

# **Appendix L. Sample Follow-Up Email to State Agencies**

Good Morning,

Thank you for submitting the April WIC participant characteristic data for [STATE]. The diagnostic tables have been prepared and reviewed. Attached you will find some suggestions and questions raised during an evaluation of the tables. Relevant tables have also been included for ease of review.

After you have a chance to review the questions and the tables, we would appreciate your feedback, which you may provide via email or in a brief conference call during which we will answer any questions you may have. Please respond by [DATE] or let me know when we can schedule a conference call within the next week. I can be reached by phone at [ANALYST PHONE] or by email at [ANALYST EMAIL].

Sincerely,

[ANALYST SIGNATURE]

*This information is being collected from State agencies to enable the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) to prepare biennial reports on WIC participant and program characteristics. This is a mandatory collection authorized under 7 CFR §246.25(b) (3). FNS uses the data from these reports to estimate budgets, submit civil rights reporting, identify needs for research, and to develop and review WIC policies and procedures. Under the Privacy Act of 1974 and the System of Record Notice FNS-8 USDA/FNS Studies and Reports, any personally identifying information obtained will be kept private to the extent of the law. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0584-0609. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services, Office of Policy Support, 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 1014, Alexandria, VA 22302, ATTN: PRA (0584-0609\*). Do not return the completed form to this address.*

The document below is a sample of the issue memo sent with the follow-up email. The issue memos have copies of diagnostic tables and additional materials attached illustrating each WIC SA's specific issues in the data.

## Memorandum



**Date:** [DATE]  
**To:** [WIC SA PC CONTACT]  
**CC:** [ADDITIONAL WIC SA STAFF]  
**From:** [ANALYST], Insight Policy Research  
**Subject:** [STATE]'s WIC PC[YEAR] Data Submission

Thank you for submitting the April WIC participant characteristics data for [STATE]. We have thoroughly reviewed the data and would like to discuss some aspects of the submission with you. These issues are described below, and the relevant tables have been attached. Please let me know when we can schedule a conference call to discuss the data submission and any next steps we might take. I can be reached at [ANALYST PHONE] or [ANALYST EMAIL].

### Transmittal Worksheet

We noticed [STATE] has not yet submitted the transmittal worksheet. We have attached a copy for your reference. Please submit this information as soon as possible.

### Caseload and Participation: Tables 2 and 3

FNS reports [STATE]'s WIC participation level at 16,922. This represents the number of participants in [STATE] who were issued benefits in April [YEAR]. The current caseload reported by [STATE]'s PC2018 data is 18,963. This indicates a nonparticipation rate of 11 percent, which is higher than expected. Is this a typical monthly nonparticipation rate for [STATE]?

The PC2018 data submission includes data for 18,963 participants, while the PC2016 data submission includes information for 21,270 participants. This is a decrease of 11 percent in [STATE]'s caseload (see table 3), which is larger than expected. Is this consistent with what you have seen in [STATE]?

### Certification Category by Age: Table 7

Table 7 shows infant and child participants' ages on the day of certification. We expect most child participants to be certified as children after their first birthday (12 months old). However, table 7 shows over 5 percent of child participants were certified as children at 11 months old. Please describe any policies that would explain this high percentage of 11-month-olds certified as children.

### Local Agency Reporting: Table 10 and [STATE]'s WIC LAD

The Local Agency ID is the unique number of the local agency where the participant was certified as eligible for WIC benefits. Table 10 lists the reported caseloads assigned to each of the local agencies within [STATE]. In this table, 15 different agencies that had a caseload reported are not currently identified as agencies in the WIC Local Agency Directory (LAD); these are indicated in red boxes. Should

these cases be assigned to other local agencies? We include a copy of [STATE]'s WIC LAD.

15 local agencies did not have a caseload reported; these are indicated in blue boxes. We expect that each local agency reports a caseload. Please observe that the number of local agencies who did not submit a caseload (15) matches the number of local agencies with caseloads but not included in the LAD. Can [STATE] verify if some of the caseloads reported to other agencies belong to the agencies that did not report a caseload?

