

<sup>8</sup> The information from this section comes from: Annual Report on State TANF and MOE Programs – 2005 Virginia, Department of Health & Human Services, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/MOE-05/virginia.htm>

<sup>9</sup> The information from this section comes from: Annual Report on State TANF and MOE Programs – 2005 Virginia, Department of Health & Human Services, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/MOE-05/virginia.htm>

state has initiated the Partners in Prevention program. This program was established to encourage and support community-directed strategies to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies.

The Partners in Prevention Program targets women ages 20-29 to reduce the out-of-wedlock birth rate. This initiative has a secondary target audience of teens, ages 10-19. Areas of focus include marriage before conception, male responsibility, discouraging cohabitation outside of marriage, delaying sexual involvement until marriage, and discouraging high-risk sexual behavior. Total Virginia expenditures for the program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$9,863. Total state expenditures claimed as MOE under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$9,863. The total number of individuals served under the program with MOE Funds was 398.

*Virginia Abstinence Education Initiative* – The Department of Health is responsible for the management, implementation, and administration of an evaluation of five abstinence education initiatives targeting seventh through eleventh grade students, both in and out of school:

- Reasons of the Heart: Educational Guidance Institute (Danville, Fairfax County, Fauquier County, and Loudoun County);
- Individuals Abstaining 'Til Marriage: Family Services of Central Virginia (Bedford City, Bedford County, Campbell County, and the City of Lynchburg),
- Very Important Person: Horizons Unlimited Ministries, Inc. (Newport News - East End and Denbigh areas),
- I Can Abstain Now: Sussex County Department of Social Services (Sussex County),
- My Choice, My Future!: Powhatan County Department of Health (Powhatan County).

Sussex County's "I Can Abstain Now" Program is typical of abstinence education efforts. In this program, students learn the importance of maintaining an abstinent lifestyle and postponing sexual involvement. Students receive classroom instruction, one-on-one sessions with abstinence educators, and experiential learning sessions with peer educators.

*Girls Empowered for Success (GEMS)* – This program, formerly called The Resource Mothers Sibling Program, provides mentoring for siblings of pregnant or parenting teens. Adult mentoring relationships, involvement in community activities, and establishment of future goals have been found to counterbalance the pressure towards risky sexual and other negative behaviors. The GEMS home visitors working with pregnant and parenting teens will refer younger non-pregnant sisters, ages 9-15, to the mentoring program.

*Comprehensive Health Investment Project (CHIP) of Virginia* – The mission of CHIP of VA is to partner with communities, to strengthen families with young children, to improve community health, and to increase family self-sufficiency.

CHIP of VA programs are local public/private partnerships that provide comprehensive care coordination, family support, and referral to medical and dental services for low-income, at-risk children. CHIP's efforts to match a family to comprehensive preventive and primary care providers, coupled with family support services, guide families to the effective use of healthcare

and community services. CHIP also works to improve the employability and earning capacity of parents so they can move their families to self sufficiency.

*Healthy Families* –Healthy Families programs offer voluntary, intensive home visiting services, for up to five years, to new parents, who are assessed as being at-risk for child abuse or neglect. The services include in-home parenting education and support services to parents who need individualized and comprehensive support. Families participating in Healthy Families are assigned a Family Support Worker who provides home-visiting services based on developing a trusting relationship with families and building on family strengths. Family needs are assessed and a case plan is developed. This plan includes role modeling in problem solving, developing effective parenting techniques and home management skills, ensuring well baby care, and linking the family with appropriate community services.

*Planning District 16 Trust Fund for At-Risk Children and Families* –The services provided by the Rappahannock Area Community Services Board include intensive in-home family therapy and mentoring to assist in the development of competent parenting and coping skills. Specific services include on-site counseling, which allows families to reveal their patterns of interaction and to make adjustments in their natural environment, and respite care and activities, designed to promote positive social behaviors in the child and prevent out-of-home placements.

The services provided by the Sixteenth District Court Service unit include intensive supervision and family outreach programs, designed to prevent juveniles from engaging in behaviors that may result in removal from their families and homes. Case managers and outreach workers make three to seven contacts weekly with each juvenile and work with parents, school officials and job sites to promote productive behavior and stable family relationships.

*Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative (TPPI)* –The goal of this initiative is to help reduce the rate of teenage pregnancies. In 1996, 36.2 in every 1,000 girls, between the ages of 10 and 19, experienced a pregnancy in Virginia. In the seven regions that TPPI serves - Alexandria, Norfolk, Richmond, the Petersburg area, Eastern Shore, Roanoke and Portsmouth - the rates ranged from 54.9 to 71.8 per thousand.

TPPI programs spearheaded community efforts and collaborated with other local organizations and programs to provide a variety of school and/or community-based services. Through education, awareness, abstinence and life-skills training, pre-teens and teens gain the following abilities: developing mature and healthy relationships; responsible decision-making skills; effective communication skills with peers and parents; and improved understanding of the physical and emotional changes of adolescence. The primary message of this initiative is one of premarital sexual abstinence and male responsibility. Mechanisms include parental involvement, access to health care services and the use of mentors and role models.

*Statutory Rape Awareness Program* –The goals of the Statutory Rape Awareness Program are to raise community awareness of the problem of statutory rape and to reduce the incidence of statutory rape. Strategies to achieve these goals include implementing a public awareness campaign targeting men, ages 18-30, and developing a web site in coordination with the public awareness campaign. Training programs and materials were developed for law enforcement



personnel, counselors and educators. Training was also conducted for fathers and adolescent males, incorporating issues of male responsibility, sexual coercion and statutory rape into existing curricula used by fatherhood programs around the state.

### ***Programs and Activities Directed at the Fourth Statutory Purpose of TANF<sup>10</sup>***

Virginia has established a number of programs designed to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families, which include:

#### *TANF-UP (Unemployed Parent) Program*

Effective October 1, 1999, the state established a separate state program to serve needy two-parent families. State MOE funds will be used for cash assistance payments, employment services, and the administrative costs of this program. This program is designed to meet the special needs of two-parent families in helping them to attain self-sufficiency. For VIEW participants, earned income is screened at 150 percent of the poverty level. Total Virginia expenditures for the program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$7,155,069. Total State expenditures claimed as MOE under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$7,155,069. The total number of families served under the program with MOE Funds was 3,024.

#### *TANF non-VIEW (Exempt Clients) Program*

Effective July 1, 2003, Virginia established a separate state program to provide assistance to TANF-eligible households, who are exempt from VIEW due to employment barriers. Employment barriers include temporary disability, the need to care for an incapacitated household member, and pregnancy during the fourth through ninth month. MOE funds will be used for cash assistance payments to this client group.

#### *CSA Early Intervention Trust Fund*

The Early Intervention Trust Fund provides individualized, comprehensive supportive services to parents including: parenting education, life skills training and coping skills training. Family needs are assessed and a case plan is developed. This plan includes developing effective parenting techniques and home management skills and linking the family with appropriate community resources. Total Virginia expenditures for the program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$333,697. Total State expenditures claimed as MOE under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$333,697. The total number of families served under the program with MOE Funds was 3,622.

#### *Virginia Preschool Initiative*

The Virginia Preschool Initiative provides supportive services to income eligible families with four-year old children. Localities that participate must ensure that the program operates at least six hours per day and conforms to the school calendar year, to ensure the program meets the

---

<sup>10</sup> The information from this section comes from: Annual Report on State TANF and MOE Programs – 2005 Virginia, Department of Health & Human Services, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/MOE-05/virginia.htm>

needs of working parents. Families participating in the Virginia Preschool Initiative may receive assistance with early childhood education and development, social services, children's health assessments and parent education. Total Virginia expenditures for the program for the 2005 Fiscal Year were \$3,613,799. Total State expenditures claimed as MOE under the program for the Fiscal Year were \$3,613,799. The total number of families served under the program with MOE Funds was 2,438.

## TANF CHANGES MANDATED BY CONGRESS

In February 2006, President Bush signed the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) into law. A major component of the DRA was a series of significant changes to the TANF program, initially created in 1996. This section of the report details the changes made by the DRA.

### *Changes to TANF Work Participation Requirements<sup>11</sup>*

#### *Caseload Reduction Credit*

The DRA makes major structural changes to the participation requirements that each state must meet under TANF. Prior to the DRA, states were required to meet participation requirements of 50 percent for all eligible families and 90 percent for two-parent families. However, these requirements were subject to significant reductions based on decreases in the state's welfare caseload since 1995 – for each percentage-point decline in a state's caseload, the participation requirements were reduced by one percent. In Virginia, this caseload reduction credit was significant – between 1995 and 2004, Virginia's TANF caseload dropped from almost 70,800 to about 35,500.

The DRA modifies the Caseload Reduction Credit by shifting the baseline year. Beginning October 1, 2006 the Credit is based on caseload reductions since 2005 instead of 1995. For each percentage-point reduction in a state's caseload after 2005, its participation rate requirement will be reduced by one percent.

#### *Participation Rate Calculation*

Under the 1996 welfare reform act that governed TANF, state programs, funded solely by state funds and a part of the state's MOE requirements, did not count when calculating the state's work participation rates.

Beginning October 1, 2006 participation rates will be calculated using the combined number of families receiving assistance in both TANF and state funded MOE programs.

#### *New Penalties*

The DRA imposes substantial penalties on states that fail to meet TANF work participation rates. States failing to meet one or both of the participation rates by 2009 are subject to a five percent reduction in their block grants in the first year of noncompliance. When a state is penalized, it must expend state funds to make up for the reduction in its block grant. If a state fails to do this, it is penalized an additional two percent of its block grant. For every subsequent year that a state fails to meet its target, the penalty grows by another two percentage points of the state's block grant. Ultimately, the total penalty cannot exceed 21 percent of the block grant.

---

<sup>11</sup> The information in this section is derived from: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Implementing the TANF Changes in the Deficit Reduction Act, May, 9, 2006, available at: <http://www.cbpp.org/5-9-06tanf.htm>.

DHHS has significant flexibility under the DRA to give states some relief from this penalty. DHHS can find that the state had “reasonable cause” for failing to meet its target or if the state prepares a corrective compliance plan that DHHS approves and the state implements.

### *New Department of Health and Human Services Regulations<sup>12</sup>*

The DRA also required the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to promulgate new regulations specifying uniform reporting procedures and required documentation. It also required DHHS to create a new list of activities that can be treated as one of the federally-approved work activities, for reporting purposes, and a list of circumstances under which a parent, who is receiving assistance and living with a child, should be included in work participation rates. DHHS published these new regulations in late June 2006 on an interim final basis; meaning they are effective immediately and remain in effect while DHHS takes and considers comments and revises them. One other important change from the DRA to note is that states that fail to implement procedures and internal controls consistent with the DHHS regulations are subject to a new five percent penalty. The interim final changes are detailed below.

- Generally, the DHHS regulations define the core and non-core activities that can be counted as work activities more narrowly than many states. Virginia, on the other hand, already placed more restrictions on the type of activities that could be counted as work activities. As a result, Virginia should not be affected by this regulatory change.
- The regulations create a new term – “work eligible individual” – to describe who can and cannot be included when calculating work participation rates.
  - Work eligible individuals are adults (or minor heads-of-household) who are included in the assistance grant, unless:
    - the individual is receiving assistance under an approved Tribal TANF plan (unless the state chooses to include such individuals in their calculations); or
    - the individual is a parent who is caring for a family member with a disability, who is living at home and who does not attend school on a full-time basis.
  - Parents, who are not receiving assistance but live with a child who is receiving assistance, are counted toward the participation rate except for the following situations:
    - the parent is an alien parent who is ineligible to receive assistance because of his or her immigration status;
    - the parent is receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI); or
    - the parent is a minor parent who is not the head or spouse of the head of the household.
- In two parent families, with one eligible and one ineligible parent, the ineligible parent may now be counted toward the work rate.

---

<sup>12</sup> The information in this section is derived from: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Center for Law and Social Policy, Analysis of New Interim Final TANF Rules, July, 21, 2006, available at: <http://www.cbpp.org/7-21-06tanf.htm>.

- States can now only count hours actually worked by recipients, not scheduled hours. Additionally, states must now proactively determine that the recipient worked the hours asserted, instead of assuming that the recipient worked the hours unless they learn otherwise. Exceptions include:
  - Hours for which recipients are paid by employers – including paid leave – may be counted for reporting.
  - For recipients in unpaid work activities, the state can count two days a month (up to a total of 10 days a year) for excused absences as hours worked for reporting requirements.
- In limited situations, participants that work in unpaid activities for less than the required number of hours can be counted for participation rate purposes. This regulation acknowledges that people in unpaid work activities cannot be forced to work at an hourly rate below the federal minimum wage. Given the size of most monthly payments under TANF, most participants would not meet the federal minimum wage requirements, if their monthly payment was divided by hours worked.
  - To use this provision, states must adopt a foodstamp workfare program and a Simplified Food Stamp Program.
- States must support the asserted hours worked for each participant with documentation such as pay stubs, employer reports or time and attendance records. The regulations provide a list of documentation that would meet the requirement but notes that the list is not exhaustive.
- States were required to submit a Work Verification Plan to DHHS by September 30, 2006. States must submit revisions, if needed, within 60 days of being notified of the need for revisions. States must be operating under an approved plan by October 1, 2007.
- States may now count spending for programs that reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies and promote two-parent families toward the MOE requirement, regardless of the financial need or family composition of program participants.
- States can also count expenditures used to match Healthy Marriage Promotion and Responsible Fatherhood grants toward the MOE requirement, despite the general rule that funds cannot be used to match or provide maintenance of effort for two different federal programs.

## INSTITUTIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

### *VDSS Recommendations: Improving the Work Participation Rate<sup>13</sup>*

#### ***Recommendation 1: Adopt the Federal Regulations for Work Activities***

Virginia historically has employed a stringent definition of work activities that includes only unsubsidized employment, subsidized employment, and community work experience. Federal regulations also allow:

- on-the-job training,
- job search and job readiness assistance,
- community service programs,
- vocational educational training (not to exceed 12 months with respect to any individual),
- job skills training directly related to employment,
- education directly related to employment,
- high school degree or General Education Development (GED) certificate; and
- the provision of child care services to an individual who is participating in a community service program.

#### ***Recommendation 2: Take Advantage of Allowable Countable Work Activities That Are Allowed by DHHS***

DHHS published new regulations on work definitions and verification requirements on June 30, 2006 to address the following issues:

- The GAO found that states were considering activities, such as personal journaling or running errands for neighbors, as work activities. The GAO recommended DHHS oversight to address this situation.
- Approximately 375 minor caretakers are exempt from VIEW because they are attending secondary school. These families could count toward the state's work participation rate if attendance hours are reported. Historically, Virginia has never reported the hours, but will begin reporting so that the state can get work participation rate credit.

#### ***Recommendation 3: Remove the 90-Day Requirement***

Virginia currently does not allow recipients to be placed in a work activity until they have been in the program for 90 days regardless of their situation. Conversely, after 90 days, all recipients must be in a work activity even if educational activities may be more appropriate. DSS proposes removing the 90-day requirement to allow case managers to develop a plan that is most appropriate for individual clients.

---

<sup>13</sup> These recommendations come from the DSS report: Achieving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Work Participation Rate Requirements in Virginia, available from the Department.

