

## **SNAP Workload Management Matrix**

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) is aware that State agencies are struggling to cope with mounting caseloads as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is responding to growing needs for food assistance. The Workload Management Matrix has been developed as a tool for States that identifies workload management strategies during a time of increasing participation and reduced resources. The strategies in this tool vary in cost and complexity, giving States the option to choose the policy or procedure that addresses their unique circumstances. The Workload Management Matrix contains four areas of focus:

- Policies and procedures for managing workloads;
- Advantages and considerations for each policy or procedure;
- States that are currently using the identified policy or procedure;
- The cost of implementing the strategy, identified by a \$ symbol for higher cost and ¢ symbol for lower cost.

An important aspect of the matrix is the inclusion of States who have already used a particular strategy to improve administration of SNAP; if a State is interested in a particular strategy, they can contact their Regional representative or go directly to the State that has already implemented a strategy of interest for more information.

**SNAP Workload Management Matrix**

1	Policies	Advantages	Considerations	Localities/States (As of 12/29/08; refer to FNS Waiver Database for additions after this date)
<b>A</b>	Break in Service Waiver (i.e. if client's case was closed and they return to agency within certification period they can have case reopened without new application) ϕ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good customer service</li> <li>• Less work for case workers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must receive waiver from FNS</li> <li>• Relatively easy to develop and implement</li> </ul>	DE, PA, NE, OR (for returned mail only), WA (for returned mail only), WI
<b>B</b>	Align SNAP reporting requirements by allowing households to report changes by the 10 <sup>th</sup> day of the month following the month in which the change occurred. ϕ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good customer service by allowing more time to report changes and reducing confusion about different requirements for affected households.</li> <li>• May allows more time for workers to act on changes</li> <li>• Administrative simplification by applying uniform reporting timeframes.</li> <li>• May result in fewer errors</li> <li>• Achieve efficiencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires waiver from FNS for non-SR households</li> <li>• Able to manage workload over longer period of time</li> </ul>	AL, AZ, DC, DE, GU, ID, KY, MN, MO, NH, PA, SC, VT, WA,

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

<b>1</b> <b>Policies</b> (¢ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Localities/States</b> (As of 12/29/08; refer to FNS Waiver Database for additions after this date)
<b>C</b> Deny an application before the 30 <sup>th</sup> day, if the HH does not respond to request for verification within 10 days  ¢	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces the number of pending cases on a worker's desk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early denial may deter applicants from completing the application process</li> <li>Requires waiver from FNS. Waivers may be approved by FNS Regional Offices without further National Office processing.</li> </ul>	AK, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, ID, IL, KS, LA, MA, ME, MI, NH, NY, TN, VT, WA, WY
<b>D</b> Self-Employment Deduction Standard  ¢	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simplification—easier for workers to budget/fewer computational errors</li> <li>Less hassle for clients (don't have to provide as much verification)</li> <li>Workers don't have to itemize</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowed by regulations; must be cost neutral</li> <li>Requires approval from FNS for standard</li> <li>Can use standard used for TANF program</li> <li>Clients with higher expenses may receive fewer benefits</li> </ul>	CA, DE, GA, IN, KS, MD, MI, OR, SD, UT, WY

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

<b>1</b> <b>Policies</b> (€ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Localities/States</b> (As of 12/29/08; refer to FNS Waiver Database for additions after this date)
<b>E</b> SSI CAP €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplification</li> <li>• Increases number of eligible persons</li> <li>• Workers don't have to verify utility expenses</li> <li>• No individual utility expense determination-simplifies budgeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires waiver from FNS</li> </ul>	AZ, FL, KY, LA, MA, MI, MS, NC, NJ, NY, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, WA, WI
<b>F</b> Simplify/Streamline Application & Client Communication €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier for clients to apply</li> <li>• Easier for workers to conduct interviews based on information on application</li> <li>• Less confusion for both workers and clients</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workers need to cover areas more thoroughly that are no longer covered in application</li> <li>• Takes time to develop and train</li> </ul>	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CT, DC, GA, HI, IA, IL, KY, LA, MD, MI, MO, NC, ND, NM, OH, OK, OR, RI, SD, WA, WI, WV
<b>G</b> Simplify/Streamline Verifications Required of Clients €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces amount of verification States require</li> <li>• Can minimize under current regulations</li> <li>• Assists in improving timeliness and making the application process more efficient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May impact payment accuracy rate</li> <li>• Mandatory items still apply</li> <li>• Consider regulation options to re-evaluate States' policy on verification</li> </ul>	FL, MO, OR

