

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
25 SIGOURNEY STREET • HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
06106-5033

DATE: August 7, 2002
TO: Distribution
FROM: Kevin Loveland, Director
Family Services, Central Office
RE: Temporary Family Assistance Program Summary Report

Attached is the Temporary Family Assistance (TFA) Program Summary Report for **June 2002**. This report summarizes some key information pertaining to the TFA caseload: number of cases; number of cases and clients reporting earned income; new applications for assistance; discontinuances; average earnings; job entries, extension data, and employment services exemption information.

Report Contents:

Page 1: **Number of TFA Cases with Earned Income**

This page shows the total number of cases and the number of cases with earnings. Charts and graphs indicate the increase or decrease in these numbers on a month to month basis.

Total TFA figures reflect the entire active caseload, including those clients who are exempt from the time limit.

The total TFA caseload **decreased**, to **22,404** cases as of the end of June. The time limited caseload **also decreased**, to 9,782. The number of time limited families with earnings **increased** to 3,130, **and** the percentage of such families with earnings **increased slightly** to 32.0%. The exempt caseload **decreased**, to 12,621.

Page 2: **TFA Cases with Earned Income by Office and Region**

This chart shows total assistance units (cases) with earnings and caseload by office and region over the last two months.

Page 3: **Percent of Time-Limited and Exempt Cases**

Page three includes a chart that shows the breakdown of cases into Exempt and Time Limited categories over the past several months. The exempt category is comprised of cases not subject to the time limit due to age, disability, or other exemptions. The time-limited group is subject to the 21-month TFA limit and employment requirements. Of the total caseload, 12,621 (56.3%) are exempt, and 9,782 cases (43.7%) are time limited. The latter category includes cases that are under extensions.

Page 4: **TFA Discontinuances**

The data displayed on this page groups monthly discontinuances over the past year by broad categories. The categories are defined on the page and are intended to highlight the most salient reasons for case closure. For example, the “Income” category includes closures for earnings above the Federal Poverty Level, but also includes closures due to other income types such as child support, unemployment compensation, and Social Security disability payments. The “Sanction” category includes case closures due to penalties, including instances of pre-21-month third or subsequent employment services non-compliance or employment quits, post-21 month employment services violations, child support non-cooperation, and failure to cooperate with the biometric identification (digital imaging) process. The “21-Month Time Limit” category includes all closures directly related to reaching the end of the 21-month time limit or a subsequent six-month extension, including denials of contiguous extensions. This category also includes closures related to restrictions on fourth or greater extensions, which were effective October 2001. Closures for the state 60-month time limit, also implemented October 1, 2001, are shown separately. The report also breaks out closures for failure to appear at appointments necessary to establish a Jobs First employment plan. These closures are shown beginning 10/01. Please note that many of the cases closed for this reason are subsequently reinstated. The “Other” category includes a miscellaneous host of other reasons, most notably, failure to complete the regular redetermination process.

In September 2001, we shifted to a new data source that records net closures in the month (i.e., closure figures do not include cases reinstated by the end of the month). Thus, the overall number of closures appear smaller after August 2001 than it would ordinarily have been.

The first graph on this page shows the total of number of discontinuances each month and the constituent reason categories. The relative area of each reason in the bars provides a means of comparing any changes in the composition of

monthly closure reasons. The second graph shows total monthly discontinuances as a percent of total monthly caseload.

Page 5: **Jobs First Time Limited Cases Under Sanction**

Page 5 shows the number of cases presently under sanction for failure to comply with employment services requirements in each region and sub-office. In addition to failure to cooperate with assigned employment services activities (e.g., attending orientation; participating in job search skills training or vocational education), the number of cases under sanction for voluntary quit of employment, reduction of hours or wages, and job termination due to willful misconduct are also included. These types of violations, labeled “Vol. Quit” in the table, are considered a special form of employment services violations and also affect eligibility for extensions. Please note that the penalty for non-compliance during an extension is discontinuance and no future extensions based on a “good faith effort.” Such penalties are not reflected on the table; they are incorporated into the discontinuance figures shown on page 4.