#### ***Recommendation 4: Increase Participation***

Because of Virginia's current stringent exemptions, much of the population is exempt from participation. As a result, the state could only achieve the required participation rate if 100 percent of current VIEW participants met the work requirements. To increase participation rates, DSS proposes changing the following exemptions:

- **Infant Caretakers** – Virginia will alter its exemption for participants caring for children 18 months old or younger. The federal exemption only allows for participants caring for infants to be exempt from work participation for up to 12 months. DSS recommends lowering the state exemption to match the federal exemption.
- **Pregnancy Exemption** – Under current regulations, pregnant women are exempt from participation after the first trimester. DSS recommends eliminating this exemption. Pregnant women would still be exempt from work requirements as soon as the pregnancy prevented participation. DSS believes this will better match private sector expectations and plans to provide education and training activities to pregnant women who are unable to work because of their pregnancies.
- **Non-Parent Exemption** – Non-parent caretakers who receive benefits currently do not have to meet work requirements. DSS recommends changing this exemption so that non-parent caretakers who are receiving benefits must meet work requirements. Non-parent caretakers who do not receive benefits would not be affected by this change.

#### ***Recommendation 5: Expand the Statewide Infrastructure for Additional Activities***

DSS has identified several existing programs that already provide services that could be counted as work activities for recipients that it proposes to enhance. They include:

- **Food Stamp Employment and Training GED Program** – DSS and VCU are already partners in an initiative to help participants in the FSET program get their GED. The Department proposes expanding this program to assist VIEW recipients and to increase efforts to promote the “Race to the GED” program.
- **TANF-funded activities** – Currently programs outside of DSS spend almost \$4 million in TANF funds annually to provide employment and training activities yet are not required to serve VIEW participants. DSS proposes amending contracts with the organizations that receive these funds to provide allowable activities to VIEW participants who are referred by DSS and to report the referees' hours of participation.
- **Create more Community Work Experience Placements (CWEP)** – CWEP allows recipients to engage in work for a governmental or non-profit organization for their benefits. DSS recommends engaging these groups in an educational effort aimed at increasing the opportunities available under the program. This will not, however, be a “first line strategy” but DSS feels it can be a useful tool for recipients who need to use it and the program is expected to provide real job experience to participants.

### ***Recommendation 6: Improve Current Performance***

According to DSS, 65 percent of VIEW participants are in work activities, but only 50 percent are in activities with enough hours to meet the work participation rate. DSS believes that it can improve this participation rate by allowing for more flexibility and focusing on achieving work participation rates. To that end, DSS is undertaking a review of every VIEW case in the Employment Services Automated System (ESPAS) to identify cases that should be closed, are working for less than minimum wage, have initial assessments overdue, and/or are not meeting the required participation hours. DSS plans to engage in substantial monitoring efforts and:

- Conduct regional meetings with local VIEW staff to train case managers on the proposed policy changes, how to calculate the work participation rate, and the importance of achieving it.
- Increase the minimum participation requirement from 30 to 35 hours per week. This change should ensure that more participants reach the required federal rate of 30 hours per week.

### ***Recommendation 7: Take Advantage of the Large Number of People that Are Already Participating***

Currently anyone who participates in a work activity and is receiving assistance can be counted toward the state's work participation rates. Once a person begins earning wages at the federal poverty threshold (about \$7.79 per hour for a family of three), however, that person is no longer eligible to receive assistance and, consequently, cannot be counted towards the state's work participation rates. DSS proposes to increase the number of people it can count toward the work participation rate by implementing a \$50 per month transitional benefit. A transitional recipient could earn this benefit for up to one year, provided she continues in her job and reports her hours to DSS. DSS estimates that 20 percent of VIEW cases fall into this transitional category and would become eligible to be reported in the state's work participation rates. DSS also notes that these families are already receiving expensive benefits such as child care yet the state receives no credit for them under TANF.

### ***Recommendation 8: Do not report all TANF-UP families***

DSS estimates that almost 16 percent of the state's two-parent caseload changes over in a given month, making it essentially impossible to meet the required 90 percent participation rate for this group. To address this situation, DSS recommends not reporting two-parent families that are not meeting the 35 hour per week requirement. To make this solution workable, the state would have to substitute additional funds to put toward its MOE requirements to make up for the funds used for these cases. The Department estimates that Virginia will need to shift another \$5 million in funds to the MOE spending requirement in order for this to work.

## ***JLARC Recommendations: Maintaining Self-Sufficiency***

Virginia's Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission have additionally offered a number of recommendations for VIEW. These recommendations are instructive in that they offer



suggestions about how to train and motivate VIEW recipients to obtain and maintain gainful employment. This in turn assists the Commonwealth with meeting mandated participation rates. These recommendations are provided in Appendix E.

## THEMES FROM OTHER STATES

One means of assessing the approach of VDSS in complying with the new federal regulations is to examine the approaches of other states. The following analysis looks at the recommendations and themes of welfare reform in Delaware, Tennessee, and South Carolina. These three case studies were chosen based on two criteria: 1) their close regional proximity to Virginia; and 2) based upon the fact that these states recently were or still are operating their welfare program under a waiver. While no one state is a perfect model of Virginia in terms of population size, the characteristics of the population in need, etc., a quick examination of other approaches does offer a few valuable insights into how VDSS might proceed with reforming policies to come into compliance with federal regulation.

### *Delaware's "A Better Chance" Program*

Delaware has been operating its TANF program under Section 1115 waivers from the Social Security Act, as approved on December 12, 1995, and amended on September 27, 1996. The state's waiver expired on September 30, 2002. From 1995 to 1999, the state undertook a massive welfare reform. Delaware's A Better Chance (ABC) program sought to transform welfare from an open-ended entitlement to a transitional program promoting economic self-sufficiency and responsible parenting.<sup>14</sup> A Better Chance was one of the nation's first comprehensive, statewide welfare reforms, and there were a number of changes made to the program worth noting. First, in order to make welfare transitional, Delaware placed a four-year cumulative limit on the total time families could receive welfare assistance. In addition, during the first two years, the policies required participation in activities emphasizing rapid job entry (such as job readiness and job search). Clients using up their first 24 months of assistance and still needing support were allowed to continue on welfare only by participating in a Workfare program that paid benefits in proportion to hours worked.

Delaware also enacted a number of policies and services to promote employment and engagement in ABC work activities. For example, a "fill-the-gap" provision was designed to reward work and cooperation with child support enforcement by reducing the effective "tax" on earned income and child support payments by about half. Rigid financial sanctions were put into place for welfare recipients who did not comply with ABC's work requirements.

A Better Chance also added a series of financial penalties and incentives to promote desired parenting behaviors. Sanctions could be imposed for failure to attend a parenting education class. Children were also required to maintain satisfactory school attendance as well as be up-to-date on their immunizations. Responsibility for childbearing decisions was also shifted to recipients through a "family cap" eliminating the traditional grant increase when welfare recipients had babies. Lastly, ABC strengthened child support enforcement and expanded eligibility for cash assistance to two-parent families in order to help bring fathers back into the picture as providers and parents.

One of the greatest attributes of Delaware as a case study is that information is available on welfare recipients' experiences over a roughly two-and-a-half-year follow-up period. In a

---

<sup>14</sup> For a complete report on the ABC program, see "Turning the Corner: Delaware's A Better Chance Welfare Reform Program (ABC) at Four Years." Stable URL: <http://www.abtassoc.com/reports/ABC-Turning.pdf>. Accessed 11/21/06.

quick summation, Delaware implemented a strict, work-oriented program (a drastic change to the state's welfare program at that time). Worth noting is that Delaware strongly enforced Contracts of Mutual Responsibilities, which required clients to participate in work activities and meet specified parenting responsibilities. In assessing the impacts on the state's recipients, the most striking result was a reduction in welfare use. Delaware's strong economy and no-nonsense work program compelling the vast majority of clients to work during at least part of the follow-up period. Thus, in terms of simple entrances into the workforce, the ABC transition could largely be viewed as a resounding success. However, one should additionally note that within the two-and-a-half-year follow-up study period the vast majority of clients were still struggling to make ends meet; few participants achieved economic independence.<sup>15</sup>

Delaware's State Plan for TANF offers the following summary of themes the state continues to build on:<sup>16</sup>

- “Easing transition from welfare to work by:
  - passing through to TANF recipients a portion of the child support collected
  - enhancing child support collection strategies and achieving record child support collections
  - changing the way the welfare system budgets income so that families go off assistance only after achieving income at 75 percent of the federal poverty level
  - increasing Delaware's investment in child care so that there is no subsidized child care waiting list for eligible working families with income up to 200% of the federal poverty level
  - increasing the income threshold below which individuals are not required to file personal income tax returns to \$15,449 for married couples and \$9,399 for single individuals; increasing the personal credit from \$100 to \$110; and reducing the tax rate for all individuals, other than the top tax bracket, by .4 percentage points
  - increasing the State minimum wage to \$6.15 an hour as of September, 2000.
  - increasing the earnings potential of TANF individuals through a State Earned Income Tax Credit for 2006.
  
- Ensuring access to health care for Delaware families through:
  - providing Medicaid coverage to uninsured adults as well as all children in families with income at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level
  - providing medical coverage for uninsured children in families with income up to 200% of the federal poverty level, through the Delaware Healthy Children Program (DHCP)
  - providing transitional Medicaid for two years for families with children who exit welfare, at incomes up to 185% of poverty.
  
- Improving education for children by:
  - expanding access to the Early Childhood Education Program (ECAP)

---

<sup>15</sup> “Turning the Corner: Delaware’s A Better Chance Welfare Reform Program (ABC) at Four Years.” Abt Associates, Inc. January 2001. Stable URL: <http://www.abtassoc.com/reports/ABC-Turning.pdf>. Accessed 11/21/06.

<sup>16</sup> “Delaware State Plan for TANF,” Delaware Health and Social Services. Stable URL: <http://www.dhss.delaware.gov/dhss/main/detanfplan.html>. Accessed 11/27/06.

- providing extra instructional time for low-achieving students
  - operating the Parents as Teachers program statewide
  - operating the Mentoring for Students program for students who need an adult role model
  - implementing a comprehensive program to ensure safe, disciplined schools
  - raising academic standards and graduation requirements and pushing for school choice and charter schools
- Recruiting, through the Delaware Economic Development Office (DEDO), new companies and maintaining existing employers with good jobs that provide career opportunities
- Strengthening Delaware's families by:
    - helping many thousands of welfare recipients go to work, and providing continuing supports to working families
    - initiating voluntary paternity establishment
    - providing transportation support for job seekers and new workers
    - establishing more effective welfare to work programs with a work first approach to employment and training services, while providing opportunities for educational advancement
    - enabling families with both parents to receive benefits and services
    - participating with community-based organizations and the faith community to support targeted, fragile populations
    - discouraging teen pregnancy through the Alliance on Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention
    - extending home visits to all first time parents following a child's birth
    - cracking down on domestic violence to protect vulnerable women and children
    - enforcing the Sexual Predator Act to protect vulnerable youth and prevent teen pregnancy.”

### ***Tennessee's "Families First" Program<sup>17</sup>***

The Tennessee General Assembly created the Families First program in the spring of 1996. The program has and continues to operate on a waiver; however, Tennessee's waiver expires in June 2007. When the waiver expires Families First will be required to conform to all federal TANF requirements. This expiration will lead to a number of changes that Virginia is also experiencing; flexibility in calculating the work participation rate and determination of months countable toward time limits will be lost. As a result, Tennessee has realized that planning now is essential to ensuring a smooth transition into compliance with the federal requirements. Thus, the state created the Governor's Task Force whose goal was to pinpoint and emphasize themes of reform. The Task Force placed strongest emphasis on these most basic overarching themes:

- The welfare program should help families achieve economic independence and improve their child's well-being
- The welfare program should assume that personal responsibility is essential

<sup>17</sup> The information in this section is derived from: Tennessee Department of Human Services, Governor's Task Force on Families First, November 2004, available at <http://www.state.tn.us/humanserv/adfam/families-first-taskforce-report-11-2004.pdf>

- “Mixed strategies” that include work, education, and training are the most effective ways to achieve self-sufficiency
- A solid educational foundation is a key to long-term economic success

Ultimately, after researching the needs of the state’s population and the operation of the state’s welfare program, the Task Force issued the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Support services are essential to client employment and employment retention (child care and transportation, for example)
- Many state and community services can be better coordinated to enhance participants’ work, education, and training achievements
- The Department should encourage client-focused services, professional development of employees, accountability, and the use of technological enhancements
- Strategic planning is best informed and developed through current research, best practices, expert advice, and input from stakeholders

Relating these themes and recommendation into concrete changes, Tennessee’s Governor’s Task Force sought the following:

- Establish a new job classification for case managers to manage small caseloads (50-70 clients)
- Create neighborhood-based satellite offices to better provide personalized attention
- Eliminate interim time limits
- Implement a diversion program, which allows families to choose some combination of time-limited cash payments, child care, transportation, or other services in lieu of full-time benefits
- Implementation of an on-the-job training program

***South Carolina’s “Moving Up” Pilot Program***<sup>18</sup>

In South Carolina, the two main laws that govern how the state’s Department of Social Services operates are the South Carolina Family Independence Act of 1995 and the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PWORA) of 1996. The most intriguing information in South Carolina, however, comes not from the state’s Family Independence Program, but rather from a pilot program called “Moving Up.”

Moving Up was a pilot employment, retention and advancement program for FIP participants that operated in rural six-county area of South Carolina, called the PeeDee. The program began in September of 2001 and ended in May of 2005. The program essentially took the form of an experiment in which the sample members (drawn from eligible welfare “leavers”)

---

<sup>18</sup> The information in this section is drawn from the following reports: National Center for Children in Poverty, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Cash Assistance: South Carolina, [www.nccp.org/state\\_detail\\_SC\\_policy\\_12.html](http://www.nccp.org/state_detail_SC_policy_12.html); South Carolina, Department of Social Services, Family Independence Program, [www.state.sc.us/dss/fi/index.html](http://www.state.sc.us/dss/fi/index.html); McCall, Edelhoach, and Strickland, Lessons from “Moving Up,” July 2005, <http://www.state.sc.us/dss/reports/files/5142.pdf>.

were randomly assigned to either a treatment group or control group. In the treatment group, case managers (called “career consultants”) contacted clients trying to engage them in the program.


Ultimately, Moving Up sought to address concerns that TANF recipients move into dead-end jobs which will not provide enough to remain self-sufficient. Thus, these “consultants” worked with the clients on employment goals and were able to offer financial incentives to help individuals reach those goals. These incentives came in the form of funding for training and education programs, support services (transportation for example), support groups, and referrals to other treatment providers if needed (such as substance abuse). By using direct case management with individual attention and well-trained “case consultants,” the goal was to develop effective case consultants to improve outcomes.

The results of the pilot were encouraging; the outcomes indicate that retention and advancement programs can be effective in TANF. The pilot was successful in reducing returns to South Carolina’s Family Independence Program (FIP). This is important for a number of reasons. First, there are high costs associated with returning recipients. Returning participants must “start over” with the program requirements and they are plagued with faster depletion of benefit limits. Thus, returning recipients impose high costs of the FIP program to the state. Accordingly, there are large benefits with reduced recidivism – job maintenance, advancement, increased benefits and wages, and job stability. Thus, given the positive results of “Moving Up,” the goal in the minds of South Carolina’s legislators is to integrate the lessons learned from administration of Moving Up to more TANF programs.

## STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION OF VIRGINIA TANF PROGRAMS


The following analysis is based on data for all active cases in Virginia during September 2006 from the Department of Social Services. The complete statistics highlighted below are available in Appendix A in table format. More detailed cross-tabs of the data are also included in Appendix B in table format. Statistics on regions and localities are available in Appendices C and D.

### Recipients by Program




Recipients of benefits under the TANF program itself form by far the largest bloc of recipients in Virginia's welfare program, with almost double the number of recipients of the next largest program, VIEW. With more than 50,000 individual recipients, TANF accounted for almost 62 percent of recipients in all Virginia TANF programs. Together, TANF and VIEW account for more than 76,000 of the approximately 82,000 people who were receiving assistance in Virginia in September 2006.

According to the DSS data, there were 34,832 active TANF cases in September 2006. TANF itself once again accounted for the greatest number of cases, with more than 24,000 of the active cases. TANF accounted for 69 percent of all active cases in September compared to 62 percent of individual recipients. The VIEW program had the next largest block of cases, with more than 9,300 cases (or 27 percent of all cases). Overall, 96 percent of Virginia's TANF cases are in either the TANF or VIEW programs (slightly more than the 93 percent of individual recipients in these programs). See chart below and Appendix A – Tables A1, A1a and A1b.



All told, more than 15,000 individuals applied for TANF benefits in September and were deemed ineligible for various reasons. The three most common reasons applicants were deemed ineligible were: 1) the applicant was an SSI or AG recipient (almost 6,700); 2) the applicant had exceeded her family cap (more than 3,400); and 3) the applicant committed some form of work violation (more than 1,600). These three categories accounted for more than 11,000 of the more than 15,000 ineligible applicants. While one might suspect that this group may be a good target to increase participation levels with, these data indicate that they may not be well-suited to tap to increase participation levels.

### Recipients by Gender




The overwhelming majority of individuals in Virginia's TANF programs are female. Fully 62 percent of individuals in TANF programs are female. This percentage actually



increases when counting only those individuals 18 years old and older. Of the 23,997 individuals in TANF programs who fit that age profile, more than 89 percent are female. Assuming that individuals aged 18 years and up are more likely to be the heads of household for TANF families, this shows that working mothers dominate Virginia's TANF roles.

**Recipient Marital Status**

Almost 89 percent of individual TANF recipients are unmarried, though this should not be surprising given that most recipients are children. Not counting children, almost 85 percent of individuals are unmarried. Importantly, married adults are outnumbered substantially by unmarried adult recipients. Not counting singles, divorced and separated adults outnumber married adults by more than 1,700 adults. All told, there are more than 20,000 single adults receiving TANF benefits and only 3,500 married adults. Interestingly, there are almost 140 married individuals under age 18 who receive benefits. See Appendix A – Tables A3 & A3a.




**Recipients by Race and Ethnicity**

Virginia's TANF recipients are predominantly African Americans. The 51,594 African Americans in the program comprise almost two-thirds of recipients (62.8 percent). The next largest group is whites with 27,365 receiving TANF benefits (33.3 percent). Of the remaining recipients, only Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders comprise more than one percent of the program with 1,644 recipients (2 percent). The vast majority of recipients are non-Hispanic. Only 3,789 TANF recipients in Virginia are of Hispanic origin compared with 78,394 non-Hispanic recipients (95 percent).

Notably, of the more than 15,000 individuals who applied for TANF benefits but were rejected, between 661 and 675 were rejected because they were illegal aliens. On the other hand, at least 2 TANF recipients reported being illegal immigrants yet still received benefits. See Appendix A, Tables A4 & A4a, A5 & A5a, and A6-A6c.

### Recipients by Age

Children account for more than two-thirds of all TANF recipients in Virginia. The largest single age group of recipients is by far the 6 to 17 year old group, with more than 31,000 recipients in this group. All told, more than 58,000 children under age 18 receive TANF benefits compared with approximately 24,000 adults age 18 and older. Adults from 25 to 34 years old and children 2 to 3 years old form the second largest groups with about 9,400 recipients each.




### Recipient Educational Attainment

While children under age 18 comprise more than two-thirds of TANF recipients, an overwhelming 95 percent of recipients have a 12<sup>th</sup> grade education or less. While children clearly account for a large percent of those recipients, a good deal of adults fall into this category as well. Indeed, of the more than 82,000 TANF recipients in Virginia, fewer than 2,300 have any vocational or post-high school education.

Among only adults, nearly 13 percent of individuals have a 9<sup>th</sup> grade education or less. About 60 percent of adults have a 12<sup>th</sup> grade education or higher, while more than 40 percent of adults have an 11<sup>th</sup> grade education or less. Less than 10 percent of adults in TANF programs have college experience and only a handful of recipients have any post-graduate education. See chart below and Appendix A – Tables A11 & A11a.


### Educational Achievement of Adult TANF Recipients



### Monthly Recipient Income

Among all adult TANF recipients, the mean monthly income is \$164.24. The highest earning age group is the 25 to 34 group, reporting average monthly income of almost \$204. However, there were a number of factors that skew these figures that must be accounted for to get a more accurate picture of what is going on with the TANF population’s monthly income. First, perhaps not surprisingly, the median income level for adults in TANF programs is actually \$0. This indicates that more than half of recipients are not working at all. Second, there are some extreme outliers in the data. This is likely the result of the self-reported nature of TANF income data. For example, at least one person indicated that she had monthly income for September of \$66,000. Another person indicated that she had monthly income for September of about \$1.50. After accounting for these features of the data, very different numbers begin to emerge.

### Mean Monthly Income by Age Group (Excluding Outliers and Non-Workers)



When excluding outliers and non-workers in the data, the mean monthly income increases substantially to \$763.13. Accounting for outliers and non-workers, the mean monthly income for recipients is \$820.27. Interestingly, the age group with the highest monthly income level becomes substantially older – recipients aged 55-59 reported average earnings of more than \$1,000 monthly. Recipients aged 25-34 now report incomes only slightly above the mean at about \$781 per month. Indeed, average monthly income starts at a low of \$444 for 18 year olds and steadily increases for each age group until it peaks with the 55 to 59 age group. See Appendix A – Tables A14 & A14a.


While average incomes are substantially higher when excluding non-workers and outliers, it is important to note that these income ranges remain below the federal poverty level. According to the 2005 Federal Poverty Guidelines (at right), none of the mean monthly income levels reported by any age group of TANF recipients would reach even the level of income required to place a family of two at the poverty threshold. This should not be surprising, given the demographic make-up of the TANF population but it does highlight the difficulties involved in putting TANF families on the road to self-sufficiency.

**2005 Federal Poverty Guidelines**

Persons in Family Unit	Poverty Level (48 Contiguous States and D.C.)
1	\$9,570
2	12,830
3	16,090
4	19,350
5	22,610
6	25,870
7	29,130
8	32,390

Source: DHHS, The 2005 HHS Poverty Guidelines, available at: <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/05poverty.shtml>

**TANF Recipients by Region**



Overall, distribution of TANF recipients across the state is fairly even. The Eastern region of the state (which includes Hampton Roads and Virginia Beach) accounts for the largest number of TANF recipients with almost 10,000 more than the next largest region. For more detailed statistics by region, city and county, see appendices C and D.

## ANALYSIS OF DSS RECOMMENDATIONS

Virginia Department of Social Services has proposed a number of recommendations to meet the new requirements. Having examined the demographics above, the present analysis now explores the policy impacts of these recommendations.

### ***Recommendation 1: Adopt the Federal Definitions of Work Activities***

***DSS Recommendation:*** *Adopt the less restrictive federal definitions of work activities. Currently, Virginia defines work activities as unsubsidized employment, subsidized employment, and community work experience. Adopting the federal definitions will allow for a number of additional activities.*

Virginia's stringent definition of work activities emphasized a work-first policy. This straightforward and easy change makes meeting the work participation rate much more feasible. From a policy perspective as well, the change seems logical. Looking at the recipient profile, the addition of these other activities to the definition of work activities should add a great number of individuals. For example, a great number of TANF recipients lack a high school diploma or GED. To achieve sustainable employment, these individuals will likely need some type of education or job-training, which the state currently would not count for its work participation rate. Thus, while the state's work-first policy has helped Virginia achieve one of the best job-entry rates in the nation, the fact remains that individuals in Virginia are obtaining low wage jobs that may not be sustainable in the long run. Indeed, Virginia currently ranks 48<sup>th</sup> in the nation for post-TANF wage advancement. While some recipients' wage situations might be offset with an increase in the federal minimum wage in the coming years, this is certainly an issue where Virginia has room for improvement.

While there is debate on this matter, it appears from the literature that states that use a "mixed strategy" approach to TANF programs have had success in promoting sustainable work. This type of approach emphasizes a combination of education and work – an approach that Virginia's current definition of work activities forecloses. By expanding the state's work activities definition to include the additional activities allowed under the federal definition, Virginia can potentially improve on its post-TANF wage advancement ranking by helping individuals achieve the skills and education necessary to garner higher-wage employment while simultaneously making significant strides toward meeting the new federal work requirements.

### ***Recommendation 2: Take Advantage of Allowable Countable Work Activities Allowed by HHS***

***DSS Recommendation:*** *HHS's new regulations for allowable work activities present opportunities for Virginia to capitalize on in its efforts to meet the work participation requirements.*

In June 2006, HHS published regulations that define the types of activities that will satisfy the federal work definitions. Again, because Virginia has historically taken a conservative approach to the types of work activities allowed, the state will be able to take advantage of new opportunities presented by the HHS regulations. From a strict policy

perspective, this change simply represents a change in the means of accounting; ground level action will not change.

While this is an easy change that should be considered, it is worth mentioning that ultimately this change may do little to help those who it affects. For example, the change would allow for an individual who is caring for a family member to be counted toward its work participation rate. Obviously this is good given the new federal requirements, but the change does nothing to help such a recipient achieve self-sufficiency. That said, this is still clearly a change that should merit serious consideration and probably be adopted ultimately.

### ***Recommendation 3: Remove the 90-day Requirement***

***DSS Recommendation:*** Remove the 90-day requirement for VIEW recipients to be in work a work activity.

As Virginia DSS has noted, “Removal of the 90-day criterion will allow the case manager to develop a plan that is most appropriate for the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the participant.” Indeed, the lessons of South Carolina’s “Moving Up” program showed that by allowing case managers (in South Carolina’s instance “consultants”) to work with clients on employment goals and to offer financial incentives to help individuals reach those goals that such a program helped reduce returnees to the welfare rolls. Removal of the 90-day requirement allows for the greater flexibility necessary to address the specific needs of individuals to help them gain self-sufficiency. Thus, this recommendation will both help meet the new federal requirements and can potentially be used in concert with other policy tools to help achieve the overarching TANF goal of self-sufficiency for recipients.

### ***Recommendation 4: Increase Participation***

***DSS Recommendation:*** Increase VIEW participation by 1) lowering the exemption for individuals with children less than 18 months of age to 12 months, 2) changing the exemption for pregnancy, and 3) changing the exemption for non-parents.

Overall, these three changes will clearly increase participation levels to some extent. However, there may be reason to at least question whether the short term benefits of the changes are worth some of the potential long term costs. Pushing pregnant women, non-working caretakers and new mothers into work activities sooner may ultimately have ramifications both for the family and for the sustainability of the mother’s employment.

On one hand, the second and third changes are probably good ways of increasing participation without serious negative consequences. For example, requiring additional pregnant mothers to meet VIEW’s 35-hour participation requirements may help mothers work towards self-sufficiency – additional employment or training may help a pregnant mother to care for her child. As DSS has noted, the change to the pregnancy exemption reflects the reality of work in the private sector. And, it is arguably only fair to require non-working caretakers who currently receive benefits to work, just as parents are.

On the other hand, lowering the 18 month exemption to 12 months may not best serve all four statutory purposes of TANF nor Virginia’s TANF population. First, this change may affect only about 260 individuals in VIEW. As seen in the demographic information presented above,

the vast majority of TANF recipients are single or divorced. By lowering the exemption, additional pressures will be put on a single mother of a 13 month old child. This change will likely create additional need for child care services, thereby potentially offsetting much of the benefit in meeting the work participation rate. Given the imperative to increase work participation however, this recommendation is likely warranted. A potential means of lessening any deleterious effects of this change would be to give a strong preference for steering these mothers into training and education-related activities instead of traditional work activities. This could allow the new mothers greater flexibility in dealing with family needs while still getting the needed increase in work participation.

***Recommendation 5: Expand the Statewide Infrastructure for Additional Activities***

***DSS Recommendation:*** *Expand the state's infrastructure to increase opportunities for education and job training for recipients throughout the state by tapping existing programs and partnerships.*

This recommendation to expand statewide infrastructure for additional activities is perhaps the most creative, as well as potentially one of the most successful recommendations proposed by DSS to meet the work participation rate. It is in line with the policy sense of the statutory purposes of TANF. By providing participants an opportunity to gain real job experience and education, Virginia TANF recipients will be better prepared for self-sufficiency. Additionally, the GED and CWEP programs provide opportunities for the state to potentially increase the wages its welfare recipients achieve in employment. Also, importantly this recommendation appears to come with minimal cost to the state.

***Recommendation 6: Improve Current Performance***

***DSS Recommendation:*** *Review current DSS activities to identify cases that can easily meet requirements and provide training for case managers. Increase the work requirement by 5 hours per week to ensure more cases meet the average hour requirement.*

Virginia DSS is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of its administrative database by reviewing every VIEW case in the Employment Services Automated System (ESPAS). DSS is reviewing reports to identify cases that should be closed, working for less than minimum wage, have initial assessments overdue, and/or are participating less than the required hours. By increasing monitoring and enforcing the work requirements, DSS believes substantial gains in the work participation rate could be achieved.

DSS's recommendation to increase training for case managers is consistent with the experience of the states reviewed above. Those case studies all indicate that direct case manager-to-client contact is a strong component of successful programs. Thus, training case managers on the policy changes is a logical means of addressing this issue and will likely prove to be effective. At the same time, if DSS is going to undertake additional case manager training, it is at least worth considering for it to broaden the scope of the training beyond just the policy goals. There is some evidence that training case managers in best practices and increasing the ratio of case managers to recipients improves overall outcomes. If DSS is already going to

undertake case manager trainings it would seem to be a good opportunity for the Department to review best practices from around the country and train case managers in applying them to Virginia's program.

***Recommendation 7: Take Advantage of the Large Number of People that are Already Participating***

***DSS Recommendation:*** *Implement a new transitional benefit for those who are working but no longer eligible because they are earning too much. This will allow Virginia to get credit for people who have been participating in the program but for whom the state can no longer take credit.*

Because of the federal poverty limit requirement for VIEW eligibility, if a VIEW participant gains employment with a wage above \$7.79/hr for a family of three, that person is no longer counted in the work participation requirement anymore. As DSS has noted, more than 20 percent of the VIEW caseload is comprised of families that are in the transitional period. DSS has proposed a new employment benefit incentive. DSS describes the new incentive as follows:

“A family that becomes ineligible for TANF due to earned income and is working 30 or more hours per week will be eligible for a job retention payment of \$50 per month for one year as long as employment continues and the client reports hours of employment. Since the more costly supportive services of child care and transportation are already being provided for these families, the only cost would be the \$600 total for the twelve month period, but it would allow us to count the family as participating for an extended period.”

