
Final Report — WIC Dynamics

Volume 2

Contract No. 53-3198-0-049

Submitted to:

**USDA, Food and Consumer Service
3101 Park Center Drive - Room 201
Alexandria VA 22302
Denise Thomas, Project Officer**

by:

**Macro International Inc.
11785 Beltsville Drive
Calverton, Maryland 20705
JoAnn Kuchak, Project Director
and
The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037
Nancy M. Pindus, Subcontract Director**

February 1995

Table of Contents

Section 1	Study Design and Methodolgy
Section 2	Local Agency Tables
Section 3	Standard Errors Tables
Section 4	State Agency Tables
Section 5	Sampling and Estimation
Section 6	Survey Instrumentation

List of Tables

Page No.

Section II

1	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Agency Size	II-1
2	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Percentage Growth	II-2
3	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Agency Sponsorship	II-3
4	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Catchment Area	II-5
5	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served	II-7
IA.6	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served	II-13
IB.6	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served	II-19
6	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Size of WIC Local Agency	II-25
7	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Perceived Caseload Change Since 1988 and Actual Growth	II-26
8	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Caseload Change Since 1988 and Agency Sponsorship	II-27
9	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Caseload Change Since 1988 and Catchment Area	II-28
10	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served	II-30
11	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Operating Capacity and Agency Size	II-36
12	Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Operating Capacity and Percentage Growth	II-37
13	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Caseload Fluctuations	II-39
14	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Factors Related to Economic Factors	II-40
15	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements	II-42
16	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors	II-43
17	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agency Having Selected Operating Characteristics	II-45
18	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants in Agencies by Use of Vans, Mobile Units, or Other Motorized Facilities	II-46
19	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Whether the Agencies Uses Non-WIC Funded Medical Providers for Certification and Consulting Staff to Provide WIC Services	II-47

List of Tables (continued)

		<u>Page No.</u>
20	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Use of Consultants or Contracting Staff to Provide WIC Services	II-48
21	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Use of Itinerant Professional, Paraprofessional, or Clerical/Support Staff	II-49
22	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agency Non-Labor Items and Funding Source	II-50
23	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical Support Staff	II-51
24	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees for Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff	II-53
25	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Recruiting Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff	II-54
26	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Retaining Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff	II-55
27	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Perceived Reasons for Not Filling Vacant Positions	II-56
28	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Perceived Reasons for Not Retaining Staff	II-58
29	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Languages Available at Agency	II-59
30	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Perceived Adequacy of Current Space	II-61
31	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service	II-62
32	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service	II-63
33	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Method of Obtaining Hematological Measurements	II-64
34	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Specified Health Services Available on Site	II-65
35	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Specified Non-Health Referral Services Available on Site	II-66
36	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Opportunity to Apply for Selected Non-Health Services on Site	II-67
37	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics in Which Obtaining Health Care and Non-Health Care Services is a Problem	II-68
38	Number and Percentage of Agencies by Reported Problems in Referring Clients to Other Agencies	II-69

List of Tables (continued)

Page No.

39	Number and Percentage of Agencies by Ratio of Type of Nutrition Staff to Total Nutritional Staff Levels	II-70
40	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Topics Covered and Methods Used	II-71
41	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Whether Nutrition Services Covered by Medicaid	II-73
42	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Frequency of Nutrition Education Contacts	II-74
43	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Group Size for Providing Nutrition Education	II-75
44	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods	II-76
45	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods	II-78
46	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors that May Act as Barriers to Providing High Quality Nutrition Education	II-80
47	Number and Percentage of Agencies by Children Provided Nutrition Education	II-81
48	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors Ranked Most Often as Promoting High Quality WIC Services	II-82
49	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors Ranked Most Often as Hindering High Quality WIC Services	II-84
50	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Certification Practices Since 1988	II-86
51	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Nutrition Education Practices Since 1988	II-88
52	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Food Instrument Practices Since 1988	II-90
53	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Scheduling Practices	II-92
54	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Staffing Practices Since 1988	II-94
55	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Waiting List Practices Since 1988	II-96
56	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations Since 1988	II-97
57	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Facilities Since 1988	II-99
58	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Other Changes Made Since 1988	II-100
59	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in Funding Sources for Labor and Non-Labor Items Compared to 1988	II-101

List of Tables (continued)

		<u>Page No.</u>
60	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in Number and Appropriateness of Staff	II-103
61	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change Perceived in Recruiting and Retaining Staff	II-105
62	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in Space Since 1988	II-106
63	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in Waiting Time and Time Spent Receiving Specific Services	II-107
64	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Degree of Change in Staff Time Spent on Referrals	II-109
65	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in the Quality of Nutrition Education Since 1988	II-110
66	Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in Caseload Since 1988	II-111