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

2 Procedures: Phones (€= Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	Advantages	Considerations	Localities/States (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
<p><b>A</b></p> <p>Automated Voice Response System <b>\$</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides 24/7 access to information about program</li> <li>Can be set up to accept changes</li> <li>Workers aren't interrupted to answer basic questions (i.e. When will my benefits be issued? What are office hours?)</li> <li>Can auto call and remind clients of interviews (AZ)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programming needed to enter information directly into system</li> <li>Needs to work seamlessly with automated system for best results</li> </ul>	<p>AZ, CA counties (Alameda, San Mateo, Stanislaus, and piloting in three cities serving the San Gabriel Valley District Office in Los Angeles Co.), CT, DC, FL, GA, ID (pilot only), IL, MO, NY, PA UT, VT, WV</p>
<p><b>B</b></p> <p>Call Centers: Centers can range from intake to change reporting to general information such as office hours. For more extensive information please refer to the Keys to Modernization and the Keys to Payment Accuracy <b>€-\$</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caseworkers can focus on processing applications and primary case work</li> <li>Clients can access person/ immediate assistance</li> <li>Comprehensive call centers with electronic case filing may distribute work across the State.</li> <li>Contributes to workload management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Call centers must be set up to function effectively:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- Customers must know to call the center and not the worker.</li> <li>-- Call center workers must be well-trained</li> <li>-- Calls must be answered timely</li> </ul> </li> <li>Call centers can focus on general information or be as specific as needed</li> <li>Ensure that center has sufficient capacity to handle work load.</li> <li>Use call center software to measure call volume and distribute work effectively and efficiently</li> </ul>	<p>AZ, CA (Los Angeles County), CO (some counties), DC, DE, FL, GA, ID (pilot only), IN, LA, Brockton, MA, MD (Baltimore City, Baltimore County), MI (Wayne County), NV, NY (Onondaga County), OH (Montgomery County, Franklin County), OK, PA, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA (Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Prince William County), WA, WI (Dane County, Lacrosse County, Milwaukee County), WV</p>

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

2	Procedures: Phones (☒ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	Advantages	Considerations	Localities/States (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
C	Telephone Interviews ☒	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces no-show rate</li> <li>• More convenient for clients, particularly those who work</li> <li>• Fewer customers in lobby</li> <li>• Allows for expansion of service hours</li> <li>• Allows for teleworking</li> <li>• Potential to improve service timeliness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workers require special training</li> <li>• Can be initiated by client or worker</li> <li>• No longer restricted to number that can use telephone interviews (old 50% cap)</li> <li>• Ensure staff have proper equipment, headsets, etc</li> </ul>	AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, IA, IL, IN, KS, MA, MD, MO, NC, ND, NJ, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, UT, WA

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

<b>3</b> <b>Procedures: Technology</b> (€= Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Localities/States</b> (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
<b>A</b> <b>\$</b> On-line Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces substantial amount of time workers spend doing data entry</li> <li>Customers can apply at home or anywhere with a computer and Internet access</li> <li>Customers can apply 24/7</li> <li>Results in fewer customers in lobby</li> <li>Facilitates work distribution throughout the State</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programming needed to transfer information directly into system</li> <li>Expedited service timeframes can be difficult to achieve</li> <li>Achieves best results if it works seamlessly with automated system</li> <li>For best results need E-signature</li> <li>Loses efficiency if workers must print out application and re-enter information</li> <li>Availability of application may increase the number of households that apply</li> </ul>	CA (Merced County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Francisco County, and Stanislaus County), CT, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID (pilot), IL (pilot), KS, MA, MD, NE, NJ, NY, PA, RI, SC, TN, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV
<b>B</b> Real Time Data Access Services (e.g. E-Find, Spider) €-\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows workers to verify additional information on a client while the interview is conducted</li> <li>Access to additional information at workers' fingertips</li> <li>Workers don't have to wait for overnight or regular data/wage matches and then process hits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private contractor can develop at a higher cost or State may developed less expensively in-house</li> <li>More readily available data should improve payment accuracy</li> <li>May require significant amount of time and coordination with IT Department</li> </ul>	AZ, FL, IA, ID, ME, MO, TX, UT, VA, WA

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

3 Procedures: Technology (¢= Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	Advantages	Considerations	Localities/States (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
<b>C</b> Online Case Access/Status for Client \$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clients can access case information 24/7</li> <li>• Reduces phone calls and inquiries for workers</li> <li>• Can also use to send official notification and/or correspondence</li> <li>• Client may be able to report changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works well with on-line application</li> <li>• May provide status only, case access or designed to allow client to report case changes</li> </ul>	CA (Alameda County), CT, FL, NE, NY, PA, UT, VT, WI
<b>D</b> Electronic Casefiling or Document Management ¢-\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case information is easy to find</li> <li>• Cases and verification unlikely to be lost</li> <li>• Saves on filing, space and paper costs</li> <li>• Improves document management</li> <li>• Can be used for caseload management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access can be provided (inquiry only) to other authorized agencies within the State</li> <li>• Should have specialized staff to scan and index verification</li> </ul>	AZ, CA (Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Merced, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Tulare, Ventura, and Yolo), CO, CT, FL, ID, IN, MS, NH, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, UT, VT, WA, WI

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.



