

Reauthorization Recommendations: Research
Table of Contents

NOTE: This table summarizes research related to issues considered relevant to reauthorization. For a more comprehensive review of the research, please see the Research Forum Key Topics Page: www.researchforum.org/keytopics.html.

- I. TANF Mission**
 - a. Goals/Purposes
- II. Statutory Regulations and Requirements**
 - a. Work Requirements
 - b. Time Limits
 - c. Sanctions
 - d. Child support
 - e. Marriage/Family Formation
- III. Incentives and Support Services**
 - a. Work retention and advancement
 - b. Child Care
 - c. Medicaid
 - d. Food Stamps
- IV. Special Populations**
 - a. Immigrants
 - b. Hard-to-serve/Barriers to employment
 - c. Child Welfare Populations
- V. Administrative Issues**
 - a. Funding
 - b. Administration/Implementation
 - c. Reporting

REAUTHORIZATION RECOMMENDATIONS: RESEARCH

I. TANF MISSION	
a. Goals/Purposes	
Original goal: Provide support to poor families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives	<p>In recent years, research findings have provided evidence relevant to each of the existing goals of TANF:</p> <p>1) With regard to child well-being, assistance is provided to children in caseloads meeting TANF requirements. A Large number of children in immigrant families are not being provided assistance, even when eligible. No significant increases in foster care placement have been documented. Child-only cases are becoming a larger proportion of the shrinking caseload. Child poverty rates continue to decrease.</p> <p>2) With regard to dependence on public benefits, solid evidence exists that as caseloads relying on public assistance (e.g. TANF, Food Stamps) have decreased dramatically, reductions in benefit expenditures have mirrored these caseload reductions. Data documenting increases in numbers of workers employed (even with recent reductions reflecting an economic downturn) substantiate a movement off the rolls of cash assistance and into regular employment. Caseload churning, in which the number of families entering welfare is similar to the number of families leaving welfare, has increased. Supports for working families, such as the EITC, have also increased.</p> <p>3) While increased marriage rates are not significant, slight decreases in divorce rates continue (these began before 1996). In addition, small reductions in household headed by a single parent are emerging. With regard to family formation, however, there is conflicting evidence about the impact of Family Cap provisions.</p> <p>4) With regard to nonmarital births, a reduction in teen birth rates (which began prior to 1996) continue. Data concerning living arrangements and school attendance for these populations is not sufficiently available.</p>
Original goal: Promote job preparation, work, and marriage in order to reduce families' receipt of government benefits	
Original goal: Prevent and reduce the incidence of nonmarital pregnancies	
Original goal: Encourage the maintenance and formation of two-parent families	
Add goal of poverty reduction	
Add goal of improving earnings, advancement, and retention	
Add goal of increasing the flexibility of states to operate programs to improve the well-being of children	
Add goal to encourage the formation and maintenance of healthy two parent married families and responsible fatherhood	
II. STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS	
a. WORK REQUIREMENTS	
Require 40-hrs/wk of full participation including at least 24 hrs/wk of work	<p>WORK REQUIREMENTS RESEARCH:</p> <p>Studies indicate that most individuals leaving TANF for employment are in low-wage jobs. Studies of "leavers" also show that those with limited education and/or other problems are most likely to return to the TANF caseload. The current state participation requirement of 50% is discounted by caseload reductions, which reduce state benchmarks. Currently, because of drastic caseload reductions, some states have very minimal participation requirements. Hours worked by TANF participants who remain on the rolls tend to be less than full-time. However, the average number of hours per week for non-welfare working mothers is 30.9. A summary of research of 20 welfare-to-work policies in 9 states found that while programs of all types (job search first, education first,</p>
Leave hourly work participation requirements unchanged	
Establish "Universal engagement requirement"	
Maintain/increase flexibility of states to determine exemption rates	
Flexibility for states in defining work requirements	
Incentives/funding to experiment w/job creation programs	
Count job-training, education programs toward work requirement	
Don't count training toward work requirement	
Count child care for children <6 yrs toward work requirement	

