

**FNS Request for Information
FNS 380-1 & FNS 245 Coding**

FNS National Office is working on a project to strengthen the coding on the FNS 380-1 and the FNS 245. They will hold State roundtable discussions (in March 2022) as part of this project. Below are the questions they are asking. They plan to use the responses to these questions to help guide their State roundtable discussions.

What can FNS do differently to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of coding in SNAP QC?

Responses:

- **Kentucky** - Highlight or prompt areas that cause most error prone coding areas. For example, on the comp sheets areas that the worker manually enters digits.
- **Colorado** – Add coding to Active Cases to capture different cause of incomplete cases. For example, add codes for refused, HH failed, third party failed as well as codes for “interview” such as no show, no contact, and refused. Last, allow for coding of what elements code not be completed. This would help states capture data and determine possible mitigation effort without having to capture this manually.
- **Colorado** – add 005 computer programming error to all elements for Negative Reviews or add cause codes to improve the understanding of the cause.

Are there areas of the FNS 380-1 that the TAG would like to see changed or improved? Please provide as many specific details as possible

Responses:

- **Georgia** - Instead of having simply an “other” code could it be an “other” code with a space to provide an explanation that is saved in that state’s SNAP QCS to be used again in the future and added to when new scenarios are seen. If a new “other” scenario is used multiple times it could then be added to the reasons/codes available to that state in SNAP QCS or shared with the other states if deemed necessary after examination.
- **Kentucky** - When completing items on the face sheet 380, have help trigger to prompt to define how to code item 68 on the 380.1. Have the face sheet prompts that require 9 digits in the SSN fields and allow a “0” as a first digits.

Are there areas of the FNS 245 that the TAG would like to see changed or improved? Please provide as many specific details as possible.

Responses:

Georgia

- **Code for residency is too vague – add code for moved to other state.**
- **Household Composition - Add a code for – Not eligible for separate household status.**
- **Verification – 415 – add a code failed to request required verification**

Kentucky

- Have a code to indicate if the error is system deficiency caused, or EW caused error.
- A code for “case should not have discontinued as Simplified Reporting or CE not considered”
- Code that states agency failed to access verification that was available on system matches (Bendex, SDX or EA)
- Have case number prompts in field 2 of the 245 that that only allows 9 digits for case number. Item 3 of 245 should not have the option of being blank LAC.

How do States utilize LAC codes, if at all, and how are LAC codes assigned? Is coding LAC difficult or are instructions clear when a round robin process is used?

Responses:

- **Georgia** uses LAC codes. We assign them based on the county in which the case was associated to in our IES and assigned to QC. We use the codes for reports when we wish to reflect QC data for a specific county. One improvement that would be helpful is the ability to save certain search criteria in SNAP QCS that we use frequently in the Active and Negative

Reports. For instance, Georgia divides its counties up into Regions which are part of Districts. Currently when we wish to pull a report from SNAP QCS for a specific Region or District we must go through and click the box next to each county from that Region or District each time we run a report. This is tedious, frustrating, and time consuming. If we had the ability to set a District up once and run the report with those parameters with the click of a button it would be great.

- **North Carolina** uses LAC codes. We are county administered; therefore, we provide various reports that are county-specific. For example, we provide a State error rate that includes each county's error rate. NC created an LAC for errors caused by our state system, state policy, and state QC.
- **Kentucky - LAC codes should be limited to the area that the client resides in, instead of indicating the region that the EW works in, that done the last action to the case. This would require the agency to seek out the EW that causes the initial error in the case. The LAC being the clients home area instead of the EW's workstation would require the statewide casework concept to look at the action or inaction that was done to the household instead of the focus on the EW's region or county of their workstation. This would ensure the agency to trace back actual errors to the root causes that caused the client to have a variance in their case. In doing this the agency would be representing the client instead of the workers actions.**

While there are situations where the use of "Other" will be the best code, its use should be minimal.

- What situations do reviewers most commonly use "Other" in the nature or causal codes of primary errors?
- What areas of coding should FNS consider adding or changing to reduce the use of "Other" in either the 380-1 or 245?
- Is there training or are there other actions that FNS should consider to help reduce the use of "Other"?

Response:

- **GA - 380-1 – 17 and 18 – add Childcare Provider and Collateral**
- **NC - In situations in which the household 'misreported' information. For example in element 363, the household misreported the rent amount at application. The options are:**

52	Deduction that should have been included was not
53	Deduction included that should not have been
64	Incorrect amount used resulting from a change in residence
123	Incorrectly prorated
97	Not required to be reported or acted upon based on timeframes and reporting requirements for allotment differences below the \$48 threshold
98	Transcription or computation errors
99	Other

- **NC - EW miscalculated the amount of the dependent care deduction (transportation expense). The options are:**

- 52 Deduction that should have been included was not
- 53 Deduction included that should not have been
- 97 Not required to be reported or acted upon based on timeframes and reporting requirements for allotment differences below the \$48 threshold
- 98 Transcription or computation errors
- 99 Other

- **KY** - A code that allows an analyst to override the system and type a short reason not defined in the drop-down list would be nice. Have an area on the 245 or 380.1 that a short font limited area that can be typed out.

If TAG is aware of State(s) that rarely use the “Other” coding, what best practices were put in place to minimize the use of “Other” coding?

Response:

- **GA** - We made a decision as a Unit to avoid using “other” a few years ago. We use the available code which best fits our situation. On rare occasions we will agree that there is no better code than other. Again, this relies on having excellent staff with experience in our Team Manger positions as they ensure the coding used by Reviewers are consistent and thoughtful.
- **KY** - : We require that the SQCA contact and discuss the use of “other” prior to using it with management to ensure that no other codes may apply... also require that Analyst to refer to the actual 310 HB that has Examples of Acceptable Documentation whereas the code prompts only have a summary as doing this may help determine a code other than other.