

Performance Measurement Counties

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 13, 2005

COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES

Jaswinder Sra, Fresno County
Martha Jue, Fresno County
Laura Maxwell, Fresno County
Lydia Ventura, Los Angeles County
Jan Bradley, Merced County
Freda Escobar, Monterey County
Carol Kochevar, Riverside County
Judy Pisel, Sacramento County
Linda Nelson, San Bernardino
Rosalie Roca, San Francisco County
Lynette Marston, San Joaquin County
Gillermo Caceres, Santa Clara
Nancie Monson, Solano County
Rob Biesemeier, Stanislaus County
Arlene Gutierrez, Ventura County
Don Aguirre, Ventura County

CDSS STAFF PRESENT

Joeana Carpenter
Ed Flores
Hector Hernandez
Karen Kennedy
Nathan Morris
Kim Murdock
Donna Portee
Diane Tanaka
Helen Tsuchida
Frank Andersen

Food and Nutrition Service

Jaime Ortega
Virginia Lugo

ECLIPSE SOLUTIONS

Alex Castro

1. Call to Order

Joeana Carpenter

Joeana Carpenter called the PMC meeting to order at approximately 10:00 AM.

2. Introductions

Joeana Carpenter, Karen Kennedy, Anna Capetillo, Hector Hernandez

- New staff members from the Federal Data Reporting and Analysis Bureau (FDRAB) and were introduced.
- Hector announced Steve Hemmerling is the new manager replacing John Moist who is retiring. Steve Hemmerling is expected to start by October 1.
- Anna introduced her new staff member, Helen Tsuchida, who will be working on Food Stamps. Helen will take over Jim Anderson's Food Stamp responsibilities, since Jim is leaving at the end of the year.

3. Review and Approval of April 19th Meeting Minutes

Joeana Carpenter

Counties were informed that hard copies of the previous meeting's minutes would no longer be passed out at PMC. Electronic copies will be available on the CDSS website and e-mailed to those in the Q5 users group. Any changes that need to be made to the meeting minutes can be submitted to Joeana before or at the next PMC Meeting.

There was a move to accept the April 19th, 2005 meeting minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

The meeting format of the PMC Meetings was discussed with the counties. It was decided to continue the present format, with the state and counties meeting in the morning and early afternoon, and the counties meeting by themselves directly following the state and county meeting. The PMC meetings will be held every other month.

4. Backing up Q5i Data

Kim Murdock

It is essential to back up Q5i daily, especially before moving a computer or moving files to a new computer system. An example of what can happen occurred recently when a county was moving a supervisor. The county had worked several June cases before moving the supervisor's computer. Unfortunately, Q5i had not been backed up before the computer was moved. They loaded Q5i onto a new computer, which caused them to lose all 30 cases they had worked. San Diego county also moved without backing up. They lost all files back to 1998.

The following suggestions were made in order to prevent loss of cases:

- Work with your IT support to ensure backups are made daily.
- Back up Q5i files before moving Q5i to a new computer.
- The state to provide alternative for backup if county doesn't have the capability of backing up files.

There were several questions about how to backup Q5. It was suggested that if a county does not have a backup system, to work with Kim Murdock to develop one.

5. TANF Enterprise Update and Review of Suggestions

Alex Castro

A project status report was given by project manager, Alex Castro, for the RADEP project. Since the last PMC meeting, the letters of intent to bid arrived, vendors provided draft proposals, confidential discussions were held with interested vendors, and vendors submitted final proposals. The cut off for the final proposals was August 31st. Wednesday, September 14th the vendor will be chosen. By Wednesday afternoon the RADEP team should have the letter of intent for the chosen vendor to develop RADEP.

The RADEP team will be working on conducting use case validation with Subject Matter Experts (SME), completing business rules validation, and developing preliminary traceability and test plan. The county QC managers gave many valuable suggestions and are encouraged to continue sending their suggestions in. (See handout)

The RADEP project is currently on schedule, with an anticipated completion date of September 2006. In the last meeting counties were asked to volunteer to send SME's to participate in the use case validation. The following counties agreed to supply SME's for the coming week: San Bernardino, Riverside, Fresno, Stanislaus, and Monterey. There will be many more opportunities for counties to be involved. FNS was invited to participate also. (See [Handout 1](#)).