Count care for disabled/sick child toward work requirement	<p>mixed initial activities) were effective to some extent, the programs that produced the largest effects on earnings used a mix of job search and education as initial activities while maintaining a strong focus on employment. The programs with the largest effects on earnings generally had the largest reductions in welfare benefits. Impacts on child outcomes were small and variable, although some negative impacts on adolescents were reported. Less is known about the well-being of infants and toddlers.</p> <p>With regard to increased work requirements, evidence does suggest that increasing work participation rates is likely to require substantially more resources, both fiscal and administrative. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that child care costs would have to increase by \$5 billion if a 40 hour work week was required. As of recently, only 3% of the total welfare population is engaged in mandatory work experience programs, also known as workfare, although this percentage could increase if economic conditions made finding “real jobs” more difficult in the face of strengthened mandatory work participation.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on work requirements, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Work Requirements Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_workrequirements.cfm).</p>
Eliminate 30% cap on number of TANF recipients who can use vocational education or high school to count toward work requirement	
Raise level of vocational education that counts toward requirement	
Count rehab services (ex. SA treatment, domestic violence counseling) toward requirement	
Exempt non-parental relative caregivers	
Exempt parent of disabled child	
Exempt teen parents from 20% vocational education limit	
Replace caseload reduction credit with employment credit	
Remove administrative barriers to accessing and maintaining subsidies	

b. TIME LIMITS	
Maintain time limits	<p>TIME LIMITS RESEARCH:</p> <p>Findings on the impact of time limits from large evaluations using random assignment methods are limited to sites in which a significant number of families on welfare reached their time limits. As of the end of 2002, relatively few families were removed from the rolls after reaching their time limits because of exemptions and state-funded extensions. Studies conducted by MDRC in Florida and Connecticut provide the earliest indicators of the impacts on time limits. In general, time limits did not produce any major effects on earnings or income. Effects on the most disadvantaged groups varied. Effects on elementary school-aged children were minimal; however, there were some negative effects on school-related and risky behavior outcomes for adolescents possibly due to reduced supervision. For those who were employed upon reaching their time limit (which ranged from ½ to almost all time limit leavers), employment was not greatly affected after leaving welfare. Many former recipients experienced financial hardship and relied heavily on family, friends, and other public assistance, but there was little evidence that time limit leavers were worse off than other welfare leavers.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on time limits, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Time Limits Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_time.cfm)</p>
Eliminate time limits	
“Stop the clock” when recipient working	
Expand state exemption options	
Don’t subject supplemental earnings to time limits	
Maintain exemption limits	
Ban time limits <5 yrs	
Maintain oversight on process of imposing/tracking time limits	
Lift 20% cap on hardship exemptions	
Exempt parents of disabled	
Exempt non-parental relative caregivers	
Exempt teen parents until complete degrees	
Exempt parents of young children	
Exempt teen parents until 20 yrs old	
Exempt families with severe barriers to employment (domestic violence, substance addiction, mental health issues)	

c. SANCTIONS	
Establish procedures to assess and address family circumstances before sanctioning	<p>SANCTIONS RESEARCH:</p> <p>Existing research does not adequately examine the direct effects of sanctions on recipient behavior. Non-experimental studies do not provide information on how recipients would have fared had they remained on welfare, and experimental studies using random assignment methods could not isolate the effects of sanctions from the effects of other program elements (e.g. expanded earnings</p>
Maintain oversight on process of imposing/tracking sanctions	
Restore benefits upon compliance	
Prohibit full family sanction	
Sanction on pro rata basis	

Exempt those with domestic violence, substance abuse, mental health issues	<p>the effects of sanctions from the effects of other program elements (e.g. expanded earnings disregards). Findings from NEWWS suggest that in programs that strongly enforced mandates, higher sanctioning rates were not associated with higher participation rates. Data suggest that most people do not comply with program requirements even after a sanction is imposed, with compliance rates averaging 30% (GAO). Other studies find that one-quarter to one-half of families subject to work requirements are sanctioned over a 12 to 24-month period (Delaware ABC; Virginia VIP). The most common reasons for being sanctioned tend to be missing appointments or failing to file required paperwork (Three-City Study). Results from the leaver studies indicate that anywhere from one-third to one-half of respondents reported that they were having trouble making ends meet. Sanctioned leavers are substantially less likely to work than individuals who left welfare for other reasons, and several leavers studies found relatively high rates of participation in both Food Stamps and Medicaid (GAO). For cases in which a parent may have developmental or substance abuse difficulties affecting their ability to comply with work requirements, the children may be adversely affected by sanctioning.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on sanctions, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Sanctions Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_sanctions.cfm).</p>
Prevent sanctioning of any parents unable to obtain child care	
Study/reporting on sanctions of teen parents	