Section III

1	Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by Percentage Growth	III-1
2	Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by Size of WIC Local Agency	III-2
3	Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by Caseload Change Since 1988 and Agency Sponsorship	III-3
4	Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by Operating Capacity and Percentage Growth	III-4
5	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Caseload Fluctuations	III-6
6	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Factors Related to Economic Factors	III-7
7	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements	III-8
8	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors	III-9
9	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agency Having Selected Operating Characteristics	III-11
10	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical Support Staff	III-12
11	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees for Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff	III-14

List of Tables (continued)

		<u>Page No.</u>
12	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Recruiting Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff	III-15
13	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Retaining Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff	III-16
14	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Languages Available at Agency	III-17
15	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Perceived Adequacy of Current Space	III-19
16	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service	III-20
17	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service	III-21
18	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Method of Obtaining Hematological Measurements	III-22
19	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Specified Health Services Available on Site	III-23
20	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Specified Non-Health Referral Services Available on Site	III-24
21	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by Opportunity to Apply for Selected Non-Health Services on Site	III-25
22	Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics in Which Obtaining Health Care and Non-Health Care Services is a Problem	III-26
23	Standard Errors of Agencies by Reported Problems in Referring Clients to Other Agencies	III-27
24	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Topics Covered and Methods Used	III-28
25	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Frequency of Nutrition Education Contacts	III-30
26	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Group Size for Providing Nutrition Education	III-31
27	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods	III-32
28	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods	III-34
29	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors that May Act as Barriers to Providing High Quality Nutrition Education	III-36
30	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Certification Practices Since 1988	III-38
31	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Nutrition Education Practices Since 1988	III-40
32	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Food Instrument Practices Since 1988	III-42

List of Tables (continued)

		<u>Page No.</u>
33	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Scheduling Practices	III-44
34	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Staffing Practices Since 1988	III-46
35	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Waiting List Practices Since 1988	III-48
36	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations Since 1988	III-49
37	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Facilities Since 1988	III-51
38	Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by Other Changes Made Since 1988	III-52

Section IV

1	Number and Percentage of State Agencies by Selected Service Characteristics	IV-1
2	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Percentage Growth in Participation Since 1988	IV-3
3	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Caseload Fluctuations	IV-4
4	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Economic Factors	IV-5
5	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements	IV-7
6	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors	IV-9
7	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Other Non-Federal Sources of Funding for WIC	IV-11
8	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Whether Unspent State-Appropriated Funds Can be Carried Forward	IV-12
9	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Change in the Availability and Amount of Funding from Other Non-Federal Sources Since 1988	IV-13

List of Tables (continued)

		<u>Page No.</u>
10	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Whether State Agency Uses an Administrative Cost Per Participant to Allocate Administrative Funds	IV-14
11	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Methods Used to Compute Administrative Funding for Local Agencies	IV-15
12	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Funding Allocation Practices	IV-16
13	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Funding Allocation Practices	IV-17
14	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Methods for Allocating Caseload	IV-18
15	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Methods for Allocating Caseload	IV-19
16	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Factors Used in Assigning Caseload Increases or Decreases to a Local Agency	IV-20
17	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Most Frequently Used Method for Allocating Caseload Under Conditions of Rapid Growth	IV-23
18	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Whether State Agency Developed Participant-to-Staff Ratios Are Used	IV-24
19	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Identification of Local WIC Staff Employer	IV-26
20	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by the Presence of Program Performance Standards	IV-27
21	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by the Presence of Performance Standards for Nutrition Education	IV-27
22	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by the Use of Program Performance Standards	IV-28
23	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by State Sponsorship of Breastfeeding Promotional Activities	IV-29
24	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Food Voucher or Instrument Practices	IV-30
25	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Food Voucher or Instrument Practices	IV-31
26	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Proportion of Agencies Using PC or Mini-Computers Versus Mainframe Computers	IV-32

List of Tables (continued)

		<u>Page No.</u>
27	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Current Usage of Automation for WIC Functions	IV-33
28	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Shifts in Automated Processing Since 1988	IV-35
29	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Shift in Type and Location of Computer Equipment Since 1988	IV-36
30	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Perceived Effect of Automation on Productivity and Quality of Program	IV-38
31	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Change in WIC Coordination With Other Programs Since 1988	IV-39
32	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by State Program Initiatives and Activities	IV-40
33	Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants by Current Capacity at Which Local Agencies in State Are Operating	IV-42
34	Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988	IV-43
35	Number and Percentage of State Agencies by Factors Ranked Most Often as Promoting High Quality WIC Services	IV-49
36	Number and Percentage of State Agencies by Factors Ranked Most Often as Hindering High Quality WIC Services	IV-50

Section 1

Study Design and Methodology

WIC Dynamics is a study of the impact of participation growth associated with infant formula rebates, new legislative and regulatory requirements, and economic factors that occurred since 1988. The focus of this research is on local WIC agencies' decisions to implement certain procedures or to modify practices between 1988 and 1993.