Page 6 **Cases at risk of being discontinued at 21 months**

These data show how many clients have two sanctions, including voluntary quits, or one work test failure and one sanction. Many, but not all of these clients, are at-risk of not being eligible for extensions. At-risk clients can restore potential extension eligibility by computing an “Individualized Performance Contract” (IPC) by the end of the 21st month of assistance.

Page 7: **Monthly TFA Job Entries by Office and Region**

Page 7 shows the unduplicated number of clients who entered employment during the month by office and region, and the statewide trend in monthly entries. The figures are actual unduplicated entries. In June, there were 1,152 new job entries.

Page 8: **Time Limited Program Client Earnings**

This table shows the average hourly and monthly income for time limited clients by region. Also indicated are the numbers of clients working by various ranges of hours. The statewide average hourly wage is \$7.46, and the average earned income amount is \$747 per client per month.

Page 9: **Disposition of Clients Reaching TFA Time Limit:
Results of Exit Interviews**

This table shows how many clients requested extensions and, of those, how many were approved or denied. Also shown are the reasons for extension approval or denial. For the group of clients reaching the time limit as of the end of July, there

were 145 extension requests, and 109 were approved. Of those denied, zero were denied due to failure to make a good faith effort to find and keep employment. These clients were referred to Safety Net Services. These figures do not include clients discontinued from an extension or denied an additional extension.

Page 10: **Cases in 6-Month Extensions to Time Limit**

This page shows the number of cases in 6-month extensions to the Jobs First time limit. As of the end of June 2002, 2,715 cases were in extensions, representing 27.8% of the time-limited caseload. Please note the drop in the number of cases in the "4th or Higher Extension" category since September 2001. Much of this drop is due to cases closed for the newly-implemented 60-month time limit and limitations on eligibility for more than three extensions. These changes were made to the program effective October 1, 2001. The 1/02 through 3/02 figures have been revised to correct for a problem in the source report.

Page 11: **TFA Application Activity**

The information on this page identifies trends in application activity and grants awarded. The data include applications made under extension provisions for cases that have used up 21 months of regular TFA eligibility.

Page 12: **Employment Services Exemptions**


This page identifies the number and relative percents of exemptions from Employment Services activities for TFA adult recipients and minor parent heads of households. The various exemption reasons allowed by policy are shown. It does not include adults who are not TFA recipients (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles, and other non-parental relatives who head cases but who are not themselves recipients—they are exempt but are not included in the data). It is not a depiction of reasons for exemptions from the time limit, although the two are related in that the Employment Services status of assistance unit members generally determines time limit status.

The constituent categories for incapacity are shown as three categories. Federally Approved Disability means people who have been determined to be disabled by the federal government (i.e., they receive Social Security disability benefits based on a disability). Medical Review Team approvals are for those with incapacities that tend to last longer than 90 days. Worker entered means a short-term (less than 90 days) incapacity based on a physician's certification.

Please direct any comments or questions you have regarding this report to me via e-mail (kevin.loveland@po.state.ct.us) or by phone at (860) 424-5031; or Daniel Jorczak, at (860) 424-5013 (daniel.jorczak@po.state.ct.us).