d. CHILD SUPPORT	
Incentives for states to provide more child support payments to leavers	<p>CHILD SUPPORT RESEARCH</p> <p>Results from MDRC’s evaluation of Parents’ Fair Share, a program designed to assist non-custodial fathers who owe child support find jobs, make child support payments, and become more involved in their children’s lives, indicated that participants were significantly more likely to pay child support than the control group and paid significantly higher amounts. The study also found that many fathers provide informal support to their children and that pressuring them to provide more support through the formal child support system reduces levels of informal support. Data from the Office of Child Support Enforcement indicate that paternity establishment and child support payments since PRWORA have increased substantially for welfare recipients but less so for those not on welfare. Studies also report that strengthened child support enforcement is associated with declines in welfare caseloads (a trend that existed prior to PRWORA) and positive outcomes for mothers and children.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on child support, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Child Support Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_childsupp.cfm)</p>
Simplify/improve distribution rules	
Eliminate child support assignment provisions	
Provide federal matching funds for pass through payments	
Give leavers all child support collected on their behalf	
Collect user fee from families never receiving TANF	
Disregard child support passed through	
Withhold limited amount of SSI from those owing support	
Lower threshold for passport denial for those owing support	
Expand child support enforcement	
Lift incentive caps	
Pass through more/all of child support to family	
Fund studies to test new methods of financing child support enforcement	
Forgive child support arrears owed if separated couple marries or remarries	
Fund research/demonstrations to help non-custodial parents support/care for kids	
Deny visas to potential immigrants if non-payment of support	
Strengthen Responsible Fatherhood programs	
States must outline how their plan will handle non-compliant fathers	
Suspend child support arrears when separated couple w/children reunites but doesn’t marry	
e. MARRIAGE/FAMILY FORMATION	
Fund demonstrations to define interventions promoting marriage, and/or family formation	<p>MARRIAGE/FAMILY FORMATION RESEARCH</p> <p>Marriage:</p> <p>Research has indicated that welfare programs that remove financial disincentives for marriage can positively affect marriage rates and stability (Minnesota’s FIP). In addition, Programs that provide financial incentives have been found to increase the number of single parents who subsequently married or cohabitated (Canada’s SSP). Delaware’s ABC program, designed to increase employment, found small positive effects on marriage rates for younger, less educated women. In California, it was found that a regime of lower benefits and higher work incentives had “sizeable and statistically significant effects” on the decision to stay married; these effects increased over time. No large-scale evaluations have studied the effect of marriage counseling on marriage rates, as such programs were generally not implemented in post-1996 welfare programs. Work mandates appear to have no effect on marriage rates.</p> <p>Nonmarital Births:</p> <p>Overall, evaluations of welfare programs saw little reduction in subsequent pregnancies and births,</p>
Eliminate/provide more flexibility for use of abstinence education funds	
Funds to encourage/replicate proven policies and research on programs that enhance family/child well-being	
Fund demonstrations to promote abstinence	
Allow benefits to teen parents not in school and/or not living in adult supervised setting	
Provide funds for programs proven to lower rates of teen pregnancy or sexual risk-taking	
Continue evaluating new teen pregnancy programs	
Replicate/adapt proven teen pregnancy prevention programs;	
Fund demonstrations to end eligibility for cash benefits for teen mothers	
Fund programs/services for teen parents	