<b>3</b> <b>Procedures: Technology</b> (€ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Localities/States</b> (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
<b>E</b> Kiosks: May range from a simple PC to advanced system with internet access <b>€-\$</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customers don't have to wait in line at reception</li> <li>• Customers can self check-in</li> <li>• In some locations, customer can report change or send message to worker</li> <li>• Can be for applying and/or office reception functions</li> <li>• Clients may have access to computer to apply on-line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can use in-house IT staff for less expensive product development</li> <li>• Customer training is necessary</li> <li>• Can add pre-screener to kiosk</li> </ul>	FL, ID (pilot), NE, OH (Toledo), PA, UT, WA, WI (Madison and Milwaukee),

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

4	Procedures: Workflow (€ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	Advantages	Considerations	Localities/States  (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
A	Targeted Interviewing & Case Processing  €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows for targeting for staff to spend more time on most error-prone cases instead of treating all cases equally</li> <li>Recognizes that few households commit fraud</li> <li>Can result in better customer service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be data-based</li> <li>Workers may resist approach, wanting to apply same procedures to all households</li> <li>Needs to be sensitive both to error proneness and need for applicant assistance</li> </ul>	FL, IN, KS
B	Targeted Case Reviews  €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target efforts (including additional work, second party reviews, additional matches, referral to call back or other unit) on high issuance/error prone cases</li> <li>High issuance cases are responsible for around 50% of errors</li> <li>Allows for dealing with higher workloads by concentrating resources on more risky cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cases with higher issuance <b>and</b> higher gross income yield the most errors</li> <li>In recent analysis, 41% of error dollars were concentrated in 18% of cases with highest allotments &amp; gross income</li> <li>Offices/States should use data to determine types of cases to target</li> </ul>	AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IL, IN, ME, MI, MN, NE, NH, NM, OH, PA, WI

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

<b>4</b> <b>Procedures: Workflow</b> (¢ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Localities/States</b> (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
<b>C</b> Same Day Expedited Service Interviews (after expedited determination is made) ¢	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces no-shows for subsequent interviews</li> <li>Improves service</li> <li>Gets benefits to needy customers faster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to be able to schedule same-day interviews</li> <li>Can order EBT card at screening to ensure expedited timeframes are met</li> </ul>	AZ, DC, FL, HI, IA, IL, KS, MD, MO, MT, ND, NV, OK, UT, VA, WV, WY
<b>D</b> Change Centers ¢-\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases likelihood that changes will be acted on</li> <li>Efficiencies realized due to worker specialization</li> <li>Caseworkers can focus on processing applications and primary case work</li> <li>Clients may be assisted more quickly</li> <li>Eligibility workers do not have to spend majority of their time processing changes or answering basic questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most effective when eligibility workers are used in the centers</li> <li>Must be able to ensure accountability and be able to determine which worker last touched case</li> <li>Can include information provided via mail, data matches, special projects, etc. dependent on call volume</li> </ul>	AZ, CA (Los Angeles County), DC, DE, FL, GA, ID (pilot), IA, IN, MI (Wayne County), NY(Orondaga County), OH (Montgomery County, Franklin County), TX, VA (Prince William County, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth), WA, WI (Dane County, Milwaukee County, Lacrosse County), WV

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

4	Procedures: Workflow (¢ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	Advantages	Considerations	Localities/States  (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
E	Workflow Analysis: Internal or contracted assessment to determine potential for workflow improvements in local/State offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify redundancies, unnecessary steps and waste</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Worker buy-in and involvement must be attained</li> </ul>	CO (Denver County), ID, NM, OR, UT
F	Caseload Banking (AKA Caseload Sharing): Workers share cases based on specialized functions or workload demands ¢	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efficiencies gained from sharing workload</li> <li>Better for handling rising caseloads when staffing levels are static</li> <li>Reduces stress for workers</li> <li>Can shift workers to accommodate workflow needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must be able to ensure accountability and be able to determine which worker last touched case</li> <li>Workers tend to prefer, but resistance often encountered at first</li> <li>Is more efficient when used with electronic casefiling</li> <li>Reduces supervisors carrying caseloads</li> <li>Should accommodate generic workers</li> <li>Client education needed</li> <li>Must be sensitive to client needs</li> </ul>	CA, DC, FL, KS, MN (Minneapolis), MO, ND, NY (Onondaga County), OH (Dayton), OR, PA (Dauphin County), UT, WI (Milwaukee)

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.

<b>4</b> <b>Procedures: Workflow</b> (€ = Low Cost \$ = High Cost)	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Localities/States</b> (As of 12/29/08; refer to Modernization Matrix for additions after this date)
<b>G</b> Verification Unit €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customers can get in and out of office quickly</li> <li>• Workers aren't interrupted</li> <li>• Specialists handle verification efficiently</li> <li>• Option: workers can also act on verification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receipts for verification should be provided</li> <li>• For offices with imaging, unit can also scan/image verification directly into automated system</li> </ul>	DC, NY (New York City), OH (Cincinnati), VA (Richmond City), WI (Milwaukee), WV (Kanawha County)
<b>H</b> Protected Time for Case Workers €	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures workers with caseloads have time to process their casework correctly</li> <li>• Can reduce failure to act errors</li> <li>• Can be initial step toward caseload banking</li> <li>• Workers can concentrate—fewer interruptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coverage procedures during protected time are needed to ensure customers are timely served</li> </ul>	CT, DC, KS, MD, MI, MO, ND, OK, VA

Note: These policies and procedures are options or available waivers under the current law and **may** be advantageous in managing your States' workload.