Sampling

Surveys. When designing the sample, it was necessary to use the local agency as the unit of analysis, and at the same time estimate the number of participants who were affected by the changes in practices and procedures. To do this, the sample was selected with probabilities proportional to the square root of the number of participants. The determination of the exact number of agencies to be sampled was based on the need to obtain adequate precision for categorical variables. It was determined that a sample of 250 respondents would provide such precision, but that a certain leeway was necessary to account for nonresponse and to guard against too optimistic a view of the stratification. The sample was therefore set at 300 local agencies.

The 13 largest agencies (all agencies with more than 30,000 participants) were first sampled with certainty. Then the agencies were sorted by overall growth, timing of growth, region, and within region in descending order of size. The square root of the population was calculated for each agency and the square roots were added. The total was divided by 287 (the number of noncertainty agencies to be sampled), and this ratio became the interval size. At this point it was verified that no agency's size measure (square root of the participant total) exceeded the interval size. The cumulative sum of the size measures was obtained for each agency, thus defining a segment for each agency. The agency in whose segment the starting point fell was sampled. Then one interval was added to the starting point and the segment in which that number fell determined the next sampled number. This process was repeated, so that in the end 287 noncertainty agencies were sampled.

Case Studies. The case study design required a sample of 22 local agencies as heterogeneous as possible. Agencies were selected across all regions and at least one agency per region had to have been included in a prior Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) case study on administrative and funding procedures. The local agencies were selected with the intention of presenting contrasts in terms of possible operational reactions to the various legislative, regulatory, and administrative initiatives between 1988 and 1992. In addition, we tried to include agencies that demonstrated growth during this time, as well as agencies that remained relatively stable or decreased in participant size.

Data Collection Procedures

Seven data collection instruments were used to collect the data needed to answer the study questions:

- State Agency Mail Survey
- Local Agency Mail Survey
- Local Agency Interview Guide
- Local Health and/or Social Service Provider Interview Guide
- Observation Checklist for Individual Nutrition Education Sessions
- Observation Checklist for Group Nutrition Education Sessions
- WIC Record Review Form

Surveys. The WIC community, including the National Association of WIC Directors (NAWD) Research Committee, State and local representatives who participated in a discussion group at the 1991 NAWD meeting held in Washington, D.C., and several State and local WIC directors made substantial input into the development of the survey instruments. This was done to ensure that the instruments captured relevant information and that it was feasible for respondents to provide valid and reliable responses. The State Agency Survey was sent to all State agencies and tribal organizations that administer the WIC program nationally. The Local Agency Survey was sent to a sample of 300 local agencies. Those agencies that did not respond within 3 to 4 weeks were sent a postcard reminding them to complete the survey. In addition, reminder telephone calls were made by Macro staff, and if necessary, by FNS staff (to the State agencies) or State staff (to the local agencies). As a result, we obtained a 91 percent response rate from the State survey, and 95 percent response rate from the local agency survey.

When the completed surveys were received, the data was entered into a computer file, an edit program was run to identify data errors and missing data, and extensive follow-up telephone calls were made to obtain the missing data and resolve discrepancies. Once the data was cleaned, the analysis tables were produced.

Case Studies. The Local Agency Interview Guide and Local Health and/or Social Service Provider Interview Guide were designed to supplement and add in-depth, qualitative dimension to the information obtained in the State and local surveys. A sample of 22 sites were selected for on-site observation and discussions with agency staff. Prior to visiting these sites, the regional office and State WIC agency were contacted, and site visit appointments were made. Not all questions in the guides were asked of all respondents. Only those questions appropriate to the staff member's functions and responsibilities were asked. The primary focus of the Local Health and/or Social Service Provider Interviewer Guide was on coordination of services, while the Local Agency Interview Guide covered local agency operations, service coordination and integration, and nutrition services.

The Observation Checklist for Individual Nutrition Education Sessions and the Observation Checklist for Group Nutrition Education Sessions were used to record observations by study team staff during nutrition education sessions. Finally, the WIC Record Review Form was used to abstract information documenting nutrition education and certification from a sample of WIC participant records at each site.

Analysis Techniques

Surveys. Separate files were created for State and local level analyses. The analysis of the local agency data looks at three separate components: 1) legislative, regulatory, and administrative changes, as well as other factors such as food cost fluctuations; 2) participation changes; and 3) local agency operational changes. Changes in local agency operations relate to a variety of factors including Federal and State legislative, regulatory, and administrative changes as well as to other local factors and economic conditions. Nine specific factors were identified for this study:

- Funding changes (Federal, State, administrative)
- Medicaid expansion
- Infant formula rebates
- Drug abuse education requirements
- Services provided to homeless
- Availability of health care and social services
- One-stop shopping/integrated services
- Food cost fluctuations
- Vendor management

Changes in participation were examined for each agency in order to classify them into: 1) agencies in which the number of participants has increased; 2) agencies in which the number of participants has remained stable; and 3) agencies in which the number of participants has declined.