No discrimination between married couples and those not married but living together with children	<p>and one program saw an increase in births among the program group (see New Chance Evaluation; Teenage Parent Demonstration Program). Evaluations of programs designed to increase prenatal and home visitation by nurses, on the other hand, found a significant reduction in subsequent pregnancies and delay of subsequent pregnancies (see Prenatal and Home Visitation by Nurses, Elmira and Memphis).</p> <p>Fatherhood programs: Fatherhood support programs have generally resulted in increased child support payments, but have had little effect on fathers' employment or earnings. Research has revealed a desire among the vast majority (98%) of fathers to be involved in the raising of their children.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on marriage and family formation, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Family Formation Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_family.cfm)</p>
Authorize Second Chance homes for teenage parents	
Eliminate "family cap"	
Eliminate separate work participation rate for two-parent families	
No discrimination against two-parent families in eligibility under TANF	

III. INCENTIVES AND SUPPORT SERVICES

a. JOB RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT

Fund innovative job retention and advancement programs	<p>JOB RETENTION RESEARCH</p> <p>Evaluations of some programs designed to increase job retention have generally found positive results. Nonetheless, despite increased job retention, substantial challenges, such as transportation, lack of health insurance, workplace conflicts, and child care, remain (see GAPS program). Other program evaluations did not find significant program impacts on increasing earnings, reducing welfare, or promoting the move toward self-sufficiency, possibly due to the strong economy during the experiment providing enhanced employment opportunities for control group members (see Post-Employment Services Program). Studies that examined barriers to employment found that common barriers to working included the lack of a high school degree, transportation difficulties, few work skills, and mental health issues (see Women's Employment Study).</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on job retention, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Job Retention Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_jobretention.cfm)</p>
Rewards to states for increasing job advancement	
Rewards to states for increasing work skills	
States must outline how state plan will deal with work retention and advancement issues	
Increase time allowed to participate in vocational training/education	

b. CHILD CARE

Increase funding level of CCDBG	<p>CHILD CARE RESEARCH</p> <p>After PRWORA, child care spending grew dramatically, with the federal TANF block grants being used as major sources for new funding for optional child care. While states have generally increased the number of children covered with child care subsidies, most states have not been able to serve the number of federally-eligible children. States have been better able to meet the child care demands for families receiving TANF, but the population of families leaving TANF is still an underserved population. In many areas, long-standing shortages in supply, particularly in low-income neighborhoods, have been reported. While spending on child care quality issues has increased among the states, need for additional funds to support higher quality formal child care is often stressed. The NICHD study of Child Care found that child care was a small but significant predictor of maternal sensitivity and child engagement, with higher quality child care associated with greater maternal</p>
Maintain funding level of CCDBG	
Maintain flexibility to use TANF for child care	
Eliminate federal rules restricting use of TANF for child care	
Increase funds, research, programs to improve quality and quantity of care	
Enforce quality standards	
Guarantee child care for all recipients	
Remove administrative barriers to accessing and maintaining child care subsidies	
Establish credit for employer-provided child care facilities and expenditures	

Provide child care for leavers	<p>sensitivity and more child-care hours associated with less child engagement. Studies of the Early Head Start program have found strong positive outcomes for both mothers and children using Early Head Start. Studies of kith and kinship care have indicated that many families are using more informal care once they leave TANF. Provisions related to kinship care vary by state.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on child care, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Child Care Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_childcare.cfm)</p>
--------------------------------	---

c. MEDICAID

Continue transitional Medicaid	<p>MEDICAID RESEARCH</p> <p>The large majority of children in families leaving welfare remain eligible for Medicaid or SCHIP, as do most of their parents. However, in most states, roughly half of parents in families that have left welfare and more than one-third of children in those families lose Medicaid. Families that lose Medicaid after they leave welfare are at high risk of becoming uninsured because they have limited access to private coverage. A significant minority of families are not aware that medical benefits may continue after loss of welfare. There is some evidence to suggest that TANF diversion policies may be unintentionally contributing to lower rates of Medicaid participation by eligible families. For adults, Medicaid leavers were less likely to report fair or poor health and less likely to have a condition limiting work than those who remain on Medicaid.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on Medicaid, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Medicaid Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_medicaid.cfm)</p>
--------------------------------	--