### **Participation in Medicaid: Table 28**

For PC2018, the data show no WIC participants also participate in Medicaid. Is this a true reflection of participation levels for WIC participants in [STATE] or can [STATE] improve this data reporting?

### **Income or Income Range - Table 38**

No participants have \$0 income. Does [STATE] truly have no participants with \$0 income, or are there any reasons for this missing data? Moreover, approximately 8 percent of participants reported an income of \$1. A numeric value of 1 should indicate an actual dollar amount, not missing data. Please let us know if these income values are \$1 or if they may indicate missing values or participants without income.

### **Nutritional Risk Codes - Tables 41 and 44**

Several nutritional risk codes in [STATE]'s data (135Z, 352Z, 411.0, 425.0, and 427.0) were not included on the nutritional risk crosswalk submitted prior to data collection. Do these codes correspond to standard FNS Nutritional Risk codes, or should they be removed from the data?

More than half of infants and children are missing a second nutritional risk code. We expect most infants and children to have more than one nutritional risk code. Please describe any factors or policies that could contribute to these high missing values for infants and children.

### **Date Breastfeeding Data Collected - Table 84**

This table displays data on infants and children who were 6 to 13 months old in April [YEAR]. Within this group, 21 percent of the infants and children who were reported to be currently breastfeeding were between 0 and 4 months of age when breastfeeding data were collected, including 9 percent for whom this information was collected at birth. This indicates that the breastfeeding information is old and will likely provide an inaccurate estimate of breastfeeding duration in [STATE]. Is [STATE] able to report a date that more accurately reflects when the breastfeeding data were collected or confirmed for these infants and children?

### **Food Package Codes - Table 87a**

Food package prescriptions should be reported for all participants (except breastfeeding women and infants who do not receive a food package). Nearly 15 percent of [STATE]'s participants are missing food package code data. Please explain what accounts for these missing data.

# Data Worksheet for Transmitting April 2020 Data Files

---

## WIC Participant and Program Characteristics 2020

---

April 2020 data submissions should be sent to Insight as soon as possible after April 2020 and no later than July 17, 2020. Only complete data files should be submitted. Therefore, a State agency that expects to receive updated data after April 2020 for income, breastfeeding, participation, or other data fields should submit its data file only *after* entering this additional information. Include this completed worksheet with the April data submission.

1. State agency: \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. Name, title, phone number, and email address of the person able to answer questions regarding the State agency's data submission:  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. April data file specifications:
  - a. Number of participant records: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Maximum record length: \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. Was racial/ethnic data reported using the three-digit code, the series of six yes/no questions, or another format? *Check only one answer.*  
 Three-digit code provided in guidance  
 Series of six yes/no questions  
 Other format (*describe*): \_\_\_\_\_
  
5. Breastfeeding data collection procedures:
  - a. When was breastfeeding data collected? *Check all that apply.*  
 At issuance  
 At certification/recertification  
 During health care appointments  
 At nutrition education sessions  
 Separate telephone or mail inquiry  
 Other (*describe*): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Was breastfeeding data collected? *Check only one answer.*

- Only on infants aged 6 to 13 months in April 2020  
 On infants aged 6 to 13 months when data are collected  
 All infants  
 Other (*describe*): \_\_\_\_\_

c. Is breastfeeding data collected routinely or only for the biennial PC reporting?  
*Check only one answer.*

- Routinely     Only for PC reporting

d. Does the State agency's automated data system maintain the most recent breastfeeding information? *Check only one answer.*

- Yes     No

e. Were food package code translations submitted for the types and amounts of WIC foods prescribed? *Check only one answer.*

Food package translations . . .

