

APPENDIX M

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

**Evaluation of Demonstrations of
NSLP/SBP Direct Certification of
Children Receiving Medicaid Benefits**

**(OMB No.: 0584-Xxxx
Expiration Date: xx/xx/20xx)**

**Project Officer: Allison Magness
Office: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Dr., Rm. 1014
Alexandria, VA 22302**

**Telephone: 703-305-2098
FAX: 703-305-2576**

Email: Allison.Magness@fns.usda.gov

CONTENTS

APPENDIX M: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.....	3
--	---

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Between
Mathematica Policy Research
and
[State] Department of Education and
[State] Department of Health and Human Services

[Date]

(Mathematica Policy Research Number xxxxx)

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishes an agreement between Mathematica Policy Research (herein “Mathematica”) and the [State] Department of Education (herein “the State”) regarding the State’s participation in the Congressionally mandated Evaluation of Demonstrations of National School Lunch Program (NSLP)/School Breakfast Program (SBP) Direct Certification of Children Receiving Medicaid Benefits (herein “the Study”). The Study is being conducted by Mathematica and its subcontractor, Insight Policy Research (herein “Insight”), for the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), under contract AG-3198-B-12-0006. Hereinafter Mathematica or the State may be referred to individually as a “Party” or collectively as the “Parties.” This MOU clarifies roles and responsibilities of the Parties for accomplishing the Study and provides the schedule for completing the Study activities in the State. Mathematica and the State are preparing this agreement in good faith and with the expectation that each Party will fulfill its obligations as described in the MOU.

BACKGROUND

The *Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010* (P.L. 111-296) directs USDA to conduct demonstrations that add Medicaid to the list of programs used to directly certify students for free meals under the NSLP and SBP. In demonstration sites, direct certification for free lunches and breakfasts will be extended to students who (1) are receiving Medicaid and (2) are members of families with income as measured by the Medicaid program, before the application of any expense, block, or other income disregard, that does not exceed 133 percent of the federal poverty guideline for their family size. Direct certification also will be extended to students living in the household with a child who meets criteria (1) and (2) above. FNS selected six States—Alaska, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, New York, and Pennsylvania—to participate in the demonstrations and selected Mathematica and Insight to evaluate the demonstrations in each State. The Study includes the following three key Investigative Areas:

1. **Investigative Area 1 (IA1): Access Evaluation.** The objective of IA1 is to identify the potential impact of Direct Certification - Medicaid (DC-M) on NSLP/SBP access, based on a retrospective match of Medicaid and student enrollment data files from the 2011–2012 school year.
2. **Investigative Area 2 (IA2): Costs and Participation Evaluation.** The objective of IA2 is to provide an estimate of the effect on actual costs and participation of DC-M as

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

demonstrated. IA2 will also examine challenges that States and local education agencies (LEAs) face in implementing DC-M.

3. **Investigative Area 3 (IA3): Assessment of Socioeconomic Survey (SES) Certification Alternative.** The objective of IA3 is to compare the costs of standard application procedures and of DC-M to costs of an SES alternative.

In addition, the Study will include a small substudy to independently validate matches made in selected demonstration LEAs using varying levels of match stringency. This substudy will be conducted in 12 LEAs in three States, which Mathematica expects to select in early summer 2013.

UNDERSTANDING

Active cooperation from participating States will be required in conducting Investigative Areas 1 and 2 and the Match Validation Substudy (MVS). In addition to the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services, [##] LEAs from [State] have been selected to participate in the Study.¹ Half of those LEAs will be included in the data collection for both IA1 and IA2, while the remaining half will be included in IA2 only. The selected districts are listed in Attachment 1, along with an indicator of which components of the study will include them.

The following sections describe the key activities, schedule, and respective roles of the Mathematica study team and staff from the State. State responsibilities include provision of data and of access to program staff. Table 1 provides a summary of the data collection requirements and the timeline for delivery. Tables 2 through 4 list the specific data elements that will be required in the data files. This list may be refined after consultation with State staff. If required by the State, the Parties will also complete a Data Use Agreement (DUA) for the individual-level data required for IA1 and the Match Validation Substudy.