In terms of meeting the work participation rate, the employment benefit incentive is rather ingenious. It allows Virginia to easily increase the number of people counted toward the work participation rate at a relatively low cost.

***Recommendation 8: Do Not Report All TANF-UP Families***

***DSS Recommendation:*** *Enact reporting changes to make the 90-percent participation rate for two-parent families feasible.*

The federal work requirements for two-parent families appear virtually impossible to achieve. The final recommendation proposed by DSS to not report all TANF-UP families is a simple change in accounting to make this feasible. DSS is proposing to change reporting procedures so that only two-parent families that are meeting the hour requirements are counted toward the state's participation rate. While this certainly will assist in meeting the work participation rate, this recommendation does have a substantial cost of an additional \$5 million per year in other sources of MOE spending. Given the seemingly insurmountable problems in achieving the 90-percent participation rate, however, this recommendation is likely worth pursuing in light of the substantial federal penalties for failure to achieve the two-parent families rate.



## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present analysis now provides some conclusions and recommendations stemming from the information contained above.

### CONCLUSIONS

#### ***Conclusion 1: The Statutory Goals of TANF Must Be Kept in Mind***

While the emphasis on meeting the work participation requirements is of great importance, when addressing any issue of the Virginia welfare program one must keep in mind the four statutory goals of TANF: 1) Provide assistance to needy families so that children can be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; 2) End the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage; 3) Prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock marriages; and 4) Encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. The temptation to put too much focus and emphasis on the work participation rate to the point of ignoring these statutory goals of TANF should be resisted.

#### ***Conclusion 2: Education and Wage Levels are Hurdles to Self-Sufficiency***

Virginia's emphasis on achieving self-sufficiency must remain paramount. To this end, the observed education and earned income levels of TANF recipients represent strong barriers that threaten clients' ability to retain their jobs and further advance toward self-sufficiency. Virginia ranks low in post-TANF wage increases, a situation that should be studied and addressed. These hurdles are part of the background that Virginia should bear in mind as it addresses the federal regulations.

#### ***Conclusion 3: Programs Geared Toward Marriage/Two-Parent Families May Have Some Effect, but Data Indicate There Is a Long Way to Go***

Program eligibility requirements make it very difficult for married couples with children to qualify for assistance for two-parent families where both parents are workers. As a result only a small percentage of TANF cases are married families. Further, nearly 85% of all adult recipients are unmarried. This indicates that there is room for improvement in achieving the fourth statutory purpose of TANF to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. Expansion of existing programs such as the CSA Early Intervention Trust Fund could be one means of working to address this.

#### ***Conclusion 4: Virginia Is Better Positioned than Other States to Meet the New Federal Work Requirements***

Virginia's historically stringent definition of work activities makes Virginia's transition to meeting the work requirements easier than the transition of other states. Because Virginia can easily expand its tight definition of work activity to include additional activities classified as work under the federal definition, Virginia is in a much better position to meet the work participation requirements than states that were permissive in their approach to defining work activities.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### ***Recommendation 1: Focus on Quality Job Placements Could Be Improved***

While Virginia ranks among the best in the nation in helping clients obtain employment, the state ranks 48<sup>th</sup> in the nation for post-TANF wage advancement. Many clients remain underemployed and earn less than they need to adequately provide for their families. In terms of achieving self-sufficiency, higher paying employment post-TANF should be emphasized. To improve the quality of VIEW participants' employment opportunities, the current employment focus of the program could be shifted to encompass job quality.

DSS's recommendation regarding not reporting TANF-UP participants presents an opportunity here. Potentially, the state could develop a pilot program with the non-counted TANF-UP recipients that would be similar to that of South Carolina's "Moving Up" program which emphasized one-on-one case-manager to client relationships. This would represent one actionable means of addressing this issue. The pilot program could study techniques for improving participant's job retention and advancement, drawing on lessons learned in other states and adapting them to Virginia's unique features. Because these recipients will not be counted toward the state's work-participation rates, the pilot would have enough flexibility to pursue different strategies in developing an approach that could ultimately be applied statewide.

### ***Recommendation 2: Emphasis on Combining Job Placement with Training and Education Could Be Strengthened***

Previous research and experiences indicate that when work and education are combined they generate the most positive outcomes for clients. Research-tested adult learning concepts and skills programs help provide participants the knowledge and skills necessary for long term self-sufficiency. One possible way of achieving these goals may be to develop an achievement incentive payment targeted to clients who participate in and excel in adult education programs.

### ***Recommendation 3: Consider Establishing a Pilot Program to Waive the VIEW Employment Requirement***

In the same vein as the recommendation above on mixed strategies, the General Assembly may wish to consider establishing a pilot project in which the statutory requirement placing priority on obtaining full-time employment would be waived, and VIEW participants would be allowed the flexibility to divide their 35-hour participation requirement between work and up to ten hours of training or education. The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee previously proposed this recommendation and the recent changes to federal TANF regulations mean it may merit serious consideration. That said, by changing Virginia's allowable work activities to match the federal definitions, this waiver may not be necessary. If this is ultimately the case, Virginia may want to develop guidelines for recipients who may benefit from this type of approach and allow case managers the flexibility to implement this type of plan for appropriate recipients.

### ***Recommendation 4: Reduce the Recipient to Case-Manager Ratio***

South Carolina's "Moving Up" program showed that by using direct case management with individual attention and well-trained "case consultants" that retention and advancement programs can be effective in TANF. Likewise, Tennessee also found that smaller client to case-

manager ratios were productive in helping more individuals achieve self-sufficiency. While DSS is not currently proposing an increase in the number of case managers, this may be worth serious consideration in the future.

***Recommendation 5: Develop a Means of Keeping Track of Individuals After They Leave the Welfare Rolls***

The state of Virginia should seriously consider adopting some method of tracking individuals who leave welfare rolls. This would greatly assist in measuring the success of Virginia's programs, as well as possibly assisting in helping to determine other potential areas for change. One potential approach to this would be to track a random sample of recipients who leave the program. This would be more cost effective than universal tracking while still offering some insight into how these individuals fare in their post-TANF lives. A second potential approach for consideration would be to study recidivism in Virginia's programs. While this may not allow for the same kind of post-TANF analysis that a sampling of recipients who leave the program would, it could still yield important insights into the effectiveness of Virginia's TANF programs and the needs of the population which they serve.

***Recommendation 6: Improve Data Collection to Allow for Program Effectiveness Analysis***

Currently, the data available to the state to assess its TANF programs allows for only high-level analysis. For example, the data in this report can only look at how many participants are in VIEW, TANF, TANF-UP, and other top-level programs. The data do not allow for analysis of lower level programs funded by TANF or MOE funds. As a result, program effectiveness studies are difficult to perform. DSS currently collects at least some of this data but the data needs to be better collected to allow for better analysis of the programs and whether they are meeting recipients needs.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A – All Statewide Descriptive Tables

*Table A1 -- Recipients by Program*  
*Table A1a – Recipients by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A1b – Families/Cases by Program*  
*Table A2 -- Recipients by Gender*  
*Table A2a -- Recipients by Gender, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A3 -- Recipients Marital Status*  
*Table A3a -- Recipients Marital Status, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A4 -- Recipients by Race*  
*Table A4a -- Recipients by Race, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A5 – Recipient Ethnicity*  
*Table A5a – Recipient Ethnicity, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A6 -- Citizenship Status*  
*Table A6a – Citizenship Status among Ineligible Cases*  
*Table A6b – Citizenship Group*  
*Table A6c – Citizenship Group among Ineligible Cases*  
*Table A7 – Participant Status*  
*Table A7a – Participant Status among Ineligible Cases*  
*Table A8 – Reason for Exclusion*  
*Table A9 – Living Arrangements*  
*Table A9a – Living Arrangements, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A10 – Disability*  
*Table A10a – Disability, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A11 – Education Level*  
*Table A11a – Education Level, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A12 – School Enrollment Status, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table A13 – Recipients by Age Group*  
*Table A14 – Recipient Income by Age (Including non-workers and outliers)*  
*Table A14a – Recipient Income by Age (Excluding non-workers and outliers)*

### Appendix B – All Statewide Detailed Cross Tabs

*Table B1 – Individual Program Recipients by Race*  
*Table B2 – Educational Attainment by Program*  
*Table B2a – Educational Attainment by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table B3 – Educational Attainment by Race*  
*Table B3a – Educational Attainment by Race, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table B4 – Recipient Age by Program*  
*Table B5 – Recipient Disability Status by Program*  
*Table B5a – Recipient Disability Status by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table B6 – Recipient Gender by Program*  
*Table B6a – Recipient Gender by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18*  
*Table B7 – Recipient Marital Status by Program*

*Table B7a – Recipient Marital Status by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18*

*Table B8 – Recipient Marital Status by Race*

*Table B8a – Recipient Marital Status by Race, Excluding Those under Age 18*

**Appendix C – All Locality Descriptive Tables (Counties & Cities Arranged Alphabetically)**

*Table C1 – Recipients by Region*

*Table C1a – Families/Cases by Region*

*Table C2 – Recipients by City and County*

*Table C2a – Families/Cases by City and County*

**Appendix D – All Locality Cross Tabs (Counties & Cities Arranged Alphabetically)**

*Table D1 – Recipients by Gender and Region*

*Table D2 – Recipients by Gender and City and County*

*Table D3 – Recipient by Program and Region*

*Table D3a – Family/Case by Program and Region*

*Table D4 – Recipient by Program and City and County*

*Table D4a – Family/Case by Program and City and County*

**Appendix E – JLARC Recommendations on Self-Sufficiency**

## **APPENDIX A – STATEWIDE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS**

## APPENDIX A – STATEWIDE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

*Table A1 -- Recipients by Program*

<b>Program</b>	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
FEP	7	0.01
TANF	50,683	61.67
TANF INVLD	185	0.23
TANF-UP	1,486	1.81
VIEW	25,924	31.54
VIEW-UP	3,903	4.75
Total	82,188	100

*Table A1a – Recipients by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18*

<b>Program</b>	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
FEP	2	0.01
TANF	12,802	53.35
TANF INVLD	93	0.39
TANF-UP	641	2.67
VIEW	8,692	36.22
VIEW-UP	1,767	7.36
Total	23,997	100

*Table A1b – Families/Cases by Program*

<b>Program</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Cases</b>
FEP	2	0.01
TANF	24,051	69
TANF INVLD	50	0
TANF-UP	418	1.2
VIEW	9,335	27
VIEW-UP	976	2.8
Total	34,832	100

*Table A2 -- Recipients by Gender*

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Female	50,880	61.91
Male	31,308	38.09
Total	82,188	

**Table A2a -- Recipients by Gender, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Female	21,437	89.33
Male	2,560	10.67
Total	23,997	100

**Table A3 -- Recipients Marital Status**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Divorced	1,855	2.26
Married	3,680	4.48
Separated	3,461	4.21
Single	73,014	88.84
Widowed	156	0.19
Reported as unknown	22	0.03

**Table A3a -- Recipients Marital Status, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Divorced	1,842	7.68
Married	3,542	14.76
Separated	3,445	14.36
Single	14,998	62.5
Widowed	153	0.64
Reported as unknown	17	0.07

**Table A4 -- Recipients by Race**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	151	0.18
Asian	645	0.78
Black/African American	51,594	62.78
Black/African American and American Indian	49	0.06
Black/African American and Asian	11	0.01
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,644	2
White	27,365	33.3
White and American Indian/Alaska Native	18	0.02
White and Asian	22	0.03
White and Black/African American	323	0.39
Other Race	366	0.45
Total	82,188	



**Table A4a -- Recipients by Race, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	46	0.19
Asian	218	0.91
Black/African American	14,553	60.65
Black/African American and American Indian	8	0.03
Black/African American and Asian	2	0.01
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	336	1.4
White	8,737	36.41
White and American Indian/Alaska Native	4	0.02
White and Asian	6	0.03
White and Black/African American	21	0.09
Other Race	66	0.28
Total	23,997	100

**Table A5 – Recipient Ethnicity**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Hispanic or Latino	3,789	5
Not Hispanic or Latino	78,394	95
Source blank	5	0
Total	82,188	

**Table A5a – Recipient Ethnicity, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Hispanic or Latino	767	3.2
Not Hispanic or Latino	23,230	96.8
Total	23,997	100

**Table A6 – Citizenship Status**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Asylee	135	0.16
Cuban, Haitian entrant	18	0.02
Illegal alien	2	0
Non-US/Source blank	163	0.2
Permanent resident alien	363	0.44
Refugee	720	0.88
US Citizen	80,786	98.29
Other	1	0

**Table A6a – Citizenship Status among Ineligible Cases**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Asylee	26	0.17
Conditional Entrant / 203(A)(7) / PRR 4/1/8	1	0.01
Illegal alien	661	4.27
Non-US / Source blank	118	1
Other	139	0.9
Permanent resident alien	123	0.79
Refugee	90	0.58
US Citizen	14,316	92.52
Total	15,474	100

**Table A6b – Citizenship Group**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Aliens paroled	1	0
Asylee	177	0.22
Battered aliens	1	0
Cuban / Haitian entrants	6	0.01
Deportation withheld	1	0
Non-US / Source blank	163	0.2
Not required	80,786	98.29
Perm resident / 40 qtrs / exclude Amerasians	61	0.07
Permanent resident / not 40 qtrs / exclude Amerasians	264	0.32
Refugee / Amerasians	724	0.88
Trafficking victims	2	0
Veteran / active military / MC, certain Am Indian	2	0
Total	82,188	

**Table A6c – Citizenship Group among Ineligible Cases**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Adjustment of status application filed	2	0.01
Aliens / relative petition approved	5	0.03
Asylee	31	0.2
Conditional entrants	4	0.03
Cuban / Haitian entrants	2	0.01
Deportation withheld	1	0.01
Illegal documented aliens	1	0.01
Illegal undocumented aliens	675	4.36
Indefinite stay of deportation	2	0.01
Indefinite voluntary deportation	2	0.01
Non-US / Source blank	118	0.76
Not required	14,316	92.52
Others reside in US w/ permission of IN	25	0.16
Perm resident / 40 qrtrs / exclude Amerasian	22	0.14
Perm resident / not 40 qrtrs / exclude Amerasia	95	0.61
Refugee / Amerasians	91	0.59
Veteran / active military / MC , certain Am Indian	1	0.01
Visitor / tourist / temporary worker / student	80	0.52
Voluntary departure granted	1	0.01
Total	15,474	100

**Table A7 – Participant Status**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Optional adult	6	0.01
Participating child	58,507	71.19
Participating parent/caretaker relative	23,675	28.81
Total	82,188	100