d. FOOD STAMPS

Continue as entitlement program	<p>FOOD STAMPS RESEARCH</p> <p>Until recently, the decrease in TANF caseloads was coupled with a decrease in Food Stamp recipients, even those who maintained their eligibility for Food Stamps after leaving TANF. Much of those decrease was blamed on increased barriers to access brought about by PRWORA's de-linking of the welfare and food stamp application processes. Barriers to access to Food Stamps reported by USDA include: formal or informal job search diversion policies; limited office hours; burdensome verification requirements; shortened food stamp certification periods; lack of employment and training services to help welfare recipients meet their work requirement and maintain benefits; food stamp sanctions for noncompliance with TANF rules, sometimes without opportunities for conciliation; and privatization of the TANF eligibility process.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on Food Stamps, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Food Stamps Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_food.cfm).</p>
Improve access	
Modify plan for sanctioning states	
Provide bonuses for states maintaining payment accuracy and providing better customer service	
Simplify application/administration	
Improve electronic benefit transfer program	
Establish higher standard deduction for larger households	
Evaluate effect of giving block grants to 5+ states on condition certain individuals/families guaranteed coverage	
Provide for families with earnings up to at least 200% of federal poverty level	

IV. SPECIAL POPULATIONS

a. IMMIGRANTS

Allow Medicaid and food stamp receipt for legal immigrants	<p>IMMIGRANT RESEARCH</p>
Allow TANF receipt for legal immigrants	

Provide State option to cover legal immigrants with Federal funds	<p>PRWORA placed drastic limits on immigrants' eligibility for public assistance. These provisions are thought to affect a large number of citizen children living in immigrant families. Seventy-five percent of children in immigrant families, where at least one parent is a noncitizen, are citizens and one in 10 children in the United States lives in a mixed-status family, where at least one parent is a noncitizen and one child is a citizen. In New York City, mixed-status families make up 30 percent of all families with children living below 200 percent of the federal poverty level. In Los Angeles mixed-status families are nearly 60 percent. In New York, 70 percent of all undocumented households with children include citizen children. (However, undocumented-headed households are less likely to include children than other immigrant-headed households.) Twenty-one percent of all children without health insurance nationwide and over half of the uninsured children in California live in mixed-status families. One-third of mixed-status families have incomes below 125 percent of the poverty level.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on immigrants, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Immigrants Issues Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_immigrant.cfm).</p>
Allow SSI for legal immigrants	
Allow SSI w/requirement that sponsor's income be deemed for their 1 st five years in US	
Retain current immigrant provisions	
Require GAO study to determine impact of SSI benefit denials to legal immigrants	
Count ESL toward work participation requirement	

b. HARD-TO-SERVE / BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT

Research and programs to address adults with multiple barriers to employment	<p>HARD-TO-SERVE / BARRIERS RESEARCH</p> <p>Research has found that multiple barriers (including human capital and other work-related barriers, physical or mental health problems, domestic violence, transportation, and child care) are associated with longer stays on TANF (see Women's Employment Study). Researchers in three cities found that leavers without high school degrees or GEDs or who were in poor or fair health were significantly less likely to be employed (see Three City Study). Other studies found housing to be a significant barrier (see Women's Employment Study; CBPP reports). In other studies, moving to higher-income neighborhoods results in significant improvements in safety and child and parent physical and mental health (see Jobs-Plus Evaluation; Moving to Opportunity Evaluation). Other studies reported TANF recipients more likely to have transportation problems and be a major issue in the context of the welfare-to-work initiatives (see Joblinks and Bridges to Work Evaluations).</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on Hard-to-Serve, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Hard-to-Serve Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_hts.cfm), the Research Forum Key Topics: Transportation Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_transportation.cfm), and the Research Forum Key Topics: Housing Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_housing.cfm),.</p>
Provide bonuses for states that best screen for and assist those with barriers	
Provide grants to improve States' policies to assist those with barriers	
Create Pathways to Self-Sufficiency Grants for multiple transitional support services	
Income supports for part-timers unable to find full-time work, in education and training programs, or at home caring for family members	
Provide transportation support	
Improve access to transitional supports (Medicaid, Food Stamps, Child Care)	
Create BusinessLink Grants to support job development	
Fund transitional job programs	
Provide states with more flexibility to carry out existing transportation assistance projects	

c. CHILD WELFARE POPULATIONS

Extend program for encouraging States to establish family preservation and support services, reunification services, and adoption promotion services	<p>CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH</p> <p>Some state level data suggest a link between increased work and neglect, particularly about the most</p>
--	--