Investigative Area 1: Access Evaluation – Data Required in Summer 2012

For Investigative Area 1, the Access Evaluation, Mathematica will require the following information:

1. **Medicaid Enrollment Files.** The State will provide individual-level Medicaid administrative data containing one record for every child up to age 19 who was enrolled in Medicaid in at least one month during the period from July 2011 through March 2012. The files should contain all available data elements listed in Table 2, which fall into two broad categories: (1) person identifiers and (2) enrollment and eligibility data. Mathematica staff will match the data from these files with the student enrollment data to simulate direct certification.
2. **Student Enrollment Files.** The State will provide contact information for each LEA included in the IA1 data collection, and instruct the LEAs to provide individual-level school year (SY) 2011–2012 enrollment data containing one record for every student attending schools in those LEAs. Ideally, the LEAs will provide the actual student

¹ Additional LEAs may be selected for SY 2013–2014.

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

enrollment files used for direct certification for at least three points in time during SY 2011–2012: (1) the first month in which matching is conducted, (2) the match conducted in or closest to October 2011, and (3) the match conducted in or closest to January 2012. The files should contain all available data elements listed in Table 3, which fall into two broad categories: (1) person identifiers and (2) certification status and information used to determine certification status.

3. **Matching Rules.** The State will provide details on any requirements it has for matching rules LEAs must follow. The State will also encourage the LEAs in the evaluation to provide details to Mathematica on the specific rules and algorithms used for matching files for direct certification, including (but not limited to) the data elements used and which elements must match exactly (if any); whether probabilistic matching is used; methods for resolving potential matches, non-matches, and duplicate matches; methods for identifying siblings; and the frequency with which matching is conducted.

The State and LEAs will deliver all IA1 data by [Date]. Mathematica will work with State and LEA data managers to address any questions about the specific data elements required and the method for delivering the data. A senior Mathematica programmer will be assigned to provide technical assistance to the State and LEAs, as necessary. The State and LEAs will be asked to provide relevant documentation for each file, including a file layout, data dictionary, and code definitions, and will provide Mathematica access to the appropriate technical staff for assistance related to these data requests.

Investigative Area 2: Cost and Participation Evaluation – Data Required in SY 2012–2013 and SY 2013–2014

For IA2, [State] officials will participate in the following data collection activities:

1. **Certification and Participation Data.** The State will provide LEA-level data for each LEA included in the study for SY 2011–2012, SY 2012–2013 and SY 2013–2014. The files should contain all available data elements listed in Table 4, which fall into two broad categories: (1) information on enrolled students by certification status and basis for certification and (2) monthly participation information for the NSLP, SBP, Special Milk Program, and Afterschool Snack Program.
2. **Cost Data.** Researchers from Mathematica will conduct cost interviews with State staff throughout SY 2012–2013 and SY 2013–2014 and will conduct a web survey of LEA staff in summer 2013 and throughout SY 2013–2014. To facilitate this data collection, the State will:
 - a. Provide access to State child nutrition staff and State Medicaid agency staff for telephone interviews on State-level costs. The interviews will take place in September, November, and February in both SY 2012–2013 and SY 2013–2014. In preparation for these interviews, State staff will complete a paper time-tracking roster covering the two or three months prior to the interview.
 - b. Provide LEA-level child nutrition staff in the LEAs included in the study with information on the types of cost data to be collected, so that they can be prepared to report on SY 2012–2013 costs at the end of the school year. Mathematica will

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

- provide technical assistance to the State in understanding the specific types of information that will be useful to track.
- c. Provide, by the end of SY 2012–2013, contact information (including name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address) for LEA-level child nutrition staff at each LEA included in the study.
 - d. Encourage LEA-level child nutrition staff to complete the web-based cost survey in summer 2013 and throughout SY 2013–2014.
3. **Challenges Data.** To learn about challenges faced implementing DC-M, researchers from Insight will conduct interviews with State staff in SY 2012–2013 and with both State and LEA staff in SY 2013–2014. To facilitate this data collection, the State will:
- a. Provide access to State child nutrition staff and State Medicaid agency staff for telephone interviews on challenges faced in initiating and conducting DC-M. The interviews will take place in September and February in both SY 2012–2013 and SY 2013–2014.
 - b. Encourage LEA-level child nutrition staff in selected LEAs (approximately six) to participate in interviews in SY 2013–2014.