Composition of Caseload



June 2002



Number and Percentage of TFA Cases with Earned Income

Statewide

Month	Cases with Earnings			Change from Previous Month		% of Caseload w/earnings		Total Caseload		
	Time Limited	Total TFA	% Time Limited	Time limited	Total TFA*	Time limited	Total TFA*	Time limited	Exempt	Total TFA *
05/00	5,985	7,054	84.8%	(166)	(160)	45.8%	26.7%	13,079	12,238	26,465
06/00	5,765	6,834	84.4%	(220)	(220)	44.7%	26.0%	12,906	12,194	26,253
07/00	5,559	6,635	83.8%	(206)	(199)	43.5%	25.4%	12,784	12,232	26,147
08/00	5,404	6,455	83.7%	(155)	(180)	42.7%	24.9%	12,648	12,149	25,893
09/00	5,290	6,320	83.7%	(114)	(135)	42.0%	24.6%	12,584	12,043	25,712
10/00	5,226	6,260	83.5%	(64)	(60)	42.2%	24.6%	12,388	12,038	25,489
11/00	5,104	6,167	82.8%	(122)	(93)	41.4%	24.2%	12,320	12,088	25,455
12/00	5,023	6,070	82.8%	(81)	(97)	41.0%	23.9%	12,245	12,135	25,394
01/01	4,847	5,884	82.4%	(176)	(186)	39.6%	23.2%	12,233	12,102	25,337
02/01	4,725	5,723	82.6%	(122)	(161)	38.9%	22.7%	12,155	12,092	25,235
03/01	4,644	5,582	83.2%	(81)	(141)	37.9%	22.2%	12,239	11,996	25,101
04/01	4,663	5,594	83.4%	19	12	37.6%	22.3%	12,416	11,996	25,123
05/01	4,604	5,549	83.0%	(59)	(45)	37.0%	22.2%	12,436	12,065	25,045
06/01	4,615	5,538	83.3%	11	(11)	36.7%	22.0%	12,558	12,201	25,132
07/01	4,625	5,473	84.5%	10	(65)	36.1%	21.8%	12,802	12,118	25,132
08/01	4,696	5,466	85.9%	71	(7)	35.4%	21.5%	13,271	12,072	25,399
09/01	4,339	5,110	84.9%	(357)	(356)	33.8%	20.4%	12,838	12,221	25,059
10/01	4,081	4,815	84.8%	(258)	(295)	32.8%	19.4%	12,451	12,356	24,807
11/01	3,855	4,561	84.5%	(226)	(254)	32.2%	18.6%	11,986	12,531	24,517
12/01	3,821	4,536	84.2%	(34)	(25)	32.5%	18.7%	11,742	12,534	24,276
01/02	3,568	4,231	84.3%	(253)	(305)	32.2%	17.9%	11,085	12,550	23,635
02/02	3,400	4,055	83.8%	(168)	(176)	31.5%	17.3%	10,778	12,635	23,413
03/02	3,327	3,953	84.2%	(73)	(102)	31.5%	17.1%	10,552	12,619	23,171
04/02	3,203	3,849	83.2%	(124)	(104)	31.3%	16.8%	10,240	12,676	22,918
05/02	3,118	3,754	83.1%	(85)	(95)	31.5%	16.6%	9,885	12,663	22,549
06/02	3,130	3,746	83.6%	12	(8)	32.0%	16.7%	9,782	12,621	22,404




* Prior to 10/01, this figure included AFDC - Control group cases that are not shown in the table.

CHANGE IN CASELOAD FROM PREVIOUS MONTH

	June 2002			May 2002		
	TFA AUs	AUs w/Earnings	% with Earnings	TFA AUs	AUs w/Earnings	% with Earnings
Hartford	4,613	739	16.0%	4,608	702	15.2%
Manchester	1,335	271	20.3%	1,360	287	21.1%
New Britain	1,440	265	18.4%	1,423	260	18.3%
Bristol	589	131	22.2%	589	123	20.9%
NORTH CENTRAL TOTAL	7,977	1,406	17.6%	7,980	1,372	17.2%
New Haven	4,780	757	15.8%	4,789	762	15.9%
Middletown	479	106	22.1%	484	105	21.7%
Meriden	908	174	19.2%	898	157	17.5%
SOUTH CENTRAL TOTAL	6,167	1,037	16.8%	6,171	1,024	16.6%
Bridgeport	2,546	403	15.8%	2,573	416	16.2%
Stamford	434	51	11.8%	451	51	11.3%
Norwalk	437	63	14.4%	458	64	14.0%
SOUTH WEST TOTAL	3,417	517	15.1%	3,482	531	15.2%
Norwich	1,586	324	20.4%	1,627	341	21.0%
Willimantic	403	67	16.6%	411	65	15.8%
EAST TOTAL	1,989	391	19.7%	2,038	406	19.9%
Waterbury	2,207	285	12.9%	2,215	302	13.6%
Danbury	327	42	12.8%	340	49	14.4%
Torrington	316	68	21.5%	321	70	21.8%
NORTH WEST TOTAL	2,850	395	13.9%	2,876	421	14.6%
Regional Offices Subtotal	22,400	3,746	16.7%	22,547	3,754	16.6%
Central Office	4	-	0.0%	2	-	0.0%
STATEWIDE	22,404	3,746	16.7%	22,549	3,754	16.6%