6. Two-parent –Separate State Program (SSP)/Maintenance of Effort (MOE) “T48” Coding Template

Karen Kennedy, Ed Flores

Ed Flores reported that all counties are improving in coding SSP/MOE cases. The T48 coding template, which was provided as a handout, is an experiment to see if using a coding template would help counties with coding SSP/MOE

cases. It appears to be working well. The template is currently being revised to reflect the following points:

- Code 01 (disregarded from the rate calculation due to a child under 12 months of age) cannot be used in SSP/MOE cases.
- Counties are doing well at combining hours of participation. If one parent meets the 35 hour requirement or both meet the 35 hour requirement when their hours are combined, then you can code each as 19.
- Code 09 (domestic violence) can be used in SSP/MOE cases.
- Codes 15 and 16 are changing in that if one parent meets code 15 or code 16 then counties will be instructed to code only that parent with the code. That is, both parents cannot be coded 15 or 16 just because one of the parents can receive that code.
- Code 07 should be used for a pregnant mother rather than code 11 in TANF and SSP/MOE cases.

We are still determining whether additional changes need to be made to the template, so we welcome any comments or ideas from the counties on how to make the template more user friendly. (See [Handout 2](#)).

7. NAPIPM Conference ***Karen Kennedy***

At the end of August, Karen Kennedy attended the National Association for Program Information and Performance Measurement (NAPIPM) Professional Development Conference in Greensboro, North Carolina. Individuals concerned with performance measurement, including Quality Control staff from different states, as well as federal staff, presented workshops and attended the conference. The workshops Karen attended were on:

- TANF reauthorization;
- TANF penalties;
- National Directory of New Hires (NDNH); and
- Improper payments in TANF.

TANF Reauthorization

The workshop presenter indicated that the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) was fairly optimistic that TANF Reauthorization would occur this year. ACF is currently working on modifications to the TANF regulations, based on both the House and Senate versions of TANF Reauthorization as well as a version that is not dependent on program changes due to Reauthorization. As a result, the presenter reported that ACF felt fairly confident that in the next six months a package of TANF regulation modifications would be released. Karen also reported that since the NAPIPM Conference, Congress has passed a bill that would reauthorize TANF through October 31, 2005, most likely due to the Hurricane Katrina.

The presenter also reported that there are some areas in the TANF regulations that the ACF sees as problematic. In addition, the General Accounting Office recently released a report on work participation in the TANF Program which identified specific states that could be considered to be over-stepping the flexibility provided to states in the current law, especially related to work activities. For example, some states are including participation in massages as job readiness. ACF believes that job search may be further regulated to ensure

supervision of the participant.

TANF Penalties

The presenter reported that states are pushing the envelope in many areas and stressed that ACF could impose more penalties than are currently being imposed. ACF is currently focusing only on states that appear to be intentionally violating the law. For example, one state used TANF funds to match federal Title IV-E funds and was penalized.

ACF is using the findings from the Single State Audits to determine if states should be penalized. A program supplement has been added to the audit that requires the auditor to review case files to determine compliance with program requirements and data reporting.

ACF staff also further reported that many Single State Audits do not contain any findings; ACF is looking closer at these audits to determine if auditors are actually completing all the activities required of a Single State Audit.

ACF staff identified the area of documentation of actual hours of participation as an area of concern. Documentation is an integral component of an audit. From an auditor's perspective, if the information is not documented in the file, the activity or event has not occurred. Additionally, assigned activities do not provide assurance that they actually occurred.

In addition, ACF has determined that many of the current TANF data elements are not used a great deal - mostly characteristic data. As a result, ACF might decide to collect less or different data. Martha Jue asked whether the counties would be able to review the proposed regulations. Karen responded that the proposed regulations are published in the Federal Register, that they usually provide an adequate comment period, and clarified that the regulations have not been published yet.

While most penalties are imposed for misuse of funds, failure to report accurate and timely data occurs often. When this occurs, ACF notifies the appropriate region every quarter via email. This email is forwarded to the state by the regional representatives.

National Directory of New hires

The National Directory of New Hires (NDNH) was created as a result of Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). It aides in the collection of child support by requiring employers to report newly hired employees within 10 day of employment.

The federal government is now making the NDNH data available to states. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has piloted the program in Washington, D. C. and Georgia. By using the new hire data, Georgia was able to improve their participation rates by eight percent. One of the reasons Washington, D.C. had such good results was because they did not have a preexisting new hire database. Access to this data would give the State of California new hire information two to three months sooner than it currently receives the information. ACF is interested in making the database available to states. However, there are significant costs associated with accessing the database. The state of California is considering entering into a pilot to see how much the data would improve the state's federal work participation rate.