- Are enclosed  
 Were already sent  
 Will be sent under separate cover

6. Were food code data submitted using food package codes, an item/quantity format, or another format?

- Food package codes (up to 14 codes with no more than 10 digits per code)  
 Item-quantity format  
 Other format (*describe*): \_\_\_\_\_

7. Was food package type reported using the specified codes 1 through 28 or another format?

- Used specified codes 1 through 28  
 Other format (*describe*): \_\_\_\_\_

Supplemental Dataset items submitted for PC2020:

- Date of first WIC certification  
 Education level  
 Number in household on WIC  
 Date previous pregnancy ended  
 Total number of pregnancies

- Total number of live births
- Prepregnancy weight
- Weight gain during pregnancy
- Birth weight
- Birth length
- Participation in Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations

8. Were Service Site IDs reported in the data?

- Yes       No

9. Management Information System (MIS) details:

a. Please provide the name of the MIS used to collect and submit the PC2020 data. \_\_\_\_\_

b. Has the State agency changed its MIS since the PC2018 data collection? If yes, please provide the name of the previous and current MIS.  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Other information:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Please send files and documentation to Insight's Secure File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site. Instructions follow; these will be provided separately to the State agency along with username and password:

1. Insight recommends sending files through our SFTP site.
2. Navigate to <https://connect.insightpolicyresearch.com>.
3. Enter your username (will be provided separately).
4. Enter your password (will be provided separately).
5. Upload the file.

Email questions to [PC2020@insightpolicyresearch.com](mailto:PC2020@insightpolicyresearch.com)

***By submitting your WIC PC data, you certify that these data are complete and accurate***

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set  
State/Agency: State Name  
Table 2  
[YEAR] vs [YEAR] Admin and PC Data Comparison*

Year	[STATE] PC Data	FNS Admin Data	Percent Non Participation
YEAR	21,270	19,093	10%
YEAR	18,963	16,922	11%

The PC[YEAR] caseload indicates a non-participation rate of 11%, which is higher than expected. Is this a typical monthly non-participation rate for State Name?



*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set*  
*State/Agency: State Name*  
*Table 3*  
*[YEAR] vs [YEAR] Change in PC Data*

<b>dataname</b>	<b>YEAR Data Total</b>	<b>YEAR Data Total</b>	<b>Change in Data</b>	<b>Percent Change in Data</b>
[STATE] YEAR PC Data	21,270	18,963	-2,307	-11%
FNS YEAR Admin Data	19,093	16,922	-2,171	-11%

The PC[YEAR] data indicates a decrease of 11% from PC [YEAR]. Is this consistent with what you have seen in State Name?

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set*  
*State/Agency: State Name*  
**Table 7**  
*Distribution of Certification Category by Age (calculated) for Infants and Children*  
 The FREQ Procedure

Frequency Row Pct	Table of cert_cat by c_age									
	cert_cat(Certification Category)	c_age(Children's Age in Months)							Total	
		0-3 Mths	4-8 Mths	9-10 Mths	11 Mths	12-23 Mths	24-35 Mths	36-47 Mths		48-60 Mths
	Infants (< 12 mos)	2,406 59.60	1,506 37.30	110 2.72	15 0.37	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	4,037
	Children (12-59 mos)	2 0.02	3 0.03	0 0.00	535 5.08	3,336 31.67	2,818 26.75	2,471 23.46	1,369 13.00	10,534
	Total	2,408	1,509	110	550	3,336	2,818	2,471	1,369	14,571

Over 5% of child participants were certified as children when they were 11 months old. Please describe any policies that would explain this percentage of 11-month-olds certified as children.

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set*  
*State/Agency: State Name*  
**Table 10**  
*Distribution of Local Agency ID*

Blue boxes show local agencies that did not have reported caseloads. For local agencies listed as active in the Local Agency Directory, we expect to see a caseload.

Red boxes indicate local agency codes that we do not have on record. Should these cases be assigned to other local agency codes?

Local Agency Name	Caseload
001 - <Invalid>	1,417
004 - <Invalid>	1,616
005 - Local agency 1 <Not Reported>	0
007 - <Invalid>	3,717
010 Local agency 16	1,629
011 - <Invalid>	4,185
012 - <Invalid>	2,216
013 - <Invalid>	1,348
015 - Local agency 2 <Not Reported>	0
016 - <Invalid>	3,568
017 - <Invalid>	2,905
018 - <Invalid>	2,300
019 - <Invalid>	3,521
020 - <Invalid>	436
021 - <Invalid>	113
025 - Local agency 3 <Not Reported>	0
035 - Local agency 4 <Not Reported>	0
040 - Local agency 5 <Not Reported>	0
045 - Local agency 6 <Not Reported>	0
050 - Local agency 7 <Not Reported>	0
055 - Local agency 8 <Not Reported>	0
060 - Local agency 9 <Not Reported>	0
065 - Local agency 10 <Not Reported>	0
070 - Local agency 11 <Not Reported>	0
095 - Local agency 12 <Not Reported>	0
098 - Local agency 13 <Not Reported>	0
101 - Local agency 14 <Not Reported>	0
102 - Local agency 15 <Not Reported>	0
213 - <Invalid>	871
214 - <Invalid>	1,178
238 - <Invalid>	1,177