TFA Discontinuances Statewide - All waiver types

CLOSURE REASON	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02
Income	450	438	486	407	543	489	555	360	359	399	405	564	418
Failed to Provide Info.	159	177	150	72	124	141	106	119	84	72	92	119	92
Sanction	105	91	109	64	72	59	50	56	59	70	76	86	63
21-Month Time Limit	480	477	458	381	422	548	475	523	545	446	463	395	347
State 60-Month Limit	-	-	-	241	69	51	67	51	27	19	9	7	8
Voluntary Closure	168	180	192	176	170	144	136	150	143	136	153	141	152
Failure to Establish ES Plan	-	-	-	-	78	200	184	239	274	211	210	208	143
Other	720	788	813	607	678	679	582	697	521	486	557	646	522
Total	2,082	2,151	2,208	1,948	2,156	2,311	2,155	2,195	2,012	1,839	1,965	2,166	1,745
Percent of TFA Cases	8.28%	8.56%	8.69%	7.77%	8.69%	9.43%	8.88%	9.29%	8.59%	7.94%	8.57%	9.61%	7.79%



Definitions

- Income** Closures due to excess income, including earned income over the Federal Poverty Level. *Does not* include time limit closures.
- Failed to Provide Info.** Discontinuance due to failure to provide information necessary to determine eligibility. *Does not* include time limit closures.
- Sanction** Discontinuances for failure to cooperate with employment services, child support, quality control, biometric identification, and other requirements.
- 21-Month Time Limit** Closures due to the Jobs First time limit, either at 21 months, or at the end of subsequent extensions.
- 60-month time limit** Closures due to the State 60-month time limit
- Voluntary Closure** Closures requested by assistance units.
- Other** All other closures, including failure to complete regular redetermination.
- Failure to Establish ES Plan** Closures for failure to appear at employment services appointments that lead to creation of an employment plan.



Note: Beginning 9/01, source data shifted to capture net rather than gross closures.

Time-Limited TFA Cases Under Employment Services Sanction

June 2002	1st OFFENSE 25% reduction for 3 months		2nd OFFENSE 35% reduction for 3 months		3rd OFFENSE discontinuance for 3 months		Total Client Sanctions	Total Time- limited cases (T cases)	% T cases under sanction in office
	Emp. Services*	Vol. Quit**	Emp. Services*	Vol. Quit**	Emp. Services*	Vol. Quit**			
HARTFORD (10)	57	37	13	3	2	2	114	2,095	5.44%
MANCHESTER(11)	25	4	1	-	1	-	31	559	5.55%
NEW BRITAIN (52)	6	7	1	-	-	-	14	643	2.18%
BRISTOL (61)	6	5	1	-	-	-	12	269	4.46%
NORTH CENTRAL REGION	94	53	16	3	3	2	171	3,566	4.80%
NEW HAVEN (20)	40	17	5	2	-	-	64	2,180	2.94%
MIDDLETOWN (50)	5	4	2	-	-	-	11	160	6.88%
MERIDEN (51)	6	5	1	-	1	-	13	444	2.93%
SOUTH CENTRAL REGION	51	26	8	2	1	-	88	2,784	3.16%
BRIDGEPORT (30)	17	27	6	2	-	1	53	1,060	5.00%
STAMFORD (32)	6	-	2	-	-	-	8	185	4.32%
NORWALK (33)	3	2	1	-	-	-	6	209	2.87%
SOUTHWEST REGION	26	29	9	2	-	1	67	1,454	4.61%
NORWICH (40)	15	11	1	4	-	-	31	685	4.53%
WILLIMANTIC (41)	19	5	5	2	-	-	31	155	20.00%
EASTERN REGION	34	16	6	6	-	-	62	840	7.38%
WATERBURY (60)	28	18	8	2	1	-	57	923	6.18%
DANBURY (31)	1	4	1	-	-	-	6	84	7.14%
TORRINGTON (62)	12	-	2	-	2	-	16	130	12.31%
NORTHWEST REGION	41	22	11	2	3	-	79	1,137	6.95%
CENTRAL OFFICE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.00%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	246	146	50	15	7	3	467	9,782	4.77%


*Penalties for failure to comply with Jobs First Employment Plan requirements without good cause

**Penalties for voluntary quit of employment, reduction in wages or hours, or job termination due to willful misconduct without good cause

Note: The penalty for employment services non-compliance, voluntary quits without good cause, or termination due to willful misconduct without good cause during a TFA extension is discontinuance and no future extensions based on good faith effort. Such discontinuances are not reflected in these figures. Also, these figures do not include closures for failure to appear at employment services appointments leading to establishment of an employment plan.