The question was asked about whether the NDNH database is any different from the state new hire report. Karen responded that the NDNH database includes many large employers whose headquarters are located out-of-state and federal employees that may be missing from the state new hire report initially. Currently the state is solely assessing the cost/benefit.

Virginia Lugo (FNS) asked whether the state is considering using NDNH for TANF and Food Stamps. The answer was that currently there is no funding for Food Stamps; however, FNS has included funding in the budget for next year

for access to the NDNH.

Improper payments in TANF

The Improper Payments Act of 2002, which requires federal specified programs to identify all payments that should not have been issued or were issued in an incorrect amount. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is implementing this Act and has requested ACF to support this act even though ACF does not believe there is authority for the collection of this information in the TANF program. As a result, ACF has developed a voluntary survey for states, which was previously distributed to states. California did not participate in that survey. Because participation in the survey was voluntary and not many states participated, ACF is planning on distributing it again. ACF has taken a 3 pronged approach to be more supportive of OMB and the Improper Payments Act of 2002:

- Send out survey to states;
- Expand auditing requirements; and
- Promote participation in Public Assistance Reporting Information System (PARIS)

There are 24 states currently using PARIS, but the ACF is trying to make PARIS available to more states. Karen has a copy of the survey if anyone would like to look at it. If you have any questions you can call Karen Kennedy at (916) 657-3400.

Food Stamps

Martha Jue asked if anyone had seen the QC policy integrity memo. Virginia Lugo explained that the memo came out of several arbitrated cases that were thrown out because of bias. One was a California case that involved a QC worker who got information from an eligibility worker about how the eligibility worker made the eligibility determination for the specific case. The QC reviewer went out and found that the GR benefit was on hold. The QC had the GR released. This made the issuance incorrect. The federal statisticians do not like the error review committee's decision. They would also like to see that the error review committees are not just looking at errors. Cases that would have been incorrect if not for Comp 1. Martha Jue wanted to know how talking with a worker is biasing the sample. Virginia Lugo responded that the QC is supposed to be independent, they are not supposed to talk to eligibility worker.

8. Food Stamp Sample

Anna Capetillo

The manager of the Trend Analysis Unit, Anna Capetillo, introduced herself. One of her main responsibilities is the Food Stamp. Helen Tsuchida was introduced as the new Food Stamp statistician. Jim Anderson is still working with the unit, but he will finish by the end of December. SARS is the Statewide Automated Reporting System. Last PMC meeting Anna attended, she discussed the idea of using SARS for the Food Stamp universe. SARS is federally mandated, and consists of all FS issuances and is reconciled daily.

The current system, County Performance System (CPS), has been in place for 15 years. The Trend Analysis Unit is assessing SARS as a replacement for CPS. First, however, they are running parallel testing on CPS and SARS to see if the universes would look the same. The time frame for switching could be as early as the October sample month. First, however, Anna's unit will do more testing. It will then show the difference in systems and present the findings to management, share them with CWDA, and present them to FNS.

Anna noted the parallel test had identified incomplete Food Stamp universes in three counties. The different scenarios for one small, one medium, and one extra large county were given.

Small County

- The small county was the first CalWIN county to begin converting. However, the software was not produced timely enough. For this reason, it was decided to remove the county from the statewide universe and do it manually. This happened for 3 months. However, after removing the county from the statewide universe, the county was not added back into the statewide universe.
- As a result 3 additional terminated cases were identified for this county.

Medium County

- Informed FDRAB that the software used to produce the secondary universe file includes only one issuance record per case.
- FDRAB universe specifications require the file include as separate records the multiple issuances to a case during the month.
- Due to this programming error, thirty supplemental FS State Secondary sample cases needed for the period of October to May 2005 sample months.
- Twelve of the thirty are NSTR.

Large County—Two Problems

- County's IT notified FDRAB of a problem with their software program used to produce the secondary universe files. The sample month was erroneously placed in the effective month field for issuance record.
- Large County IT was incorrectly excluding "non-restoration" issuances from the FS secondary universe.
- FDRAB requested "raw" universe files and reconstructed both the secondary and terminated universes for the October 2004 to May 2005 period.
- Fifty-five secondary Federal cases have been identified for the active supplemental sample. However, because 75% of the secondary sample cases should be retroactive issuances and therefore not subject to review, only 14 cases will be subject to review.
- We identified 54 termination cases for these 9 months, of which about 17 will be reviewed.

The need for there to be good communication between QC and IT departments was highly stressed. What may look like a simple file, if altered, could cause a very large increase in workload to correct. It was suggested that counties have their IT and administration meet together before any changes are made to file specifications. Anna also asked counties to contact her or her staff regarding any planned changes at the county level.