**Table A7a – Participant Status among Ineligible Cases**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Adoption assistance child	5	0
Court convicted parent	2	0.01
Excluded adult	550	4
Mandatory child	151	0.98
Optional adult	5	0.03
Participating child	7,439	48.07
Participating parent / caretaker relative	7,310	47.24
Spouse of non-parent caretaker / relative	12	0.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,474</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table A8 – Reason for Exclusion**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Adoption assistance child	4	0.03
Already participating	37	0.24
Compulsory school attendance not met	210	1.36
Court convicted parent	1	0.01
Drug conviction / fleeing felon / parole violation	317	2.05
Failure to cooperate for support	182	1.18
Family cap	3,436	22.2
IPV disqualified	64	0.41
IV-E foster care child in TANF case	11	0.07
Individual not in home	83	0.54
Ineligible alien child	121	0.78
Ineligible alien parent	809	5.23
Ineligible child	790	5.11
Ineligible non-parent caretaker / relative	193	1.25
Ineligible parent / stepparent case	46	0.3
Ineligible / exclusion of other AU member	19	0.12
No eligible children	5	0.03
Non resident	37	0.24
Noncooperation in establishing paternity	1	0.01
POI due to receipt of diversionary asst	12	0.08
Questionable citizenship	17	0.11
Received 60 months TANF / ineligible child	2	0.01
Received 60 months TANF /	1	0.01

ineligible parent / child		
Received 24 months of VIEW	18	0.12
Required member not requesting asst	32	0.21
Resident of excluded institution	6	0.04
SSI or AG recipient	6,698	43.29
SSN requirement not met	58	0.37
Spouse of non-parent caretaker / relative	11	0.07
Stepparent / senior parent	499	3.22
TANF parental status not provided	21	0.14
Temporary absence not reported timely	2	0.01
Unverified information	114	0.74
Work program violation	1,617	10.45
Total	15,474	100

*Table A9 – Living Arrangements*

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Drug / alcohol facility	3	0
FED subsidized housing / elderly housing	3	0
Group living arrangement / disabled / blind	13	0.02
Homeless	474	0.58
Hospital, nursing, psychiatric facility	4	0
Private residence	81,550	99.22
Residential facility /group home	7	0.01
Shelter / battered women, children	134	0.16
Total	82,188	100

**Table A9a – Living Arrangements, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Drug / alcohol facility	2	0.01
Group living arrangement / disabled / blind	4	0.02
Homeless	173	0.72
Hospital, nursing, psychiatric facility	1	0
Private residence	23,776	99.08
Residential facility /group home	2	0.01
Shelter / battered women, children	39	0.16
Total	23,997	100

**Table A10 – Disability**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Disability related Medicaid	6	0.01
Eligible for rehabilitation	4	0
MDU determined-disabled	8	0.01
Not disabled per MDU	2	0
Not disabled per SSA	24	0.03
Pending SSA/SSI-MDU	20	0.02
Presumptive disabled	3	0
SSA Title II	17	0.02
SSI disability	109	0.13
Source blank	79,531	96.77
Temporarily disabled	2,396	2.92
Temporarily incapacitated	68	0.08
Total	82,188	100

**Table A10a – Disability, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Disability related Medicaid	6	0.03
Eligible for rehabilitation	3	0.01
MDU determined-disabled	8	0.03
Not disabled per MDU	2	0.01
Not disabled per SSA	21	0.09
Pending SSA/SSI-MDU	18	0.08
Presumptive disabled	3	0.01
SSA Title II	16	0.07
SSI disability	47	0.2
Source blank	21,432	89.31
Temporarily disabled	2,374	9.89
Temporarily incapacitated	67	0.28
Total	23,997	100

*Table A11 – Education Level*

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentage</b>
None	30,235	36.79	36.79
Kindergarten	3,877	4.72	41.51
First grade	3,188	3.88	45.39
Second grade	2,847	3.46	48.85
Third grade	2,758	3.36	52.21
Fourth grade	2,683	3.26	55.47
Fifth grade	2,712	3.3	58.77
Sixth grade	2,683	3.26	62.03
Seventh grade	2,584	3.14	65.17
Eighth grade	3,107	3.78	68.95
Ninth grade	3,370	4.1	73.05
Tenth grade	3,781	4.6	77.65
Eleventh grade	4,162	5.06	82.71
Twelfth grade	9,914	12.06	94.77
GED	1,935	2.35	97.12
Vocational training	106	0.13	97.25
College 1st year	945	1.15	98.4
College 2nd year	705	0.86	99.26
College 3rd year	273	0.33	99.59
College 4th year	83	0.1	99.69
College graduate	180	0.22	99.91
Graduate school	16	0.02	99.93
Business school	34	0.04	99.97
Doctoral program	8	0.01	99.98
Source blank	2	0	99.98
Total	82,188	100	

**Table A11a – Education Level, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentage</b>
None	251	1.05	1.05
Kindergarten	9	0.04	1.09
First grade	8	0.03	1.12
Second grade	15	0.06	1.18
Third grade	14	0.06	1.24
Fourth grade	33	0.14	1.38
Fifth grade	31	0.13	1.51
Sixth grade	90	0.38	1.89
Seventh grade	204	0.85	2.74
Eighth grade	786	3.28	6.02
Ninth grade	1,724	7.18	13.2
Tenth grade	2,856	11.9	25.1
Eleventh grade	3,836	15.99	41.09
Twelfth grade	9,874	41.15	82.24
GED	1,921	8.01	90.25
Vocational training	106	0.44	90.69
College 1st year	943	3.93	94.62
College 2nd year	704	2.93	97.55
College 3rd year	272	1.13	98.68
College 4th year	83	0.35	99.03
College graduate	180	0.75	99.78
Graduate school	16	0.07	99.85
Business school	33	0.14	99.99
Doctoral program	8	0.03	100
Total	23,997	100	

**Table A12 – School Enrollment Status, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Correspondence School	6	0.03
Elementary School	32	0.13
GED General Education Diploma	81	0.34
Grad. / Inst. of Higher Learning	44	0.18
High school	587	2.45
Middle / Junior High School	70	0.29
Non-Credit College Courses	2	0.01
On the Job Training	1	0
Post High School / Training Program	12	0.05
Undergraduate / Institute of Higher Learning	437	1.82
Vocational / Technical / Trade School	156	0.65
Source blank	22,569	94.05
Total	23,997	100



**Table A13 – Recipients by Age Group**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>	<b>Cumulative Percentage</b>
1-11 months	4,343	5.28	5.28
12-17 months	2,596	3.16	8.44
18-23 months	2,633	3.2	12.73
2-3 years old	9,404	11.44	28.48
4-5 years old	7,889	9.6	59.97
6-17 years old	31,326	38.12	99.91
18 years old	893	1.09	9.53
19-21 years old	3,538	4.3	17.04
22-24 years old	4,276	5.2	33.68
25-34 years old	9,404	11.44	45.12
35-44 years old	4,314	5.25	50.37
45-49 years old	947	1.15	61.12
50-54 years old	411	0.5	61.62
55-59 years old	144	0.18	61.8
60-64 years old	54	0.07	99.98
65-74 years old	13	0.02	100
75-84 years old	1	0	100
Over 85 years old	2	0	100
Total	82,188	100	

**Table A14 – Recipient Income by Age (Including non-workers and outliers)**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Mean Monthly Income</b>
18	\$41.37
19-21	\$101.31
22-24	\$157.48
25-34	\$203.60
35-44	\$182.15
45-49	\$143.38
50-54	\$92.77
55-59	\$32.66
60-64	\$8.59
65-74	\$113.17
75-84	\$0.00
Over 85	\$0.00
Total	\$164.24

*Table A14a – Recipient Income by Age (Excluding non-workers and outliers)*

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Mean Monthly Income</b>
18	\$443.68
19-21	\$667.65
22-24	\$707.50
25-34	\$780.75
35-44	\$814.25
45-49	\$861.39
50-54	\$864.72
55-59	\$1,035.98
60-64	\$517.17
65-74	\$977.40
Total	\$763.13

## **APPENDIX B – STATEWIDE DETAILED CROSS TABS**

**APPENDIX B – ALL STATEWIDE DETAILED CROSS TABS**

*Table B1 – Individual Program Recipients by Race*

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	107	0	4	38	2	151
Asian	0	374	6	26	148	91	645
Black/African American	4	31,963	52	465	17,820	1,290	51,594
Black/African American and American Indian	0	34	0	5	6	4	49
Black/African American and Asian	0	6	1	2	1	1	11
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	1,174	4	55	346	65	1,644
White	3	16,593	116	893	7,355	2,405	27,365
White and American Indian/Alaska Native	0	15	0	0	3	0	18
White and Asian	0	5	0	3	10	4	22
White and Black/African American	0	205	3	9	81	25	323
Other Race	0	207	3	24	116	16	366
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>50,683</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>25,924</b>	<b>3,903</b>	<b>82,188</b>

**Table B2 – Educational Attainment by Program**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
None	1	18,971	66	585	9,174	1,438	30,235
Kindergarten	0	2,348	4	51	1,328	146	3,877
First grade	0	2,005	5	44	1,021	113	3,188
Second grade	0	1,812	6	43	894	92	2,847
Third grade	1	1,833	2	32	817	73	2,758
Fourth grade	0	1,785	4	21	797	76	2,683
Fifth grade	0	1,849	2	13	775	73	2,712
Sixth grade	1	1,919	4	23	670	66	2,683
Seventh grade	0	1,805	3	12	706	58	2,584
Eighth grade	2	2,110	3	34	861	97	3,107
Ninth grade	0	2,179	4	53	967	167	3,370
Tenth grade	0	2,269	7	83	1,231	191	3,781
Eleventh grade	1	2,324	23	97	1,456	261	4,162
Twelfth grade	1	5,326	35	289	3,572	691	9,914
GED	0	968	5	43	752	167	1,935
Vocational training	0	56	0	2	40	8	106
College 1st year	0	484	1	20	384	56	945
College 2nd year	0	364	3	14	271	53	705
College 3rd year	0	117	3	12	110	31	273
College 4th year	0	40	1	6	21	15	83
College graduate	0	92	2	9	54	23	180
Graduate school	0	4	1	0	6	5	16
Business school	0	19	1	0	14	0	34
Doctoral program	0	2	0	0	3	3	8
Source blank	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	7	50,683	185	1,486	25,924	3,903	82,188

**Table B2a – Educational Attainment by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
None	0	128	5	17	50	51	251
Kindergarten	0	6	0	0	0	3	9
First grade	0	3	0	0	1	4	8
Second grade	0	5	1	0	7	2	15
Third grade	0	7	0	2	3	2	14
Fourth grade	0	18	3	0	5	7	33
Fifth grade	0	20	0	0	8	3	31
Sixth grade	0	56	1	4	22	7	90
Seventh grade	0	111	1	3	72	17	204
Eighth grade	0	427	1	19	290	49	786
Ninth grade	0	956	3	37	587	141	1,724
Tenth grade	0	1,564	6	74	1,038	174	2,856
Eleventh grade	1	2,069	20	92	1,397	257	3,836
Twelfth grade	1	5,297	35	288	3,563	690	9,874
GED	0	960	5	43	747	166	1,921
Vocational training	0	56	0	2	40	8	106
College 1st year	0	483	1	19	384	56	943
College 2nd year	0	364	3	14	270	53	704
College 3rd year	0	116	3	12	110	31	272
College 4th year	0	40	1	6	21	15	83
College graduate	0	92	2	9	54	23	180
Graduate school	0	4	1	0	6	5	16
Business school	0	18	1	0	14	0	33
Doctoral program	0	2	0	0	3	3	8
Total	2	12,802	93	641	8,692	,767	23,997

**Table B3 – Educational Attainment by Race**

	American Indian / Alaska Native	Asian	Black / African American	Black / African American and Asian	Black / African American and American Indian	Black / African American and Asian	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	White
None	45	197	19,091	7	29	7	691	9,705
Kindergarten	7	27	2,500	0	1	0	101	1,213
First grade	4	27	2,051	2	1	2	80	1,010
Second grade	12	29	1,767	0	1	0	62	968
Third grade	5	21	1,773	0	0	0	73	869
Fourth grade	2	26	1,720	0	3	0	63	852
Fifth grade	6	29	1,754	0	2	0	67	837
Sixth grade	5	30	1,727	0	0	0	61	845
Seventh grade	7	24	1,616	0	3	0	50	864
Eighth grade	9	32	1,845	0	2	0	59	1,143
Ninth grade	5	46	2,026	0	0	0	62	1,215
Tenth grade	5	26	2,423	0	0	0	46	1,269
Eleventh grade	8	20	2,803	0	2	0	56	1,264
Twelfth grade	19	70	6,175	2	2	2	121	3,489
GED	2	7	900	0	1	0	20	998
Vocational training	1	1	69	0	0	0	0	34
College 1st year	5	4	611	0	1	0	13	305
College 2nd year	2	5	405	0	1	0	15	272
College 3rd year	0	9	162	0	0	0	1	98
College 4th year	0	3	44	0	0	0	0	32
College graduate	2	8	96	0	0	0	2	64
Graduate school	0	2	7	0	0	0	1	6
Business school	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	10
Doctoral program	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	2
Source blank	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	151	645	51,594	11	49	11	,644	27,365

*Table B3 – Continued*

	White and American Indian / Alaska Native	White and Asian	White and Black / African American	Other Race	Total
None	10	12	255	193	30,235
Kindergarten	1	0	12	15	3,877
First grade	1	2	1	9	3,188
Second grade	1	0	4	3	2,847
Third grade	0	0	5	12	2,758
Fourth grade	0	1	6	10	2,683
Fifth grade	0	2	4	11	2,712
Sixth grade	0	0	2	13	2,683
Seventh grade	0	0	4	16	2,584
Eighth grade	0	1	5	11	3,107
Ninth grade	0	0	4	12	3,370
Tenth grade	2	0	1	9	3,781
Eleventh grade	0	0	3	6	4,162
Twelfth grade	0	0	11	25	9,914
GED	2	2	0	3	1,935
Vocational training	0	0	0	1	106
College 1st year	0	0	2	4	945
College 2nd year	0	0	2	3	705
College 3rd year	1	0	0	2	273
College 4th year	0	0	0	4	83
College graduate	0	2	2	4	180
Graduate school	0	0	0	0	16
Business school	0	0	0	0	34
Doctoral program	0	0	0	0	8
Source blank	0	0	0	0	2
Total	18	22	323	366	82,188



**Table B3a – Educational Attainment by Race, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	American Indian / Alaska Native	Asian	Black / African American	Black / African American and Indian	Black / African American and Asian	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	White
None	0	28	115	1	0	14	88
Kindergarten	0	1	5	0	0	0	2
First grade	0	1	4	0	0	0	2
Second grade	0	3	8	0	0	0	4
Third grade	0	0	6	0	0	3	4
Fourth grade	0	9	11	0	0	2	10
Fifth grade	0	3	17	0	0	1	10
Sixth grade	0	9	37	0	0	8	34
Seventh grade	0	2	89	0	0	3	110
Eighth grade	1	4	397	0	0	16	365
Ninth grade	4	17	957	0	0	35	708
Tenth grade	4	15	1,832	0	0	30	972
Eleventh grade	6	16	2,610	2	0	52	1,142
Twelfth grade	19	69	6,148	2	2	120	3,479
GED	2	7	898	1	0	20	986
Vocational training	1	1	69	0	0	0	34
College 1st year	5	4	610	1	0	13	304
College 2nd year	2	5	405	1	0	15	271
College 3rd year	0	9	161	0	0	1	98
College 4th year	0	3	44	0	0	0	32
College graduate	2	8	96	0	0	2	64
Graduate school	0	2	7	0	0	1	6
Business school	0	1	22	0	0	0	10
Doctoral program	0	1	5	0	0	0	2
Total	46	218	14,553	8	2	336	8,737