## [STATE] WIC LAD

---

Local Agency Number	Local Agency Name
005	Local agency 1
010	Local agency 16
015	Local agency 2
025	Local agency 3
035	Local agency 4
040	Local agency 5
045	Local agency 6
050	Local agency 7
055	Local agency 8
060	Local agency 9
065	Local agency 10
070	Local agency 11
095	Local agency 12
098	Local agency 13
101	Local agency 14
102	Local agency 15

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set  
 State/Agency: State Name  
 Table 28  
 Previous Year vs Current Year - Medicaid*

Participation in Medicaid	YEAR Data N	YEAR Data Pct	YEAR Data N	YEAR Data Pct	Percent Difference	Percentage-Point Difference
Missing	216	1.02	134	0.71	-37.9630	-0.31
No	21,054	98.98	18,829	99.29	-10.5681	0.31

No WIC participants in State Name are reported as also participating in Medicaid. Is this an accurate reflection of participation in Medicaid among WIC participants in State Name?

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set*  
*State/Agency: State Name*  
**Table 38**  
*Distribution of Certification Category by Presence of Income or Adjunctive Income Range*  
*The FREQ Procedure*

Frequency Percent	Table of cert_cat by p2				
	cert_cat(Certification Category)	p2(Any Income Reported)			Total
		Missing	\$1	> \$1	
	Pregnant Women	0 0.00	5 0.44	61 5.41	66 5.85
	Breastfeeding Women	0 0.00	13 1.15	125 11.08	138 12.23
	Postpartum Women	0 0.00	7 0.62	117 10.37	124 10.99
	Infant (< 12)	3 0.27	13 1.15	185 16.40	201 17.82
	Child (12-59)	1 0.09	49 4.34	549 48.67	599 53.10
	<b>Total</b>	4 0.35	87 <b>7.71</b>	1037 91.93	1128 100.00

There are no participants who reported a \$0 income. Does *State Name* truly have no participants with \$0 income, or are there any reasons for this missing data?

Approximately 8 percent of participants reported have an income of \$1. A numeric value of 1 should indicate an actual dollar amount, not missing data.  
  
Please indicated if these income values are \$1 or if they may indicate missing values.

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set*  
*State/Agency: State Name*  
**Table 41**  
*FNS and State Agency Nutritional Risk Codes*

*The FREQ Procedure*

These 5 nutritional risk codes in *State Name* were not included on the nutritional risk crosswalk submitted prior to data collection. Do these codes correspond to standard FNS nutritional risk codes? Or should they be removed from the data?

FNS Codes	[STATE] Codes	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
135	135Z	76	0.16	76	0.16
352	352Z	2	0.00	78	0.17
411	411.0	561	1.22	639	1.39
425	425.0	10145	22.02	10784	23.40
427	427.0	718	1.56	11502	24.96
A10	101	96	0.21	11598	25.17
A10	103	609	1.32	12207	26.49
A20	111	2690	5.84	14897	32.33
A20	113	1508	3.27	16405	35.60
A20	114	2774	6.02	19179	41.62
A20	115	1012	2.20	20191	43.82
A30	121	1117	2.42	21308	46.24
A40	131	577	1.25	21885	47.49
A40	132	269	0.58	22154	48.08
A40	133	1736	3.77	23890	51.84
A40	134	27	0.06	23917	51.90
A40	135	46	0.10	23963	52.00
A50	141	522	1.13	24485	53.13
A50	142	808	1.75	25293	54.89
A90	151	12	0.03	25305	54.91

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set  
 State/Agency: State Name  
 Table 44  
 Distribution of Certification Category by NAWD Code 2  
 The FREQ Procedure*