The Food Stamp Plan is a document completed yearly. These are the specifications used to develop the universe. FNS audits the Federal Data Reporting and Analysis Bureau and reviews files from counties.

9. Food Stamps *Hector Hernandez*

Start with Questions from northern and central meetings. Then do food stamps

Question #1

- There still appear to be some confusion about the completion of TFS cases in which the client has failed or refuses to cooperate with face-to-face interview. During PMC which took place 4/19/05 Virginia Lugo had stated that cases that had been completed without the face to face would be returned to the counties. Could you please verify with Virginia to clarify if all case completed without a face to face would be returned, or only those cases in which it was not established that the

client had failed or refused to cooperate?

Answer

- Virginia responded that you must go through the steps. If you go through all the steps you can complete the case if have refusal to interview. However, you cannot complete the case if no face-to-face has been done.

Question #2

- One of the counties has not been allowed to discontinue TFS cases when client is non-coop/refusal. The county stated that their policy person has talked to a state policy person, who has stated that TFS cases can not be discontinued. Hopefully at the meeting this county will have the name of the state policy person. QC has presented to their policy the QC memo which states that TFS case can be discontinued for non-coop/refusal as there is no change to current policy. The county policy person is not accepting the QC memo (attaching for your convenience) and sought answer from the state. How can we assist this county? Could you ask that Leanna Torres, or whomever, issue an ACL/ACIN or something that is specific to QC cooperation and when a case can be discontinued?

Answer

- Hector will take the question to the correct person and get an answer.

Question #3

- State assistance in conducting courtesy face-to-face interviews, in state reviews, for sampled cases whose clients move to a non-PMC county.

Answer

- Hector doesn't have the staff. When PMC started in the mid 90's FOB and counties were set up differently and FOB had one staff consultant for each county. They can not assist with all the state cases, but they can do all the federal cases.
- After some more discussion, Hector agreed to review the number of face-to-face interviews that the counties have. It was agreed that each of the 19 counties would email Hector with the number of state face-to-face interviews that they have done in the last 12 months and what counties they went to. The counties should also email Hector if they had zero face-to-face interviews in the last 12 months. Hector needs a response within the next 30 days.

Question #4

- FNS 310 Section 722. I believe it has been verbally confirmed that this section applies to QR/PB households. Is anything going to be issued in writing? We understand that Michael has been working on a transmittal that would include FNS 310, 722, and 1063 sections. Could you please update us on the status?

Answer

- Still waiting for Richard to review.

Question #5

- When a review contains unreported income, is Comparison II

completed, and if so, what income is used? I am thinking that we would need to verify the Data Month income and use that. We would then report the lesser of Comp I or II as a final QC determination.

Answer

- Hector will check with Mike. This kind of question is better for Michael to have in writing--with enough lead time to research it. Martha agreed to send the question in writing.

Question #6

- Is a memo usually issued letting the counties know which FFY of reviews can be disposed. Somewhere I heard that a FFY is to be kept for three years. Could you please clarify?

Answer

- It is OK to dispose of reviews if there are no litigation or settlement issues. We will look it up the policy and email you [Martha Jue].

Question #7

- On state re-reviews of federal cases there is a policy that the FOB has to acknowledge the receipt of cases. Why is the policy not being followed?

Answer

- Hector will follow up.

Question # 8

- There is a policy that on state re-reviews of federal cases FOB will give written input to PMC Supervisor within 5 working days of receipt of the case.

Answer

- Hector will talk to Richard about it.

Question #9

- When the case contains an Undocumented individual, is QC mandated to call for an IEVS on a SSN that does not belong to them (fake). I thought I heard from another county that Giv (Management Eval.) had stated that we should not be calling IEVS on those types of numbers. Could you please verify? It makes sense since we would be accessing another person's information.

Answer

- Giv does not work in QC, please contact Richard or Michael.

Question #10

- Whether or not to send drop cases to Jaime Ortega.

Answer

- Send both the negative completes to and the negative drops to Jaime.

Question # 11

- Could the counties get the error rate on a county (not state) level?

Answer

- The information on the error rates has been given to Hector's organization. FOB is planning on presenting the information shortly.

Question # 12

- Does the state report back to counties the final error rate?

Answer

- The error rates are released with the disposition report. Make sure that you monitor your disposition reports. Call Jim Anderson or Anna Capetillo right away if any information is incorrect.