TFA Time Limited Cases At Risk


June 2002	# at risk cases	Percent of office T cases
HARTFORD (10)	133	6.35%
MANCHESTER(11)	25	4.47%
NEW BRITAIN (52)	29	4.51%
BRISTOL (61)	19	7.06%
NORTH CENTRAL	206	5.78%
NEW HAVEN (20)	37	1.70%
MIDDLETOWN (50)	14	8.75%
MERIDEN (51)	25	5.63%
SOUTH CENTRAL	76	2.73%
BRIDGEPORT (30)	61	5.75%
STAMFORD (32)	12	6.49%
NORWALK (33)	12	5.74%
SOUTHWEST	85	5.85%
NORWICH (40)	44	6.42%
WILLIMANTIC (41)	21	13.55%
EASTERN	65	7.74%
WATERBURY (60)	97	10.51%
DANBURY (31)	25	29.76%
TORRINGTON (62)	25	19.23%
NORTHWEST	147	12.93%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	579	5.92%



At risk cases are defined as assistance units who are in jeopardy of not being eligible for extensions to the 21 month time limit. These cases include AUs with one sanction and a work test failure and/or all cases with two or more sanctions. These figures do not include cases where the **only** sanction happens in month 16 or later, and the sanction is for: voluntary quit, not accepting employment, termination for willful misconduct or failure to accept additional hours of employment. Completion of an "Individualized Performance Contract" (IPC) prior to the end of the 21 month limit restores potential extension eligibility. However, IPC information is not incorporated into these figures.

Monthly TFA Job Entries - By Office and Region

Office and Region	Jun-00	Jul-00	Aug-00	Sep-00	Oct-00	Nov-00	Dec-00	Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02
HARTFORD (10)	339	278	297	323	342	276	261	251	170	214	247	244	249	209	236	231	245	193	231	196	159	184	231	189	196
MANCHESTER (11)	105	88	76	120	119	97	82	80	74	63	86	91	81	56	78	77	75	79	58	87	73	84	73	74	103
NEW BRITAIN (52)	99	93	91	91	103	117	87	79	74	57	79	84	78	63	91	65	88	71	62	68	64	85	59	91	59
BRISTOL (61)	51	34	51	43	53	52	50	51	30	22	39	46	42	37	42	39	50	28	35	30	37	42	49	50	48
NORTH CENTRAL	594	493	515	577	617	542	480	461	348	356	451	465	450	365	447	412	458	371	386	381	333	395	412	404	406
NEW HAVEN (20)	266	226	235	241	306	252	211	200	186	201	244	241	214	200	198	234	218	198	205	206	167	214	189	181	185
MIDDLETOWN (50)	25	38	36	18	35	36	21	26	20	25	29	30	25	29	20	27	34	19	33	42	29	27	43	43	37
MERIDEN (51)	55	56	59	51	61	55	53	46	47	43	51	37	56	46	27	45	64	59	48	42	41	40	44	71	59
SOUTH CENTRAL	346	320	330	310	402	343	285	272	253	269	324	308	295	275	245	306	316	276	286	290	237	281	276	295	281
BRIDGEPORT (30)	205	164	168	123	159	134	136	121	106	114	158	145	136	104	125	128	122	124	126	116	125	137	140	147	129
STAMFORD (32)	18	21	20	21	34	30	19	21	22	16	23	16	25	13	21	14	26	17	16	31	14	24	28	17	22
NORWALK (33)	30	34	29	39	41	20	28	18	26	17	25	31	20	26	32	24	28	20	26	25	23	25	24	33	19
SOUTHWEST	253	219	217	183	234	184	183	160	154	147	206	192	181	143	178	166	176	161	168	172	162	186	192	197	170
NORWICH (40)	155	159	152	154	153	144	117	112	100	107	125	118	112	111	131	109	122	114	129	103	101	111	132	133	130
WILLIMANTIC (41)	26	26	25	50	31	16	21	16	21	27	17	40	20	17	23	26	35	17	23	22	22	26	29	39	30
EASTERN	181	185	177	204	184	160	138	128	121	134	142	158	132	128	154	135	157	131	152	125	123	137	161	172	160
WATERBURY (60)	114	128	123	118	131	97	106	88	88	91	112	121	103	107	107	93	106	99	87	86	80	106	123	117	83
DANBURY (31)	30	29	23	31	23	21	30	20	18	27	21	29	30	24	25	21	31	26	22	27	32	32	33	28	28
TORRINGTON (62)	28	21	29	23	36	25	38	35	31	21	24	37	26	22	26	20	43	18	20	24	18	29	21	27	24
NORTHWEST	172	178	175	172	190	143	174	143	137	139	157	187	159	153	158	134	180	143	129	137	130	167	177	172	135
STATEWIDE	1,546	1,395	1,414	1,446	1,627	1,372	1,260	1,164	1,013	1,045	1,280	1,310	1,217	1,064	1,182	1,153	1,287	1,082	1,121	1,105	985	1,166	1,218	1,240	1,152