*Table B3a – Continued*

	White and American Indian / Alaska Native	White and Asian	White and Black / African American	Other Race	Total
None	0	0	0	5	251
Kindergarten	0	0	0	1	9
First grade	0	1	0	0	8
Second grade	0	0	0	0	15
Third grade	0	0	0	1	14
Fourth grade	0	0	0	1	33
Fifth grade	0	0	0	0	31
Sixth grade	0	0	0	2	90
Seventh grade	0	0	0	0	204
Eighth grade	0	1	1	1	786
Ninth grade	0	0	0	3	1,724
Tenth grade	1	0	1	1	2,856
Eleventh grade	0	0	3	5	3,836
Twelfth grade	0	0	10	25	9,874
GED	2	2	0	3	1,921
Vocational training	0	0	0	1	106
College 1st year	0	0	2	4	943
College 2nd year	0	0	2	3	704
College 3rd year	1	0	0	2	272
College 4th year	0	0	0	4	83
College graduate	0	2	2	4	180
Graduate school	0	0	0	0	16
Business school	0	0	0	0	33
Doctoral program	0	0	0	0	8
Total	4	6	21	66	23,997

**Table B4 – Recipient Age by Program**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
1-11 months	0	3,645	21	126	330	221	4,343
12-17 months	0	2,099	10	69	259	159	2,596
18-23 months	0	1,712	4	65	711	141	2,633
2-3 years	1	4,985	13	168	3,802	435	9,404
4-5 years	0	4,578	14	119	2,833	345	7,889
6-17 years	4	20,862	30	298	9,297	835	31,326
18 years	0	707	1	14	153	18	893
19-21 years	0	2,304	18	89	921	206	3,538
22-24 years	0	2,311	22	130	1,508	305	4,276
25-34 years	1	4,390	29	280	3,903	801	9,404
35-44 years	0	2,106	16	92	1,765	335	4,314
45-49 years	1	525	5	19	325	72	947
50-54 years	0	278	1	12	101	19	411
55-59 years	0	123	1	1	14	5	144
60-64 years	0	47	0	4	2	1	54
65-74 years	0	8	0	0	0	5	13
75-84 years	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Over 85	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>50,683</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>25,924</b>	<b>3,903</b>	<b>82,188</b>

**Table B5 – Recipient Disability Status by Program**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
Disability related Medicaid	0	3	0	0	3	0	6
Eligible for rehabilitation	0	2	0	0	2	0	4
MDU determined-disabled	0	5	0	0	3	0	8
Not disabled per MDU	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Not disabled per SSA	0	18	0	0	6	0	24
Pending SSA/SSI-MDU	0	17	0	0	3	0	20
Presumptive disabled	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
SSA Title II	0	15	0	0	1	1	17
SSI disability	0	84	1	1	22	1	109
Source blank	6	48,541	183	1,479	25,433	3,889	79,531
Temporarily disabled	1	1,938	1	6	438	12	2,396
Temporarily incapacitated	0	56	0	0	12	0	68
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>50,683</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>25,924</b>	<b>3,903</b>	<b>82,188</b>

**Table B5a – Recipient Disability Status by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	FEP	TANF	TANF INVLD	TANF- UP	VIEW	VIEW- UP	Total
Disability related Medicaid	0	3	0	0	3	0	6
Eligible for rehabilitation	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
MDU determined-disabled	0	5	0	0	3	0	8
Not disabled per MDU	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Not disabled per SSA	0	16	0	0	5	0	21
Pending SSA/SSI-MDU	0	15	0	0	3	0	18
Presumptive disabled	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
SSA Title II	0	14	0	0	1	1	16
SSI disability	0	39	0	0	8	0	47
Source blank	1	10,727	93	636	8,221	1,754	21,432
Temporarily disabled	1	1,923	0	5	433	12	2,374
Temporarily incapacitated	0	55	0	0	12	0	67
Total	2	12,802	93	641	8,692	1,767	23,997

**Table B6 – Recipient Gender by Program**

	FEP	TANF	TANF INVLD	TANF- UP	VIEW	VIEW- UP	Total
Female	4	31,181	92	748	16,872	1,983	50,880
Male	3	19,502	93	738	9,052	1,920	31,308
Total	7	50,683	185	1,486	25,924	3,903	82,188

**Table B6a – Recipient Gender by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	FEP	TANF	TANF INVLD	TANF- UP	VIEW	VIEW- UP	Total
Female	2	11,976	47	344	8,169	899	21,437
Male	0	826	46	297	523	868	2,560
Total	2	12,802	93	641	8,692	1,767	23,997

**Table B7 – Recipient Marital Status by Program**

	FEP	TANF	TANF INVLD	TANF- UP	VIEW	VIEW- UP	Total
Divorced	0	1,064	0	20	716	55	1,855
Married	0	1,200	51	415	826	1,188	3,680
Separated	1	1,952	1	19	1,434	54	3,461
Single	6	46,339	133	1,031	22,906	2,599	73,014
Widowed	0	112	0	1	38	5	156
Reported as unknown	0	16	0	0	4	2	22
Total	7	50,683	185	1,486	25,924	3,903	82,188

**Table B7a – Recipient Marital Status by Program, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVLD</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
Divorced	0	1,056	0	20	711	55	1,842
Married	0	1,119	51	405	805	1,162	3,542
Separated	1	1,942	1	19	1,429	53	3,445
Single	1	8,563	41	196	5,706	491	14,998
Widowed	0	109	0	1	38	5	153
Reported as unknown	0	13	0	0	3	1	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12,802</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>8,692</b>	<b>1,767</b>	<b>23,997</b>

**Table B8 – Recipient Marital Status by Race**

	<b>Divorced</b>	<b>Married</b>	<b>Separated</b>	<b>Single</b>	<b>Widowed</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Total</b>
American Indian / Alaska Native	5	4	11	129	2	0	151
Asian	26	102	22	481	14	0	645
Black / African American	688	1,071	1,546	48,207	71	11	51,594
Black / African American and American Indian	1	0	2	46	0	0	49
Black / African American and Asian	0	0	0	11	0	0	11
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	37	59	52	1,495	1	0	1,644
White	1,090	2,413	1,816	21,968	67	11	27,365
White and American Indian / Alaska Native	1	1	0	16	0	0	18
White and Asian	0	5	0	17	0	0	22
White and Black / African American	2	1	3	317	0	0	323
Other Race	5	24	9	327	1	0	366
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,855</b>	<b>3,680</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>73,014</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>82,188</b>

**Table B8a – Recipient Marital Status by Race, Excluding Those under Age 18**

	<b>Divorced</b>	<b>Married</b>	<b>Separated</b>	<b>Single</b>	<b>Widowed</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Total</b>
American Indian / Alaska Native	5	4	11	24	2	0	46
Asian	26	99	22	57	14	0	218
Black / African American	684	1,013	1,540	11,241	68	7	14,553
Black / African American and American Indian	1	0	2	5	0	0	8
Black / African American and Asian	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	36	56	52	191	1	0	336
White	5	22	9	29	1	0	66
White and American Indian / Alaska Native	1,082	2,341	1,806	3,431	67	10	8,737
White and Asian	1	1	0	2	0	0	4
White and Black / African American	0	5	0	1	0	0	6
Other Race	2	1	3	15	0	0	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,842</b>	<b>3,542</b>	<b>3,445</b>	<b>14,998</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>23,997</b>

**APPENDIX C – REGIONAL AND LOCAL DESCRIPTIVE  
STATISTICS**

## APPENDIX C – REGIONAL AND LOCAL STATISTICS

*Table C1 – Recipients by Region*

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Central	17,542	21.34
East	26,704	32.49
North	13,433	16.34
Piedmont	14,771	17.97
West	9,738	11.85
Total	82,188	100

*Table C1a – Families/Cases by Region*

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
Central	7,516	22
East	11,412	32.76
North	5,560	15.96
Piedmont	6,205	17.81
West	4,139	11.88
Total	34,832	100

*Table C2 – Recipients by City and County*

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
001 - Accomack	399	0.49
003 - Albemarle	271	0.33
005 - Alleghany	221	0.27
007 - Amelia	152	0.18
009 - Amherst	184	0.22
011 - Appomattox	201	0.24
013 - Arlington	574	0.7
015 - Augusta	594	0.72
017 - Bath	16	0.02
019 - Bedford County	335	0.41
021 - Bland	59	0.07
023 - Botetourt	52	0.06
025 - Brunswick	386	0.47
027 - Buchanan	549	0.67
029 - Buckingham	240	0.29
031 - Campbell	651	0.79
033 - Caroline	255	0.31
035 - Carroll	307	0.37
036 - Charles City	54	0.07
037 - Charlotte	184	0.22
041 - Chesterfield	1,941	2.36
043 - Clarke	22	0.03
045 - Craig	20	0.02



047 - Culpeper	321	0.39
049 - Cumberland	140	0.17
051 - Dickenson	273	0.33
053 - Dinwiddie	324	0.39
057 - Essex	142	0.17
059 - Fairfax County	3,385	4.12
061 - Fauquier	268	0.33
063 - Floyd	97	0.12
065 - Fluvanna	37	0.05
067 - Franklin County	510	0.62
069 - Frederick	232	0.28
071 - Giles	95	0.12
073 - Gloucester	225	0.27
075 - Goochland	83	0.1
077 - Grayson	162	0.2
079 - Greene	144	0.18
081 - Greensville	140	0.17
083 - Halifax	771	0.94
085 - Hanover	326	0.4
087 - Henrico	3,128	3.81
089 - Henry	914	1.11
093 - Isle of Wight	298	0.36
095 - James City	226	0.27
097 - King and Queen	43	0.05
099 - King George	88	0.11
101 - King William	92	0.11
103 - Lancaster	103	0.13
105 - Lee	774	0.94
107 - Loudoun	660	0.8
109 - Louisa	239	0.29
111 - Lunenburg	84	0.1
113 - Madison	70	0.09
115 - Mathews	58	0.07
117 - Mecklenburg	458	0.56
119 - Middlesex	97	0.12
121 - Montgomery	976	1.19
125 - Nelson	105	0.13
127 - New Kent	75	0.09
131 - Northampton	276	0.34
133 - Northumberland	81	0.1
135 - Nottoway	381	0.46
137 - Orange	188	0.23
139 - Page	136	0.17
141 - Patrick	411	0.5
143 - Pittsylvania	632	0.77
145 - Powhatan	89	0.11
147 - Prince Edward	394	0.48
149 - Prince George	204	0.25
153 - Prince William	2,723	3.31

155 - Pulaski	479	0.58
157 - Rappahannock	10	0.01
159 - Richmond County	96	0.12
161 - Roanoke County	641	0.78
163 - Rockbridge	91	0.11
165 - Rockingham	372	0.45
167 - Russell	662	0.81
169 - Scott	508	0.62
171 - Shenandoah	94	0.11
173 - Smyth	427	0.52
175 - Southampton	309	0.38
177 - Spotsylvania	612	0.74
179 - Stafford	560	0.68
181 - Surry	95	0.12
183 - Sussex	228	0.28
185 - Tazewell	892	1.09
187 - Warren	252	0.31
191 - Washington	462	0.56
193 - Westmoreland	188	0.23
195 - Wise	1,166	1.42
197 - Wythe	355	0.43
199 - York	186	0.23
510 - Alexandria	985	1.2
515 - Bedford City	130	0.16
520 - Bristol	570	0.69
530 - Buena Vista	35	0.04
540 - Charlottesville	745	0.91
550 - Chesapeake	2,551	3.1
570 - Colonial Heights	157	0.19
580 - Covington	101	0.12
590 - Danville	1,588	1.93
595 - Emporia	235	0.29
600 - Fairfax City	2	0
620 - Franklin City	264	0.32
630 - Fredericksburg	370	0.45
640 - Galax	172	0.21
650 - Hampton	3,070	3.74
660 - Harrisonburg	414	0.5
670 - Hopewell	693	0.84
678 - Lexington	27	0.03
680 - Lynchburg	1,352	1.65
683 - Manassas	339	0.41
685 - Manassas Park	135	0.16
690 - Martinsville	436	0.53
700 - Newport News	4,094	4.98
710 - Norfolk	5,523	6.72
720 - Norton	136	0.17
730 - Petersburg	1,320	1.61
735 - Poquoson	25	0.03

740 - Portsmouth	3,578	4.35
750 - Radford	206	0.25
760 - Richmond City	7,151	8.7
770 - Roanoke City	2,703	3.29
790 - Staunton	379	0.46
800 - Suffolk	1,260	1.53
810 - Virginia Beach	2,678	3.26
820 - Waynesboro	424	0.52
830 - Williamsburg	72	0.09
840 - Winchester	238	0.29
Total	82,188	100

**Table C2a – Families/Cases by City and County**

	<b>Number of Recipients</b>	<b>Percent of Total TANF Recipients</b>
001 - Accomack	177	0.51
003 - Albemarle	105	0.3
005 - Alleghany	80	0.23
007 - Amelia	67	0.19
009 - Amherst	81	0.23
011 - Appomattox	86	0.25
013 - Arlington	282	0.81
015 - Augusta	261	0.75
017 - Bath	7	0.02
019 - Bedford County	155	0.44
021 - Bland	25	0.07
023 - Botetourt	28	0.08
025 - Brunswick	156	0.45
027 - Buchanan	261	0.75
029 - Buckingham	95	0.27
031 - Campbell	277	0.8
033 - Caroline	112	0.32
035 - Carroll	122	0.35
036 - Charles City	28	0.08
037 - Charlotte	70	0.2
041 - Chesterfield	811	2.33
043 - Clarke	14	0.04
045 - Craig	8	0.02
047 - Culpeper	145	0.42
049 - Cumberland	62	0.18
051 - Dickenson	130	0.37
053 - Dinwiddie	147	0.42
057 - Essex	63	0.18
059 - Fairfax County	1,415	4.06
061 - Fauquier	115	0.33
063 - Floyd	40	0.11
065 - Fluvanna	17	0.05
067 - Franklin County	225	0.65
069 - Frederick	91	0.26
071 - Giles	45	0.13
073 - Gloucester	100	0.29
075 - Goochland	39	0.11
077 - Grayson	69	0.2
079 - Greene	56	0.16
081 - Greensville	58	0.17
083 - Halifax	307	0.88
085 - Hanover	145	0.42
087 - Henrico	1,327	3.81
089 - Henry	372	1.07
093 - Isle of Wight	126	0.36
095 - James City	95	0.27