10. Scheduling of Next PMC Meeting

Joeana Carpenter

The next PMC meeting was scheduled for November 15. The meeting was then closed by Joeana Carpenter.

Action Items

- Back up Q5i data on a daily basis (counties).
- Submit suggestions for T48 coding template (counties)
- Hector will take the question about TFS cases and get an answer (Hector).
- Each of the 19 counties needs to email Hector with the number of state face-to-face interviews that they have done in the last 12 months and what counties they went to. The counties that had no face-to-face interviews in the last 12 months should also email Hector. Hector needs a response within the next 30 days (counties/Hector).
- Follow up with Mike on the question about when a review contains unreported income (Hector).
- Martha Jue will be emailed an answer to her question about a policy on when reviews can be disposed of (Joeana).
- Follow up on the acknowledgement of receipt of cases for state re-reviews of federal cases (Hector).
- Talk to Richard about the written input to PMC Supervisor within 5 working days of receipt of the case on state re-reviews of federal cases (Hector).

<<Handout 1>>

Slide 1

RADEP I Project Update

September 13, 2005

Project Status

- Major Vendor Procurement Milestones Reached
 - RFP released on June 6, 2005
 - Bidders conference June 22, 2005
 - Letters of Intent to Bid June 29, 2005
 - Draft proposals submitted July 21, 2005
 - Confidential Discussions Week of August 15, 2005
 - Final Proposals August 31, 2005
 - Vendor Selection Week of September 5, 2005
- Major Project Milestones Reached
 - Preliminary Use Cases completed
 - Edits have been validated
 - Process Model completed
 - Physical system architecture validated

RADEP I Team Activities

- **Conduct Use Case Validations with SME's**
(Use Case describes a sequence of actions that provide something of measurable value)
- **Complete business rules validation**
- **Develop preliminary traceability and test plan**

Subject Matter Expert Support in Use Case Validation

- Provide feedback for the process flow of QC activities.
- Assist the RADEP team in understanding County workflow conditions.
- Ensure that the documentation reflects how Case Reviewer function interacts with the system.
- Provide alternatives for how the system would interact with the Case Reviewer.

Suggestions from County QC Managers - Stanislaus

- Streamline – Combine areas/categorize
 - Income all in 1 screen
 - Property / Resources 1 screen
 - Deductions 1 screen
 - Combine Employment Classes 160 to 165
- Individual Demographics
- Combine Class 110 – 111 – 130
- Eliminate unnecessary and outdated questions
- Vehicles Class 222
- Enable Tab/Enter without using the mouse to enter information
- More User Friendly

Suggestions from County QC Managers - Fresno

- Spell check.
- Ability to print from (one system).
- References in definition are not up to date.
- Make the face-sheet instructions available.
- In class 150 list SHH and not as unknown. If unknown must remain, then add SHH as an option.
- Reduce duplicate items in 363 (363-0029).
- Ability to delete persons on face-sheet when added inadvertently.

Suggestions from County QC Managers - Merced

- **Class 110/130**
 - The race and gender shall be together in one class. Maybe remove gender from class 130 and add it to class 110.
 - If someone is listed as an undocumented person on the front sheet could it pre-populate all additional fields where this person is listed.
- **Class 140**
 - We can not use it so delete it totally.
- **Class 151i/160i**
 - These 2 classes has to do with disqualification. Maybe we can combine into one and if we answer yes to any of the person then it will bring up the next question. If we answer no or leave it blank then we can stop there.
 - Class 211, this is the bank acct information. Maybe we can hide this class, gosh! What is the word. For example if we answer "YES" to question 010-0025, cat eligible then this class will stays hidden. If we answer "NO" to the question when it will bring up class 211. Also we can combine class 211/213.
- **Class 222i**, we don't use it anymore, delete.
- **Class 311, 312 and 314** shall be in the same page or class. *
- **Class 321i and 323i, 365 & 366**, these have to do with deduction. Can we combine these into one? *
- **Class 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336 and 346**.....they all have to do with unearned income. Possible combine them into one. *
- * can we have drop down boxes and hyperlinks. Can this information be pre-populated to a particular person.
- **Class 363/364**.....rent and SUA, shall be in the same class or page.
- **Class 371/372**.....into one.
- **Class 520/530 into one.**
 - If the case is ineligible in one element can the new system allow us to stop there without the case not passing edits.
- Can we eliminate the 600 series.
- We need to be able to edit the front page i.e If we mistakenly add someone and need to remove.
- We need spell check.
- **TAN 2**
- **T13 thru 16**.....why do we need to have them? If not them remove it.
- **TAN3**...adult level
- **The questions T36a thru 36E, T40 & T40A, T41, T44 thru T65G** should reflect how we answer to T30. For example if T30 code 1, member in AU or 2 sanction parents then the system will bring all these extra items. Undoc parents, noneedy or other then we need to go no further.
- What I really like to see if just like in C-IV or magic with the root questions. When we answer "YES" to a question then it will trigger the system to bring up the next level of items that need to be completed.