Frequency Row Pct		Table of cert_cat by nawd2													
		nawd2(Nutritional Risk #2)													
cert_cat(Certification Category)	Missing	A10	A20	A30	A40	A50	A90	B10	C10	C20	C30	C40	C50	C60	
Pregnant Women	12 18.18	1 1.52	11 16.67	0 0.00	20 30.30	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 4.55	2 3.03	0 0.00	4 6.06	2 3.03	2 3.03	1 1.52	
Breastfeeding Women	41 29.71	1 0.72	17 12.32	0 0.00	30 21.74	0 0.00	0 0.00	13 9.42	2 1.45	9 6.52	0 0.00	1 0.72	6 4.35	0 0.00	
Postpartum Women	26 20.97	2 1.61	11 8.87	0 0.00	30 24.19	0 0.00	0 0.00	28 22.58	1 0.81	3 2.42	1 0.81	6 4.84	7 5.65	0 0.00	
Infant (< 12)	111 55.22	4 1.99	2 1.00	2 1.00	4 1.99	11 5.47	1 0.50	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	
Child (12-59)	352 58.76	1 0.17	19 3.17	16 2.67	24 4.01	19 3.17	0 0.00	35 5.84	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	8 1.34	0 0.00	
Total	542	9	60	18	108	30	1	79	5	12	5	9	23	1	

55 percent of infants and 59 percent of children are missing Nutritional Risk Code #2. This is higher than expected.  
 Please describe any factors or policies that could contribute to these high missing values for infants and children.



*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set  
 State/Agency: State Name  
 Table 84  
 Distribution of Currently Breastfeeding by Date Breastfeeding Data Collected  
 For Infants and Children 6 to 13 Months at Reference Date*

*The FREQ Procedure*

Frequency Row Pct		Table of cbrstfed by bfnmonths														
cbrstfed(Currently Breastfeeding)	bfnmonths(Age in Months at Breastfeeding Response)															
	Missing	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Missing	3 100.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	3	
Yes	0 0.00	6 8.70	1 1.45	2 2.90	3 4.35	3 4.35	0 0.00	10 14.49	11 15.94	8 11.59	12 17.39	9 13.04	2 2.90	2 2.90	69	
No	0 0.00	3 2.05	2 1.37	0 0.00	1 0.68	4 2.74	3 2.05	19 13.01	13 8.90	23 15.75	42 28.77	22 15.07	5 3.42	9 6.16	146	
Total	3	9	3	2	4	7	3	29	24	31	54	31	7	11	218	

21 percent of infants and children (6 to 13 months old) who answered YES to currently breastfeeding were between 0 and 4 months old when breastfeeding data were collected; nearly 9 percent were collected at birth.

This indicates that the breastfeeding information is old, and will likely provide an inaccurate estimate of breastfeeding in State Name.

Is State Name able to report a date that more accurately reflects when the breastfeeding data was collected/ confirmed for these infants and children?

*Preliminary Statistics for Minimum Data Set  
 State/Agency: State Name  
 Table 87a  
 Distribution of Food Package Codes*

*The FREQ Procedure*

Food package prescriptions are expected to be reported for all participants (except partially breastfeeding women who do not receive a food package).  
  
 Nearly 15 percent of State Name's participants are missing Food Package Code data. Please explain what accounts for these missing data.

Food Package Codes	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Missing	163	14.45	163	14.45
00068	3	0.27	166	14.72
00585	1	0.09	167	14.80
12542	49	4.34	216	19.15
12596	3	0.27	219	19.41
12601	4	0.35	223	19.77
12618	3	0.27	226	20.04
12619	1	0.09	227	20.12
12621	29	2.57	256	22.70
12660	69	6.12	325	28.81
12674	8	0.71	333	29.52
12677	9	0.80	342	30.32
12681	1	0.09	343	30.41
12712	6	0.53	349	30.94
12713	12	1.06	361	32.00
12714	245	21.72	606	53.72
12715	16	1.42	622	55.14
12732	2	0.18	624	55.32
12733	1	0.09	625	55.41
12740	6	0.53	631	55.94