097 - King and Queen	21	0.06
099 - King George	33	0.09
101 - King William	40	0.11
103 - Lancaster	48	0.14
105 - Lee	322	0.92
107 - Loudoun	247	0.71
109 - Louisa	104	0.3
111 - Lunenburg	40	0.11
113 - Madison	31	0.09
115 - Mathews	24	0.07
117 - Mecklenburg	195	0.56
119 - Middlesex	37	0.11
121 - Montgomery	403	1.16
125 - Nelson	39	0.11
127 - New Kent	33	0.09
131 - Northampton	120	0.34
133 - Northumberland	39	0.11
135 - Nottoway	145	0.42
137 - Orange	82	0.24
139 - Page	50	0.14
141 - Patrick	153	0.44
143 - Pittsylvania	290	0.83
145 - Powhatan	38	0.11
147 - Prince Edward	161	0.46
149 - Prince George	88	0.25
153 - Prince William	1,103	3.17
155 - Pulaski	210	0.6
157 - Rappahannock	5	0.01
159 - Richmond County	37	0.11
161 - Roanoke County	282	0.81
163 - Rockbridge	46	0.13
165 - Rockingham	147	0.42
167 - Russell	295	0.85
169 - Scott	215	0.62
171 - Shenandoah	37	0.11
173 - Smyth	169	0.49
175 - Southampton	129	0.37
177 - Spotsylvania	245	0.7
179 - Stafford	239	0.69
181 - Surry	39	0.11
183 - Sussex	91	0.26
185 - Tazewell	392	1.13
187 - Warren	101	0.29
191 - Washington	205	0.59
193 - Westmoreland	81	0.23
195 - Wise	498	1.43
197 - Wythe	144	0.41
199 - York	82	0.24
510 - Alexandria	417	1.2

515 - Bedford City	58	0.17
520 - Bristol	228	0.65
530 - Buena Vista	17	0.05
540 - Charlottesville	318	0.91
550 - Chesapeake	1,135	3.26
570 - Colonial Heights	71	0.2
580 - Covington	46	0.13
590 - Danville	639	1.83
595 - Emporia	89	0.26
600 - Fairfax City	2	0.01
620 - Franklin City	115	0.33
630 - Fredericksburg	151	0.43
640 - Galax	76	0.22
650 - Hampton	1,312	3.77
660 - Harrisonburg	163	0.47
670 - Hopewell	296	0.85
678 - Lexington	12	0.03
680 - Lynchburg	573	1.65
683 - Manassas	130	0.37
685 - Manassas Park	48	0.14
690 - Martinsville	180	0.52
700 - Newport News	1,735	4.98
710 - Norfolk	2,289	6.57
720 - Norton	54	0.16
730 - Petersburg	584	1.68
735 - Poquoson	11	0.03
740 - Portsmouth	1,560	4.48
750 - Radford	83	0.24
760 - Richmond City	3,079	8.84
770 - Roanoke City	1,126	3.23
790 - Staunton	151	0.43
800 - Suffolk	542	1.56
810 - Virginia Beach	1,166	3.35
820 - Waynesboro	171	0.49
830 - Williamsburg	26	0.07
840 - Winchester	107	0.31
Total	34,832	100



**APPENDIX D – REGIONAL AND LOCAL CROSS TABS**



## APPENDIX D – REGIONAL AND LOCAL CROSS TABS

*Table D1 – Recipients by Gender and Region*

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
Central	11,031	6,511	17,542
East	16,809	9,895	26,704
North	8,224	5,209	13,433
Piedmont	9,091	5,680	14,771
West	5,725	4,013	9,738
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,880</b>	<b>31,308</b>	<b>82,188</b>

*Table D2 – Recipients by Gender and City and County*

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
001 - Accomack	241	158	399
003 - Albemarle	174	97	271
005 - Alleghany	128	93	221
007 - Amelia	102	50	152
009 - Amherst	108	76	184
011 - Appomattox	135	66	201
013 - Arlington	349	225	574
015 - Augusta	359	235	594
017 - Bath	12	4	16
019 - Bedford County	209	126	335
021 - Bland	32	27	59
023 - Botetourt	30	22	52
025 - Brunswick	236	150	386
027 - Buchanan	309	240	549
029 - Buckingham	157	83	240
031 - Campbell	382	269	651
033 - Caroline	161	94	255
035 - Carroll	182	125	307
036 - Charles City	32	22	54
037 - Charlotte	108	76	184
041 - Chesterfield	1,166	775	1,941
043 - Clarke	13	9	22
045 - Craig	14	6	20
047 - Culpeper	191	130	321
049 - Cumberland	86	54	140
051 - Dickenson	162	111	273
053 - Dinwiddie	195	129	324
057 - Essex	92	50	142
059 - Fairfax County	2,080	1,305	3,385
061 - Fauquier	164	104	268
063 - Floyd	53	44	97
065 - Fluvanna	24	13	37
067 - Franklin County	282	228	510
069 - Frederick	148	84	232
071 - Giles	64	31	95

073 - Gloucester	132	93	225
075 - Goochland	48	35	83
077 - Grayson	102	60	162
079 - Greene	84	60	144
081 - Greensville	81	59	140
083 - Halifax	493	278	771
085 - Hanover	186	140	326
087 - Henrico	1,951	1,177	3,128
089 - Henry	542	372	914
093 - Isle of Wight	185	113	298
095 - James City	134	92	226
097 - King and Queen	26	17	43
099 - King George	54	34	88
101 - King William	53	39	92
103 - Lancaster	59	44	103
105 - Lee	422	352	774
107 - Loudoun	389	271	660
109 - Louisa	132	107	239
111 - Lunenburg	63	21	84
113 - Madison	42	28	70
115 - Mathews	38	20	58
117 - Mecklenburg	275	183	458
119 - Middlesex	61	36	97
121 - Montgomery	586	390	976
125 - Nelson	61	44	105
127 - New Kent	42	33	75
131 - Northampton	167	109	276
133 - Northumberland	48	33	81
135 - Nottoway	233	148	381
137 - Orange	119	69	188
139 - Page	81	55	136
141 - Patrick	238	173	411
143 - Pittsylvania	377	255	632
145 - Powhatan	51	38	89
147 - Prince Edward	233	161	394
149 - Prince George	127	77	204
153 - Prince William	1,684	1,039	2,723
155 - Pulaski	248	231	479
157 - Rappahannock	6	4	10
159 - Richmond County	59	37	96
161 - Roanoke County	372	269	641
163 - Rockbridge	58	33	91
165 - Rockingham	224	148	372
167 - Russell	390	272	662
169 - Scott	289	219	508
171 - Shenandoah	55	39	94
173 - Smyth	268	159	427
175 - Southampton	191	118	309
177 - Spotsylvania	361	251	612

179 - Stafford	375	185	560
181 - Surry	54	41	95
183 - Sussex	150	78	228
185 - Tazewell	539	353	892
187 - Warren	147	105	252
191 - Washington	288	174	462
193 - Westmoreland	110	78	188
195 - Wise	686	480	1,166
197 - Wythe	216	139	355
199 - York	112	74	186
510 - Alexandria	606	379	985
515 - Bedford City	83	47	130
520 - Bristol	343	227	570
530 - Buena Vista	25	10	35
540 - Charlottesville	462	283	745
550 - Chesapeake	1,633	918	2,551
570 - Colonial Height	101	56	157
580 - Covington	59	42	101
590 - Danville	1,032	556	1,588
595 - Emporia	133	102	235
600 - Fairfax City	1	1	2
620 - Franklin City	166	98	264
630 - Fredericksburg	249	121	370
640 - Galax	96	76	172
650 - Hampton	1,946	1,124	3,070
660 - Harrisonburg	244	170	414
670 - Hopewell	443	250	693
678 - Lexington	13	14	27
680 - Lynchburg	877	475	1,352
683 - Manassas	191	148	339
685 - Manassas Park	87	48	135
690 - Martinsville	286	150	436
700 - Newport News	2,613	1,481	4,094
710 - Norfolk	3,487	2,036	5,523
720 - Norton	78	58	136
730 - Petersburg	834	486	1,320
735 - Poquoson	14	11	25
740 - Portsmouth	2,276	1,302	3,578
750 - Radford	134	72	206
760 - Richmond City	4,610	2,541	7,151
770 - Roanoke City	1,649	1,054	2,703
790 - Staunton	215	164	379
800 - Suffolk	784	476	1,260
810 - Virginia Beach	1,675	1,003	2,678
820 - Waynesboro	271	153	424
830 - Williamsburg	39	33	72
840 - Winchester	148	90	238
Total	50,880	31,308	82,188

**Table D3 – Recipient by Program and Region**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
Central	0	10,628	39	233	5,979	663	17,542
East	0	16,926	5	271	8,829	673	26,704
North	7	8,464	70	392	3,847	653	13,433
Piedmont	0	9,051	41	298	4,578	803	14,771
West	0	5,614	30	292	2,691	1,111	9,738
Total	7	50,683	185	1,486	25,924	3,903	82,188

**Table D3a – Family/Case by Program and Region**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
Central	0	5,076	12	69	2,206	153	7,516
East	0	7,996	1	69	3,184	162	11,412
North	2	3,980	17	111	1,291	159	5,560
Piedmont	0	4,229	11	84	1,675	206	6,205
West	0	2,770	9	85	979	296	4,139
Total	2	24,051	50	418	9,335	976	34,832

**Table D4 – Recipient by Program and City and County**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
001 - Accomack	0	285	0	5	109	0	399
003 - Albemarle	0	194	0	7	61	9	271
005 - Alleghany	0	66	0	7	94	54	221
007 - Amelia	0	84	0	3	60	5	152
009 - Amherst	0	123	0	0	47	14	184
011 - Appomattox	0	111	0	6	77	7	201
013 - Arlington	0	386	0	17	150	21	574
015 - Augusta	0	392	3	18	127	54	594
017 - Bath	0	5	0	0	8	3	16
019 - Bedford County	0	227	0	0	82	26	335
021 - Bland	0	35	0	0	8	16	59
023 - Botetourt	0	35	0	0	17	0	52
025 - Brunswick	0	221	0	0	148	17	386
027 - Buchanan	0	386	3	10	110	40	549
029 - Buckingham	0	117	3	18	78	24	240
031 - Campbell	0	348	4	13	216	70	651
033 - Caroline	0	196	0	8	37	14	255
035 - Carroll	0	157	0	15	99	36	307
036 - Charles City	0	34	0	0	20	0	54
037 - Charlotte	0	101	0	7	59	17	184
041 - Chesterfield	0	1,165	4	35	643	94	1,941
043 - Clarke	0	17	0	0	0	5	22
045 - Craig	0	9	0	0	11	0	20
047 - Culpeper	7	226	0	9	79	0	321

049 - Cumberland	0	94	0	4	37	5	140
051 - Dickenson	0	201	0	4	42	26	273
053 - Dinwiddie	0	194	0	0	111	19	324
057 - Essex	0	74	0	6	59	3	142
059 - Fairfax County	0	2,286	26	106	761	206	3,385
061 - Fauquier	0	195	5	3	63	2	268
063 - Floyd	0	54	0	4	24	15	97
065 - Fluvanna	0	24	0	0	9	4	37
067 - Franklin County	0	330	0	44	110	26	510
069 - Frederick	0	117	7	0	87	21	232
071 - Giles	0	64	0	4	27	0	95
073 - Gloucester	0	136	5	6	67	11	225
075 - Goochland	0	55	0	2	26	0	83
077 - Grayson	0	99	0	0	52	11	162
079 - Greene	0	81	0	8	51	4	144
081 - Greensville	0	80	0	0	60	0	140
083 - Halifax	0	455	4	20	242	50	771
085 - Hanover	0	195	0	11	107	13	326
087 - Henrico	0	1,985	18	50	930	145	3,128
089 - Henry	0	505	0	16	328	65	914
093 - Isle of Wight	0	181	0	2	102	13	298
095 - James City	0	172	0	0	54	0	226
097 - King and Queen	0	31	0	0	12	0	43
099 - King George	0	54	0	9	19	6	88
101 - King William	0	72	0	5	15	0	92
103 - Lancaster	0	74	0	0	29	0	103
105 - Lee	0	416	6	13	206	133	774
107 - Loudoun	0	368	6	27	209	50	660
109 - Louisa	0	137	0	11	84	7	239
111 - Lunenburg	0	59	0	0	25	0	84
113 - Madison	0	50	0	4	13	3	70
115 - Mathews	0	47	0	0	11	0	58
117 - Mecklenburg	0	255	0	6	188	9	458
119 - Middlesex	0	53	0	4	29	11	97
121 - Montgomery	0	565	8	21	297	85	976
125 - Nelson	0	59	0	10	26	10	105
127 - New Kent	0	46	0	2	18	9	75
131 - Northampton	0	155	0	6	103	12	276
133 - Northumberland	0	57	0	0	24	0	81
135 - Nottoway	0	198	0	0	137	46	381
137 - Orange	0	88	0	6	80	14	188
139 - Page	0	59	4	3	44	26	136
141 - Patrick	0	160	0	30	127	94	411
143 - Pittsylvania	0	449	0	24	132	27	632
145 - Powhatan	0	74	0	4	9	2	89
147 - Prince Edward	0	193	0	8	141	52	394
149 - Prince George	0	137	0	6	53	8	204
153 - Prince William	0	1,680	4	89	850	100	2,723
155 - Pulaski	0	289	2	11	147	30	479

157 - Rappahannock	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
159 - Richmond County	0	53	0	3	37	3	96
161 - Roanoke County	0	404	0	6	184	47	641
163 - Rockbridge	0	49	0	0	36	6	91
165 - Rockingham	0	215	0	13	117	27	372
167 - Russell	0	400	5	29	178	50	662
169 - Scott	0	302	0	21	118	67	508
171 - Shenandoah	0	94	0	0	0	0	94
173 - Smyth	0	288	0	9	91	39	427
175 - Southampton	0	148	0	16	131	14	309
177 - Spotsylvania	0	330	3	9	222	48	612
179 - Stafford	0	402	4	8	146	0	560
181 - Surry	0	51	0	0	44	0	95
183 - Sussex	0	119	0	13	96	0	228
185 - Tazewell	0	549	0	26	239	78	892
187 - Warren	0	142	5	3	86	16	252
191 - Washington	0	261	0	12	133	56	462
193 - Westmoreland	0	148	0	0	28	12	188
195 - Wise	0	684	4	48	283	147	1,166
197 - Wythe	0	190	0	7	114	44	355
199 - York	0	100	0	3	65	18	186
510 - Alexandria	0	703	0	7	253	22	985
515 - Bedford City	0	89	0	0	34	7	130
520 - Bristol	0	266	2	23	207	72	570
530 - Buena Vista	0	20	0	0	15	0	35
540 - Charlottesville	0	404	8	16	280	37	745
550 - Chesapeake	0	1,607	0	18	896	30	2,551
570 - Colonial Height	0	101	0	2	49	5	157
580 - Covington	0	43	0	0	46	12	101
590 - Danville	0	1,008	3	13	526	38	1,588
595 - Emporia	0	140	0	0	76	19	235
600 - Fairfax City	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
620 - Franklin City	0	147	0	0	106	11	264
630 - Fredericksburg	0	168	3	10	184	5	370
640 - Galax	0	77	0	5	59	31	172
650 - Hampton	0	2,053	0	37	885	95	3,070
660 - Harrisonburg	0	218	3	24	110	59	414
670 - Hopewell	0	379	0	3	277	34	693
678 - Lexington	0	13	0	0	14	0	27
680 - Lynchburg	0	804	0	14	484	50	1,352
683 - Manassas	0	226	0	3	102	8	339
685 - Manassas Park	0	71	0	4	57	3	135
690 - Martinsville	0	254	0	0	171	11	436
700 - Newport News	0	2,638	0	39	1,306	111	4,094
710 - Norfolk	0	3,334	0	50	2,026	113	5,523
720 - Norton	0	68	0	0	60	8	136
730 - Petersburg	0	883	0	3	397	37	1,320
735 - Poquoson	0	13	0	0	12	0	25
740 - Portsmouth	0	2,314	0	27	1,181	56	3,578