<p>Repeal State option to opt out of criminal background checks for prospective foster care or adoptive parents</p>	<p>disadvantaged clients (see ABC, JCPR). Since 1996, some efforts to coordinate TANF and child welfare services are getting underway, but most are at initial stages. These efforts are considered more important due to the rising proportion of child-only cases in the TANF caseload. Kinship care is also receiving more attention, as about 10% of TANF recipient children live with relatives.</p> <p>For a more detailed summary of research on Child Welfare, see the Research Forum Key Topics: Child Welfare Page (www.researchforum.org/cfm/key2_childwelfare.cfm).</p>
---	--

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

a. FUNDING

Maintain current level/increase
Maintain flexibility in use of funds
Allow surplus funds to be used for non-assistance
Annual inflation adjustment
Revise/strengthen Contingency Fund
In economic downturn, increase grant proportionate to increased caseload
Allow rainy day funds w/o threat of decrease in grant
Additional grants for states with greater percentage of poor children. ("Equity Grants")
Allow states to divert surpluses to non-welfare initiatives or back to taxpayers
Avoid supplantation
Provide Supplemental Grants for States
Restore Social Services Block Grant funding
Eliminate caseload reduction credit
Replace caseload reduction credit with employment credit
Redesign caseload reduction credit/ Rewards for states with leavers who are working
Provide bonus/reward for reducing child poverty
Provide bonus/reward for increasing employment
Eliminate illegitimacy bonus
Allow full benefits for children born to families already receiving TANF
Prohibit new entrants to system

Funding. After a slow uptake in which many states did not use their full block grants, TANF funds have, for the most part, been well used. Of particular note is those TANF funds used to expand child care.

In looking at the overall totals of TANF and MOE funds used in FY 2000, key points are that:

- 1) Basic assistance continues to be the largest single use of funds, but reflects less than half of the funds used; there has been a diversification of state funding away from cash benefits.
- 2) Child care is, by a substantial margin, the second most common use of funds.
- 3) While the majority of funds are being used for basic assistance and child care, the remainder - comprising about \$10 billion dollars - is being used for a diverse array of activities. After basic assistance and child care, no other category of expenditure involves at least 10% of TANF spending. (See CLASP, August 2001).

b. ADMINISTRATION/IMPLEMENTATION

Improve access/outreach to eligible families
Increase flexibility and simplicity in administration
Establish State Program Implementation Waivers ("Superwaivers")
Increase coordination among agencies
Discontinue pre-PRWORA AFDC waivers
Allow pre-PRWORA waivers to continue
Prohibit states from refusing to accept application for assistance
Prohibit disclosure of individual information, except if necessary to administer program or individual consents
Provide individuals with opportunity to appeal any adverse decision
Provide technical assistance to tribes

Flexibility. Flexibility has been essential to bringing about the dramatic change in addressing social welfare issues.

Management Information Systems and Information Technology. MIS/IT issues are being ignored. In order to advance a new social welfare agenda, far more information needs to be collected and shared across domains.

Implementation. The research findings from the Rockefeller Institute needs to be incorporated in planning for the next generation of change in social policy.

Allow states the option of aligning foster care and adoption assistance eligibility with TANF eligibility	
c. REPORTING / MOE	
Improve reporting	While the more detailed reporting categories initiated in 2000 have improved the ability to describe how funds are being used, the residual category ("other") and minimally specified categories are still substantial, and the lack of detail about those categories makes it difficult to fully describe the wide range of ways in which TANF and MOE funds are now being used. This suggests a continuing need to improve the financial reporting definitions and categories in order to better understand the uses of TANF and MOE funds. (See CLASP, August 2001).
Set, measure, report performance goals	
Enforce state/local compliance with anti-discrimination statutes	
Incorporate child well-being into Individual Responsibility Plan	
Maintain MOE	
Increase MOE with inflation	
Remove MOE	