TIME LIMITED CLIENT EARNINGS BY OFFICE

June 2002														
Office	Time Limited Cases (T)	Total* Employed T Recipients	Time Limited Recipients' Hours of Employment										Avg. Earnings per Hour	Avg. Mo. Earnings per Client
			0-19 hrs./wk	%	20-24 hrs./wk	%	25-29 hrs./wk	%	30-34 hrs./wk	%	35+ hrs./wk	%		
Hartford (10)	2,095	793	302	38%	184	23%	95	12%	81	10%	131	17%	\$ 6.98	\$ 716
Manchester (11)	559	302	118	39%	73	24%	29	10%	40	13%	42	14%	\$ 6.80	\$ 695
New Britain (52)	643	279	98	35%	78	28%	28	10%	34	12%	41	15%	\$ 7.33	\$ 759
Bristol (61)	269	144	67	47%	23	16%	20	14%	10	7%	24	17%	\$ 8.07	\$ 750
NC Region	3,566	1,518	585	39%	358	24%	172	11%	165	11%	238	16%	\$ 7.11	\$ 723
New Haven (20)	2,180	816	363	44%	167	20%	82	10%	94	12%	110	13%	\$ 7.61	\$ 722
Middletown (50)	160	96	32	33%	32	33%	9	9%	15	16%	8	8%	\$ 7.25	\$ 667
Meriden (51)	444	181	71	39%	41	23%	14	8%	29	16%	26	14%	\$ 7.72	\$ 744
SC Region	2,784	1,093	466	43%	240	22%	105	10%	138	13%	144	13%	\$ 7.60	\$ 721
Bridgeport (30)	1,060	475	196	41%	103	22%	39	8%	63	13%	74	16%	\$ 8.03	\$ 765
Stamford (32)	185	94	41	44%	17	18%	9	10%	16	17%	11	12%	\$ 8.07	\$ 760
Norwalk (33)	209	96	40	42%	26	27%	7	7%	6	6%	17	18%	\$ 7.60	\$ 772
SW Region	1,454	665	277	42%	146	22%	55	8%	85	13%	102	15%	\$ 7.97	\$ 765
Norwich (40)	685	363	142	39%	70	19%	33	9%	49	13%	69	19%	\$ 7.91	\$ 790
Willimantic (41)	155	83	27	33%	9	11%	11	13%	11	13%	25	30%	\$ 8.00	\$ 870
Eastern Region	840	446	169	38%	79	18%	44	10%	60	13%	94	21%	\$ 7.93	\$ 805
Waterbury (60)	923	310	95	31%	92	33%	23	59%	37	12%	63	20%	\$ 6.82	\$ 810
Danbury (31)	84	56	18	32%	13	23%	9	16%	8	14%	8	14%	\$ 8.65	\$ 826
Torrington (62)	130	68	32	47%	9	13%	5	7%	7	10%	15	22%	\$ 8.26	\$ 792
NW Region	1,137	434	145	33%	114	26%	37	9%	52	12%	86	20%	\$ 7.28	\$ 809
Central Office	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 18.96	\$ 929
Statewide Total	9,782	4,157	1,643	40%	937	23%	413	10%	500	12%	664	16%	\$ 7.46	\$ 747

*This figure reflects the number of T recipients who are working. Some are working more than one job. The columns to the right group clients by total hours worked.

