

## **Direct Verification Study – Response to OMB Questions, December 7, 2007**

### **1. Update on State information**

#### *Participating States*

The OMB submission lists 7 States participating in the study: Georgia, Indiana, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin. Since the time of submission, two States have notified us that they were unable to implement Direct Verification with Medicaid (DV-M) for the SY2007-08 school year, but will participate in the “nonresponse” portion of the study (sample #2).

- Oregon was unable to roll-out DV-M to all districts, but made the process available to two districts. The study will collect data for sample #2 only.
- Wisconsin was unable to implement DV-M for SY2007-08. The study will collect data from sample #2 only.

#### *Data sharing agreements for collection of State data*

Abt Associates sent data requests to each of the States for collection of State administrative data. As described on page 4 of the OMB submission (Part A), Abt Associates requested files containing lists of children enrolled in the Food Stamp and Medicaid program. These files will be matched to data from NLSP applications for households that did not respond to verification in SY2006-07 (sample #2; “nonresponse study”). Our request for data included a list of the population to include (children age 4-19), and the data elements to include. Abt Associates also provided the States with a copy of our data security plan for the study. Abt Associates offered to enter into a formal data sharing agreement with each of the States.

The current status of data sharing agreements is:

- Formal signed agreements have been obtained from South Carolina and Washington.
- A formal data sharing agreement is pending from Wisconsin.
- Oregon and Georgia informed us that a formal signed agreement is not needed by their agency; the data request and data security plan from Abt Associates was sufficient.
- Tennessee and Washington are not included in the “nonresponse study” because they implemented DV-M on a statewide basis in SY2006-07.

## 2. Updated tables for Part B of the OMB submission

### Exhibit B-3

#### Characteristics of the Sampling Frame of LEAs

	GA	IN	OR	SC	TN	WA*	WI
All LEAs	160	317	177	85	138	265	426
Self-representing LEAs	2	8	5	3	3	7	6
Avg # applications in verification samples							
Self-representing LEAs	722	137	97	262	530	125	177
Non-self-representing LEAs	43	13	9	42	18	10	5

### Exhibit B-4

#### Characteristics of Sample #1 – Direct Verification Sample – Collection of SY2007-08 Information

	GA	IN	OR	SC	TN	WA*	WI
Number of LEAs							
Self-representing LEAs	2	8	5	3	3	7	6
Districts in PPS stratum	12	32	32	18	13	32	38
Total LEAs	14	40	37	21	16	39	44
Expected sample size of applications							
In self-representing LEAs	1444	1095	483	787	1591	872	1063
In PPS stratum	1953	934	717	1298	569	915	475
Total	3397	2029	1200	2085	2160	1787	1538

### Exhibit B-5

#### Characteristics of Sample #2 – Nonresponse Sample – Collection of SY2006-07 Information

	GA	IN	OR	SC	WI
Number of LEAs					
Self-representing LEAs	3	8	12	2	12
LEAs in PPS stratum	9	25	23	12	40
Total LEAs	12	33	35	14	52
Expected sample size of households that did not respond to verification requests					
In self-representing LEAs	586	477	264	355	226
In PPS stratum	428	306	133	475	88
Total	1014	783	397	830	314

Note: Tennessee and Washington are not included in the Nonresponse Sample because they implemented DV-M on a statewide basis in SY2006-07.