Questions

T48 Coding Template for Separate State Program (SSP), i.e., 2-Parent, State Funded, Cases

- Beginnng notes: -These T48 codes are not applicable for SSP cases: 01, 06, 07, 09, 17.
 -T48 is left blank for each parent who is not in the AU.
 -Teen means 19 years old or younger.
 -Code 11 (exempt other) is used for a pregnant woman pursuant to MPP 42-712.48. (Unless she qualifies for code 19).

Question #	Questions	Yes	No
#1	Is this a Separate State Program (2-parent) Case?		
#2	Is there at least one aided adult in the Assistance Unit (AU)?		
Step 1	If "yes" to both #1 and #2, then proceed to Question #3. (Note: If #2 is "no," then leave T48 <u>blank</u> for both parents which completes T48 coding).		
#3	Is the Sum of T49, T50, T51, T52, T53, T54, T55,T56 and T60 equal to or greater than 35 hours for either one or both of the aided adults either individually or <u>when hours for both are combined</u> ?		
Step 2	If #3 is "yes," then code T48 as "19" for <u>both parents</u> in the AU. If "no" then proceed to Question #4.		
#4	Is the Sum of T49, T50, T51, T52, T53, T54, T55,T56 and T60 total to at least 30 hours but less than 35 hours for either one or both of the aided adults either individually or <u>when hours from both are combined</u> ?		
#5	Are the hours from question #4 and the sum of T57, T58, and T59 equal to or greater than 35 hours for either one or both of the aided adults either individually or <u>when hours from both are combined</u> ?		
Step 3	If "yes" to both #4 and #5, code T48 as "19" for <u>both parents</u> . If "no," then proceed to Question #6 AND, <u>henceforth, apply each question to each parent in the AU.</u>		Parent 1 yes no
#6	Are the hours in T59 greater than "0"?		
#7	Is the parent a married teen?		
Step 4	If "yes" to both #6, and #7, code T48 as "15" for <u>both parents</u> . If "no," then proceed to Question #8.		Parent 2 yes no
#8	Is the sum of T57 and T58 equal to or greater than 20 hours for the parent?		

#9	Is the parent a married teen?				
Step 5	If "yes" to both #8 and #9, code T48 as "16" for <u>both</u> parents. If "no," then proceed to Question #10 for the parent(s) for whom "no" applies.	Parent 1 yes no	Parent 2 yes no		
#10	Is the Sum of T49, T50, T51, T52, T53, T54, T55, T56, T57, T58, T59, T60 greater than 0 hours but not enough to use code 19? Or, are there hours in only T61 and/or T62?				
Step 6	If "yes" to #10," code T48 as "18" for that parent. If "no," then proceed to Question #11 for the parent(s) for whom "no" applies.				
Step 6 Cont'd	Step 6 continued.	Parent 1 yes no	Parent 2 yes no		
#11	Is the Sum of T49, T50, T51, T52, T53, T54, T55, T56, T57, T58, T59, T60, T61, and T62 equal to 0 hours?				
#12	Is the adult caring for a severely disabled child?				
Step 7	If "yes" to both #11 and #12, code T48 as "08" for only this adult. If "no," then proceed to Question #13 for the parent(s) for whom "no" applies. Note: only one adult can be coded "08."	Parent 1 yes no	Parent 2 yes no		
#13	Is the Sum of T49, T50, T51, T52, T53, T54, T55, T56, T57, T58, T59, T60, T61, and T62 equal to 0 hours?				
#14	Is the adult exempted from work participation for any other reason, e.g., pregnant pursuant to MPP 42-712.48? (Unless she qualifies for code 19).				
Step 8	If "yes" to both #13 and #14, then code T48 as "11," for that parent.* If "no," then code T48 as "14" for the parent(s) for whom "no" applies because the parent does not qualify for any other applicable code.				

End notes: SSP cases remain in the SSP-MOE caseload for sampling purposes even when one or both parents have timed-out or are WTW sanctioned.

*Note the reason for code #11 in the comments section of the Q5i.