It also reflects those cases that may have more than one job, as well as two parent cases with both parents employed.

For these reasons, the columns may not total the number of recipients, or the number of recipients working.

Totals include a small number of Central Office cases

DISPOSITION OF CLIENTS REACHING TFA TIME LIMIT: RESULTS OF EXIT INTERVIEWS


June 2002	# 20 month exit interviews scheduled ¹	Interview outcomes				Reasons granted extension		Reasons denied extension	
		Extensions Requested ²	# granted ⁵	# denied ⁴	good faith effort	other reasons ³	above TFA payment standard	Other	
Hartford	64	39	33	6	33	0	6	0	
Manchester	13	9	7	2	7	0	2	0	
New Britain	15	6	2	4	2	0	4	0	
Bristol	7	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	
NORTH CENTRAL TOTAL	99	57	45	12	45	0	12	0	
New Haven	45	24	19	5	16	3	5	0	
Middletown	3	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	
Meriden	12	10	6	4	4	0	1	0	
SOUTH CENTRAL TOTAL	60	36	26	10	21	3	7	0	
Bridgeport	32	22	18	4	18	0	4	0	
Stamford	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Norwalk	6	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	
SOUTH WEST TOTAL	40	25	20	5	20	0	5	0	
Norwich	21	11	9	2	9	0	2	0	
Willimantic	8	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
EAST TOTAL	29	12	9	3	9	0	3	0	
Waterbury	31	14	9	5	9	0	5	0	
Danbury	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Torrington	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
NORTH WEST TOTAL	38	15	9	6	9	0	6	0	
STATEWIDE	266	145	109	36	104	3	33	0	

1. 20 month interview outcome data is based on interviews held in the prior reporting month. For example, Feb. outcomes are based on interviews conducted in Jan.
2. Of the interviews scheduled, this chart reflects only those clients who attended their exit interview and requested an extension. This chart does not reflect those clients who did not request an interview when asked or did not attend the interview.
3. "Other Reasons" include domestic violence, possible harm to children, and circumstances beyond one's control.
4. These clients are referred to Safety Net contractors.
5. There may be some variations in the number of extensions and the total number of extensions granted and denied by reason. This is due to the combining of different reports run at different times. The total differential consists of less than .1% of total caseload.

CASES IN 6-MONTH EXTENSION TO TIME LIMIT


Statewide

Month	1st Extension	2nd Extension	3rd Extension	4th or Higher Extension	Total in Extensions	Time-Limited Caseload	% of Time-Limited Cases
Apr-00	1,270	1,059	1,093	1,764	5,186	13,528	38.3%
May-00	1,231	1,021	1,030	1,794	5,076	13,079	38.8%
Jun-00	1,209	1,009	969	1,831	5,018	12,906	38.9%
Jul-00	1,183	986	944	1,875	4,988	12,784	39.0%
Aug-00	1,157	998	895	1,871	4,921	12,648	38.9%
Sep-00	1,161	960	858	1,877	4,856	12,584	38.6%
Oct-00	1,146	925	807	1,900	4,778	12,388	38.6%
Nov-00	1,160	934	781	1,929	4,804	12,320	39.0%
Dec-00	1,108	930	791	1,910	4,739	12,245	38.7%
Jan-01	1,071	913	776	1,937	4,697	12,233	38.4%
Feb-01	1,091	897	741	1,968	4,697	12,155	38.6%
Mar-01	1,082	912	743	2,035	4,772	12,239	39.0%
Apr-01	1,086	923	741	2,033	4,783	12,416	38.5%
May-01	1,114	882	747	1,994	4,737	12,436	38.1%
Jun-01	1,132	865	738	2,040	4,775	12,558	38.0%
Jul-01	1,116	868	738	2,064	4,786	12,802	37.4%
Aug-01	1,100	886	759	2,075	4,820	13,271	36.3%
Sep-01	1,086	851	763	1,818	4,518	12,451	36.3%
Oct-01	1,068	862	759	1,551	4,240	12,356	34.3%
Nov-01	1,054	880	737	1,273	3,944	11,986	32.9%
Dec-01	1,072	889	738	967	3,666	11,742	31.2%
Jan-02	1,096	897	746	907	3,646	11,085	32.9%
Feb-02	1,076	847	719	633	3,275	10,778	30.4%
Mar-02	1,051	836	749	432	3,068	10,552	29.1%
Apr-02	1,035	871	744	282	2,932	10,240	28.6%
May-02	1,108	832	686	180	2,806	9,885	28.4%
Jun-02	1,010	812	710	183	2,715	9,782	27.8%