Match Validation Substudy – Data Required in Summer–Fall 2013

This substudy will be conducted in 12 demonstration LEAs in three States. Mathematica will select the LEAs in early summer 2013 and will require the following information for this substudy:

1. **Medicaid Enrollment Files.** The State will provide the individual-level Medicaid enrollment files used in the initial SY 2013–2014 direct certification process. The data elements required will be almost identical to those provided for IA1, plus any additional variables used by the LEA in the matching process.
2. **Student Enrollment Files.** The State will provide contact information for each of the LEAs selected for this substudy and will encourage the LEAs to provide the individual-level student enrollment files used in the SY 2013–2014 direct certification process to Mathematica. The data elements required will be almost identical to those provided for IA1, plus any additional variables used by the LEA in its matching process.
3. **Matching Rules.** The State will provide details on any requirements it has for matching rules LEAs must follow. The State will also encourage the LEAs in the substudy to provide details on the specific rules and algorithms used for matching files for Medicaid direct certification matching in SY 2013–2014, including similar details provided for IA1.
4. **Matched Files.** The State will encourage the selected LEAs to provide the final individual-level SY 2013–2014 matched files, indicating the outcome of Medicaid direct certification matching for each student.

As in IA1, Mathematica staff will work with State and LEA data managers to address any questions and provide technical assistance, as needed. The file formats and transmittal methods established during the data collection for IA1 will be used in the Match Validation Substudy as

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

well. Each file should be provided to Mathematica as soon as it is available, with the final file submitted no later than fall 2013.

SCHEDULE

Table 1 outlines the anticipated schedule for each data collection activity during the term of the Memorandum of Understanding:

Table 1: Summary of Data Collection Activities and Schedule

Evaluation Component	Type of Data or Access Needed	Reference Period	Timing
IA1	Medicaid Enrollment Files	SY 2011–2012	Summer 2012
IA1	Student Enrollment Files	SY 2011–2012	Summer 2012
IA1	Description of matching rules	SY 2011–2012	Summer 2012
IA2	Year 1 Challenge Interviews (States)	SY 2012–2013	Sept. 2012 and Feb. 2013
IA2	Year 1 Participation Data	SY 2012–2013	SY 2012–2013
IA2	Year 1 Cost Survey	SY 2012–2013	States: Sept. 2012–Feb. 2013 LEAs: July 2013–Aug. 2013
IA2	Year 2 Cost Survey	SY 2013–2014	Sept. 2013–Feb. 2014
IA2	Year 2 Challenge Interviews (States and LEAs)	SY 2013–2014	Sept. 2013 and Feb. 2014
IA2	Year 2 Participation Data	SY 2013–2014	SY 2013–2014
MVS	Medicaid Enrollment Files	SY 2013–2014	Summer 2013
MVS	Student Enrollment Files	SY 2013–2014	Summer 2013
MVS	Description of matching rules	SY 2013–2014	Summer 2013
MVS	Final matched files	SY 2013–2014	Fall 2013

FILE TRANSMISSION

The State will upload the individual-level data required for IA1 and the MVS, in encrypted electronic files, to a secure file transfer protocol (FTP) site provided by Mathematica. The study team will consult with State data managers to determine the format that will work best for the data delivery. All information collected will be kept secure, as discussed below.

The FTP site can also be used for LEA-level data files required for IA2. Alternatively, those files may be transmitted via email, since they will be smaller and will not contain personally identifiable information on individuals.

PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Any confidential information or data of a personal nature about an individual or proprietary information or data pertaining to an institution or organization received by Mathematica from the State shall be used only for its intended purpose under this MOU. Mathematica will not duplicate or disclose the confidential information or data to any third party, except as may be required by law or as approved by the State. Mathematica will establish administrative and physical safeguards to prevent the unauthorized disclosure and/or use of all confidential data or information provided under this agreement.

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

At the end of the study, Mathematica will create and submit restricted use files to FNS, which will include all primary and extant data gathered during the study. Mathematica will destroy all remaining data files containing individual-level information once the study has been completed.

COORDINATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES

The State shall designate [**contact name**], as its technical point of contact for this agreement and shall notify Mathematica if a new or alternate point of contact is designated. Mathematica shall designate Lara Hulsey, Mathematica's deputy project director, as its technical point of contact for this agreement and shall notify the State if a new or alternate point of contact is designated.

All notices required or permitted to be given hereunder shall be sufficient if in writing and personally delivered; or if sent by certified mail, return receipt requested and postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

If to Mathematica:

Mathematica Policy Research
600 Alexander Park
Suite 100
Princeton, NJ 08540
Attention: Julius Clark, Deputy Director of Contracts
RE: MOU No. 40065X02868

If to the State:

[State] Department of Education
Address
City, State zip
Attention: [**contact name, title**]
RE: MOU No. 40065X02868

DURATION AND TERMINATION

The term of this Memorandum of Understanding is for the **period beginning [Date] and ending on [October 31, 2015]**, unless modified by the mutual written agreement of the Parties. Either Party may terminate this agreement by providing written notice to the other Party.

ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Memorandum of Understanding constitutes the entire agreement between Mathematica and the State with respect to the subject matter hereof, and supersedes and replaces any other arrangements, oral or written, between the parties hereto pertaining to this agreement. No waiver, modification, or amendment of any of the terms and conditions hereof shall be effective unless set forth in writing and duly signed by both Mathematica and the State.

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the respective parties have entered into this MOU on the date first cited above.

For Mathematica Policy Research:

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

For [State] Department of Education:

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

For [State] Department of Health and Human Services:

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Attachment 1. Districts Included in the Study

Attachment 2. Tables of Requested Data Elements

Table 2. Data Elements Requested in Medicaid Files (for Investigative Area 1)

Individual Identifiers	Enrollment/Eligibility Data
Child's first name	Monthly enrollment status
Child's last name	Eligibility determination date
Child's middle initial	Basis of eligibility (age/income, medically needy, foster care, Medicaid expansion, etc.) ^a
Date of birth	
SSN	Gross family income (before the application of any expense, block, or other income disregard)
Beneficiary (child's) ID number	
Case (household) ID number	Net family income (used to determine Medicaid eligibility)
Gender	
Race/ethnicity	Components of family income (if readily available)
Street address	Family size
City	Indicator of SNAP receipt (if readily available)
County	Indicator of TANF receipt (if readily available)
State	
Zip code	
Parent/Guardian #1 first name	
Parent/Guardian #1 middle initial	
Parent/Guardian #1 last name	
Parent/Guardian #2 first name	
Parent/Guardian #2 middle initial	
Parent/Guardian #2 last name	
Parent SSN	

^aThis data element should include the information necessary to identify children in the "Children with Special Needs" Medicaid category (PH-95).

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

Table 3. Data Elements Requested in School Enrollment Files (for Investigative Area 1)

Individual Identifiers	NSLP/SBP Certification Data
Child's first name	Certification status (free, reduced-price, paid)
Child's last name	Certification method (direct certification, categorically eligible based on application, application income, etc.)
Child's middle initial	
Date of birth	Basis of direct certification or categorical eligibility (SNAP, TANF, FDPIR, other)
SSN	
Student ID number	SNAP/TANF/etc. case number (if readily available)
Family/sibling ID number	Household income (if readily available)
Gender	Household size (if readily available)
Race/ethnicity	
Street address	
City	
County	
State	
Zip code	
Parent/Guardian #1 first name	
Parent/Guardian #1 middle initial	
Parent/Guardian #1 last name	
Parent/Guardian #2 first name	
Parent/Guardian #2 middle initial	
Parent/Guardian #2 last name	
School district name	
School district ID number	
School name	
School ID number	

Note: If separate files are not available for the three points in time requested, then the enrollment files will also need to include data on enrollment and certification status at each point in time (or beginning and ending dates of enrollment and certification date).

Appendix M: Memorandum of Understanding

Table 4. Data Elements Requested in Certification and Participation Files (for Investigative Area 2)

October Data	Participation Data (Monthly)
Number of students enrolled	Number of institutions participating in the NSLP
Number of students certified free	Number of reimbursable lunches served:
Number of students certified free:	- free
- by application, based on income and household size	- reduced-price
- by application, based on categorical eligibility	- paid
- by direct certification	- total
Number of students directly certified based on (if available):	- average daily (or number of operating days)
- Medicaid	Number of institutions participating in the SBP ^a
- SNAP	Number of reimbursable breakfasts served:
- TANF	- free
- FDPIR	- reduced-price
- Other	- paid
Number of students categorically eligible based on (if available):	- total
- Medicaid	- average daily (or number of operating days)
- SNAP	Number of institutions participating in the Special Milk Program
- TANF	Number of institutions, by type (school, Residential Child Care Institution, non-residential child care institution, summer camp)
- FDPIR	Number of reimbursable milks served:
- Other	- free
Number of students certified reduced-price	- paid
Number of applications approved free	- total
- based on income and household size	- average daily (or number of operating days)
- based on categorical eligibility	Number of institutions participating in the NSLP Afterschool Snack Program (ASP)
Number of applications approved reduced-price	Number of institutions, by type (school, Residential Child Care Institution)
Average daily attendance in the district (if available)	Number of reimbursable snacks served:
School district name	- free, in area-eligible sites
School district ID number	- free, in all sites
	- reduced-price
	- paid
	- total
	- average daily (or number of operating days)

Note: Schools participating in Provision 2 or Provision 3 should not be included in these data.

^aAll data elements related to the SBP will be required both for all schools and separately for severe need.