750 - Radford	0	103	0	0	70	33	206
760 - Richmond City	0	4,184	14	62	2,746	145	7,151
770 - Roanoke City	0	1,775	15	53	737	123	2,703
790 - Staunton	0	205	4	15	128	27	379
800 - Suffolk	0	769	0	8	469	14	1,260
810 - Virginia Beach	0	1,850	0	32	691	105	2,678
820 - Waynesboro	0	319	0	3	98	4	424
830 - Williamsburg	0	35	0	3	27	7	72
840 - Winchester	0	139	0	19	80	0	238
Total	7	50,683	185	1,486	25,924	3,903	82,188

**Table D4a – Family/Case by Program and City and County**

	<b>FEP</b>	<b>TANF</b>	<b>TANF INVL</b>	<b>TANF- UP</b>	<b>VIEW</b>	<b>VIEW- UP</b>	<b>Total</b>
001 - Accomack	0	138	0	2	37	0	177
003 - Albemarle	0	82	0	2	19	2	105
005 - Alleghany	0	34	0	2	30	14	80
007 - Amelia	0	44	0	1	21	1	67
009 - Amherst	0	60	0	0	18	3	81
011 - Appomattox	0	50	0	2	32	2	86
013 - Arlington	0	213	0	8	54	7	282
015 - Augusta	0	185	1	6	54	15	261
017 - Bath	0	3	0	0	3	1	7
019 - Bedford County	0	117	0	0	30	8	155
021 - Bland	0	18	0	0	3	4	25
023 - Botetourt	0	22	0	0	6	0	28
025 - Brunswick	0	98	0	0	54	4	156
027 - Buchanan	0	207	1	3	37	13	261
029 - Buckingham	0	52	1	5	31	6	95
031 - Campbell	0	176	1	4	80	16	277
033 - Caroline	0	90	0	2	16	4	112
035 - Carroll	0	74	0	4	35	9	122
036 - Charles City	0	21	0	0	7	0	28
037 - Charlotte	0	46	0	2	19	3	70
041 - Chesterfield	0	558	2	10	217	24	811
043 - Clarke	0	13	0	0	0	1	14
045 - Craig	0	4	0	0	4	0	8
047 - Culpeper	2	110	0	2	31	0	145
049 - Cumberland	0	48	0	1	12	1	62
051 - Dickenson	0	107	0	1	15	7	130
053 - Dinwiddie	0	106	0	0	37	4	147
057 - Essex	0	40	0	1	21	1	63
059 - Fairfax County	0	1,079	7	30	250	49	1,415
061 - Fauquier	0	91	1	1	21	1	115
063 - Floyd	0	26	0	1	9	4	40
065 - Fluvanna	0	12	0	0	4	1	17
067 - Franklin County	0	164	0	13	40	8	225
069 - Frederick	0	56	1	0	29	5	91
071 - Giles	0	33	0	1	11	0	45
073 - Gloucester	0	71	1	2	22	4	100
075 - Goochland	0	28	0	1	10	0	39
077 - Grayson	0	48	0	0	18	3	69
079 - Greene	0	35	0	2	18	1	56
081 - Greensville	0	37	0	0	21	0	58
083 - Halifax	0	211	1	5	78	12	307
085 - Hanover	0	99	0	3	40	3	145
087 - Henrico	0	933	5	11	344	34	1,327
089 - Henry	0	235	0	5	114	18	372
093 - Isle of Wight	0	88	0	0	35	3	126
095 - James City	0	79	0	0	16	0	95



097 - King and Queen	0	17	0	0	4	0	21
099 - King George	0	25	0	2	5	1	33
101 - King William	0	34	0	1	5	0	40
103 - Lancaster	0	37	0	0	11	0	48
105 - Lee	0	207	2	3	75	35	322
107 - Loudoun	0	164	1	7	64	11	247
109 - Louisa	0	70	0	3	29	2	104
111 - Lunenburg	0	33	0	0	7	0	40
113 - Madison	0	24	0	1	5	1	31
115 - Mathews	0	20	0	0	4	0	24
117 - Mecklenburg	0	129	0	2	63	1	195
119 - Middlesex	0	24	0	1	10	2	37
121 - Montgomery	0	269	2	7	103	22	403
125 - Nelson	0	24	0	2	11	2	39
127 - New Kent	0	23	0	1	7	2	33
131 - Northampton	0	77	0	2	39	2	120
133 - Northumberland	0	30	0	0	9	0	39
135 - Nottoway	0	86	0	0	49	10	145
137 - Orange	0	53	0	1	24	4	82
139 - Page	0	28	1	1	13	7	50
141 - Patrick	0	77	0	8	44	24	153
143 - Pittsylvania	0	224	0	6	52	8	290
145 - Powhatan	0	32	0	1	4	1	38
147 - Prince Edward	0	94	0	2	54	11	161
149 - Prince George	0	67	0	2	17	2	88
153 - Prince William	0	776	1	23	278	25	1,103
155 - Pulaski	0	145	1	3	51	10	210
157 - Rappahannock	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
159 - Richmond County	0	20	0	1	15	1	37
161 - Roanoke County	0	202	0	2	67	11	282
163 - Rockbridge	0	31	0	0	14	1	46
165 - Rockingham	0	98	0	4	37	8	147
167 - Russell	0	204	1	10	67	13	295
169 - Scott	0	146	0	8	45	16	215
171 - Shenandoah	0	37	0	0	0	0	37
173 - Smyth	0	126	0	2	31	10	169
175 - Southampton	0	69	0	4	52	4	129
177 - Spotsylvania	0	158	1	2	75	9	245
179 - Stafford	0	189	1	3	46	0	239
181 - Surry	0	24	0	0	15	0	39
183 - Sussex	0	53	0	3	35	0	91
185 - Tazewell	0	274	0	7	91	20	392
187 - Warren	0	68	1	1	28	3	101
191 - Washington	0	137	0	4	49	15	205
193 - Westmoreland	0	66	0	0	12	3	81
195 - Wise	0	336	1	13	108	40	498
197 - Wythe	0	89	0	2	42	11	144
199 - York	0	53	0	1	23	5	82
510 - Alexandria	0	319	0	2	91	5	417

515 - Bedford City	0	42	0	0	14	2	58
520 - Bristol	0	127	1	6	73	21	228
530 - Buena Vista	0	12	0	0	5	0	17
540 - Charlottesville	0	195	2	4	109	8	318
550 - Chesapeake	0	784	0	4	341	6	1,135
570 - Colonial Height	0	50	0	1	19	1	71
580 - Covington	0	26	0	0	16	4	46
590 - Danville	0	426	1	2	200	10	639
595 - Emporia	0	58	0	0	27	4	89
600 - Fairfax City	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
620 - Franklin City	0	71	0	0	41	3	115
630 - Fredericksburg	0	78	1	3	67	2	151
640 - Galax	0	42	0	2	23	9	76
650 - Hampton	0	975	0	8	305	24	1,312
660 - Harrisonburg	0	97	1	8	43	14	163
670 - Hopewell	0	183	0	1	104	8	296
678 - Lexington	0	8	0	0	4	0	12
680 - Lynchburg	0	371	0	4	186	12	573
683 - Manassas	0	95	0	1	32	2	130
685 - Manassas Park	0	26	0	2	19	1	48
690 - Martinsville	0	115	0	0	62	3	180
700 - Newport News	0	1,209	0	10	487	29	1,735
710 - Norfolk	0	1,538	0	12	714	25	2,289
720 - Norton	0	30	0	0	22	2	54
730 - Petersburg	0	420	0	1	157	6	584
735 - Poquoson	0	8	0	0	3	0	11
740 - Portsmouth	0	1,097	0	8	443	12	1,560
750 - Radford	0	48	0	0	27	8	83
760 - Richmond City	0	2,002	4	24	1,016	33	3,079
770 - Roanoke City	0	810	4	16	262	34	1,126
790 - Staunton	0	93	1	4	46	7	151
800 - Suffolk	0	373	0	2	162	5	542
810 - Virginia Beach	0	889	0	8	245	24	1,166
820 - Waynesboro	0	132	0	1	37	1	171
830 - Williamsburg	0	14	0	1	9	2	26
840 - Winchester	0	71	0	4	32	0	107
Total	2	24,051	50	418	9,335	976	34,832

## **APPENDIX D – JLARC Recommendations on Self-Sufficiency**

## APPENDIX D – JLARC RECOMMENDATIONS ON SELF-SUFFICIENCY

These recommendations are instructive in that they offer suggestions about how to train and motivate VIEW recipients to obtain and maintain gainful employment, which in turn assists the Commonwealth with meeting mandated participation rates.

***Recommendation 1:*** *The General Assembly may wish to consider amending §63.2-609 of the Code of Virginia to exempt from TANF work requirements parents or caretakers who personally care for a child under 12 months of age instead of 18 months.*

- ***Emphasis on Addressing Barriers to Self-Sufficiency Could Have Longer-Term Outlook.*** Left unaddressed, barriers will likely continue to affect clients and threaten their ability to retain their jobs and further advance toward self-sufficiency. To foster better long-term outcomes, it may be necessary for the VIEW program to elevate the importance of addressing barriers to the level of participating in work activities. One method might be to allow case managers to impose sanctions for failure to comply with the activities listed in clients' service plans.
- ***Focus on Quality Job Placements Could Be Improved.*** Many clients remain underemployed and earn less than they need to adequately provide for their families. To improve the quality of VIEW participants' employment opportunities, the current employment focus of the program could be shifted to encompass job quality, and this shift could be reflected in program policies and practices.

***Recommendation 2:*** *The Secretary of Health and Human Resources and the Virginia DSS should adopt a dual employment focus for the VIEW program, emphasizing both expeditious job placement and job quality in order to ensure that more participants secure jobs that offer higher wages, opportunities for advancement with an employer, or access to viable career paths.*

***Recommendation 3:*** *Emphasis on Combining Job Placement with Training and Education Could Be Strengthened.*

The Secretaries of Health and Human Resources and Commerce and Trade should consider what factors have limited effective collaboration between the social services system and the Virginia Workforce Network and what measures can be taken to develop an effective partnership in order to provide more VIEW participants with existing information about job opportunities and career development.

***Recommendation 4:*** *The General Assembly may wish to consider establishing a pilot project in which the statutory requirement placing priority on obtaining full-time employment would be waived, and VIEW participants would be allowed the flexibility to divide their 30-hour participation requirement between work and up to ten hours of training or education.*

***Recommendation 5:*** *The Virginia Department of Social Services should (1) encourage local departments to raise awareness of workforce center services among VIEW participants; and (2) require the development of a long-term education and training plan for all VIEW participants.*

***Recommendation 6:*** *The Secretaries of Health and Human Resources, Commerce and Trade, and Education should consider measures the State can take to increase short-term training programs through workforce centers or other entities that would be available to current and former clients of the social services system to enhance their skills and provide them with a greater opportunity to obtain quality jobs.*

- ***Focus on Self-Sufficiency Could Be Expanded Beyond TANF Recipients.*** It appears that clients, who do not receive cash assistance, are also experiencing long-term difficulties that preclude them from securing jobs that pay self-sufficient wages, and a quarter of these families eventually come to rely on TANF benefits.
- ***Shift in Priorities and Resources Would Be Needed to Establish Self-Sufficiency as a Goal for All Recipients.*** One argument in favor of providing such services is that most families receiving government assistance appear unable to attain self-sufficiency on their own and likely will continue to rely on various government programs if they do not receive support services.
- ***Personal Accountability Could Be Emphasized.*** While the federal government has not granted states the flexibility to impose work requirements upon benefit recipients who do not participate in TANF, Virginia could choose to make cooperation with DCSE a condition of eligibility for Food Stamp and Child Care Subsidy benefits.

***Recommendation 7:*** *The General Assembly may wish to consider whether the Code of Virginia should be amended to require participants in the Food Stamp and Child Care Subsidy programs to cooperate with the Division of Child Support Enforcement as a condition of program participation, as is currently required of participants in the TANF program.*

- Providing Assessment and Service Referrals Could Help Clients Overcome Barriers to Self-Sufficiency.
- Job Placement and Career Advancement Initiatives Could Help Clients Advance Closer to Self-Sufficiency.

***Recommendation 8:*** *The Secretary of Health and Human Resources and VDSS should develop a pilot project with the FSET.*

In the pilot, the intensity of services provided through the FSET program would be increased to the level provided through the VIEW program, and participation would be expanded to all Food Stamp recipients who choose to volunteer for the program. The pilot project should include an evaluation component to assess program costs and effectiveness, and to provide a basis upon which to evaluate whether statewide expansion should be pursued.

***Recommendation:*** *The Secretaries of Health and Human Resources and Commerce and Trade should consider barriers to collaboration between the social services system and the Virginia Workforce Network.*

These organization should also consider what measures can be taken to develop an effective partnership in order to provide more non-VIEW clients with (1) existing information about job

opportunities and career development; and (2) career guidance and access to training or education that are not available through the social services system.

***Recommendation 10: Underutilized Tax Credits Could Advance Social Services Clients Closer to Self-Sufficiency.***

- If the families who receive financial assistance through DSS claimed each tax credit for which they are eligible, their average annual resources could increase by thousands of dollars. This increase in resources would benefit clients and the State by:
  - Raising the proportion of families who reduce their reliance on government assistance;
  - Lifting more families out of poverty and above the Self-Sufficiency Standard; and
  - Bringing a substantial amount of additional federal dollars into the State's economy.
  
- To increase the proportion of eligible families who receive tax credits, the State could follow a two-pronged approach:
  - Raise awareness among clients of the social services system about the existence and benefits of tax credits; and
  - Link potentially eligible clients with tax preparation services.

***Recommendation 10. The General Assembly may wish to consider amending §58.1-3 of the Code of Virginia to expand the authority of the Tax Commissioner to share with the Virginia Department of Social Services information about its clients' filing status, number and type of dependents, and whether they have claimed the federal Earned Income Tax Credit.***

While a lack of awareness may be a significant factor preventing Virginia low-income families from claiming tax credits, another barrier may be the lack of access to tax preparation assistance. Although free tax preparation sites administered by volunteers are the best option for low-income families who need guidance, these sites would not be able to meet the demand that would likely result from a strong outreach effort to DSS clients. To increase the number of free tax sites, additional volunteers would have to be recruited in areas that are currently underserved. Because of the potential benefits that their clients could derive from obtaining tax credits, DSS should use its staff to identify and contact potentially eligible clients, and lead a statewide recruitment campaign that would target volunteers from all potential private and public sources.

***Recommendation 11. The Secretary of Health and Human Resources and the Virginia Department of Social Services should continue to make Earned Income Tax Credit outreach an agency priority.***

The Department of Social Services should allocate existing State staff as needed to make the necessary contacts with families who may be eligible for the federal tax credit and to recruit volunteers who can provide tax preparation support to those filers seeking to claim the credit. The Department of Social Services should develop and present a plan for conducting this outreach to the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Finance Committee by September 1, 2006, and begin outreach efforts for the 2006 tax year.