TFA Application Activity Statewide--All waiver types

Month	Applications Received	% Change from Same Mo. Last Yr.	Applications Granted	% Change from Same Mo. Last Yr.
06/99	2,904	-1.7%	1,714	-12.1%
07/99	3,235	-8.6%	1,971	-15.5%
08/99	3,203	-15.5%	2,009	-21.6%
09/99	3,132	-7.9%	1,889	-19.3%
10/99	3,215	-4.7%	2,054	-10.1%
11/99	2,856	-6.1%	1,705	-25.4%
12/99	2,520	-10.6%	1,735	-8.0%
01/00	3,119	-3.6%	1,741	-12.6%
02/00	2,435	-6.3%	1,554	-14.2%
03/00	2,876	1.0%	1,859	-4.6%
04/00	2,429	-6.8%	1,506	-7.9%
05/00	2,458	-12.5%	1,408	-22.2%
06/00	2,934	1.0%	1,630	-4.9%
07/00	3,128	-3.3%	1,853	-6.0%
08/00	3,190	-0.4%	1,754	-12.7%
09/00	3,024	-3.4%	1,790	-5.2%
10/00	2,990	-7.0%	1,803	-12.2%
11/00	2,869	0.5%	1,681	-1.4%
12/00	2,459	-2.4%	1,647	-5.1%
01/01	2,914	-6.6%	1,638	-5.9%
02/01	2,275	-6.6%	1,406	-9.5%
03/01	2,519	-12.4%	1,467	-21.1%
04/01	2,719	11.9%	1,628	8.1%
05/01	2,626	6.8%	1,582	12.4%
06/01	2,849	-2.9%	1,602	-1.7%
07/01	2,939	-6.0%	1,680	-9.3%
08/01	3,075	-3.6%	1,896	8.1%
09/01	2,765	-8.6%	1,668	-6.8%
10/01	2,996	0.2%	1,804	0.1%
11/01	2,608	-9.1%	1,553	-7.6%
12/01	2,449	-0.4%	1,605	-2.6%
01/02	2,701	-7.3%	1,429	-12.8%
02/02	2,167	-4.7%	1,350	-4.0%
03/02	2,469	-2.0%	1,499	2.2%
04/02	2,513	-7.6%	1,456	-10.6%
05/02	2,363	-10.0%	1,354	-14.4%
06/02	2,626	-7.8%	1,366	-14.7%



Employment Services Exemptions Statewide TFA Adults and Minor Parent Heads of Household*

Exempt Reason	Number of Clients	% of Total Exempt
Age (Over 60, Under 16)	48	0.95%
Minor Parent in School	24	0.47%
Caring for Non-Cap Child Under One	2,447	48.32%
Caring for Incapacitated Household Member	235	4.64%
Pregnancy/Post Partum Related Illness	196	3.87%
Not Employable	83	1.64%
Federally Approved Disability	22	0.43%
Worker Entered Incapacity	696	13.74%
Approved by Medical Review Team	1,313	25.93%
<i>(Incapacitated Subtotal)</i>	<i>2,031</i>	<i>40.11%</i>
Total	5,064	100.00%



* Excludes non-recipient adults