Changes in an agency's operations were defined in terms of the following three dimensions:

- Agency practices that affect service delivery and administration (e.g., the provision of nutrition education services or the tailoring of food vouchers).
- Agency resources relating to personnel, space, and facilities.
- Agency operations or the deployment of resources (e.g., office hours, number of sites).

Frequencies and cross tabulations were used to analyze the survey data. Unit nonrespondents were omitted and the weights were adjusted to total the 1,777 local agencies and their 5,396,569

participants in the 1992 FNS-191 file. Some survey items addressed activities and procedures that differ among clinics in local agencies. To capture this diversity and minimize burden, local agencies were asked to report for each of their "principal clinics," the largest clinics, up to six. Hence, data were weighted to the 5,387 principal clinics in the 1,777 local agencies for some analyses. Item nonresponses were assigned to a separate category in all the tables. The number of participants were then adjusted to correspond to the known population totals. Standard errors for selected tables were obtained using the SUDAAN statistical package and presented in tables comparable to the frequency tables.

Case Studies. Individual site visit reports provide summaries of each of the key areas addressed in the site visits, as well as relevant historical and background information. Data tables were prepared to summarize information and to enhance the accompanying narrative information. The case studies are used to illustrate key survey findings. They provide depth and explanation to our presentation of how agencies operate and how operations have changed since 1988.

Section 2

Local Agency Tables

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Agency Size

Agencies

Agency Size (in No. of Participants)	No.	Pct.
0-99	99	5.59
100-999	627	35.27
1000-1999	412	23.21
2000-9999	538	30.29
10000-24999	81	4.53
25000-49999	15	0.82
50000 or More	5	0.28
Total	1777	100.00

Participants

Agency Size (in No. of Participants)	No.	Pct.
0-99	7,125	0.13
100-999	350,534	6.50
1000-1999	605,621	11.22
2000-9999	2,277,510	42.20
10000-24999	1,113,962	20.64
25000-49999	513,875	9.52
50000 or More	527,942	9.78
Total	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Percentage Growth

Agencies

Percentage Growth in Participants	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	379	21.35
15% to 33%	398	22.38
33% to 50%	317	17.86
50% to 100%	493	27.76
Greater than 100%	146	8.21
Not Applicable	43	2.46
Total	1777	100.00

Participants

Percentage Growth in Participants	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	678,008	12.56
15% to 33%	1,194,411	22.13
33% to 50%	1,033,484	19.15
50% to 100%	1,847,125	34.23
Greater than 100%	607,400	11.26
Not Applicable	36,141	0.67
Total	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 3
Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Agency Sponsorship
Agencies

Sponsorship/Type	No.	Pct.
Health Agencies:		
State	44	2.47
District	113	6.37
Multi-County	117	6.58
Single-County	812	45.72
Municipal	44	2.46
Community	295	16.58
Indian	96	5.41
Hospitals:		
Public	40	2.24
Private Voluntary	0	0
Private Proprietary	0	0
CAA	125	7.04
Other	91	5.14
Total	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 3

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Agency Sponsorship

Participants

Sponsorship/Type	No.	Pct.
Health Agencies:		
State	500,702	9.28
District	655,451	12.15
Multi-County	487,049	9.03
Single-County	1,510,956	28.00
Municipal	460,780	8.54
Community	616,008	11.41
Indian	87,962	1.63
Hospitals:		
Public	187,704	3.48
Private Voluntary	0	0
Private Proprietary	0	0
CAA	345,363	6.40
Other	544,596	10.09
Total	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 4

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Catchment Area

Agencies

Catchment Area	No.	Pct.
Single Neighborhood	11	0.61
Group of Neighborhoods	55	3.12
City	73	4.12
Portion of One County	81	4.55
One County	937	52.73
Portions of Several Counties	179	10.08
Multiple Counties	280	15.77
State Designated Health District	141	7.95
Special Populations	2	0.11
Entire State	11	0.64
Don't Know	6	0.33
Total	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 4

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Catchment Area

Participants

Catchment Area	No.	Pct.
Single Neighborhood	37,568	0.70
Group of Neighborhoods	172,444	3.20
City	599,629	11.11
Portion of One County	450,812	8.35
One County	1,907,288	35.34
Portions of Several Counties	126,531	2.34
Multiple Counties	807,885	14.97
State Designated Health District	1,031,363	19.11
Special Populations	34,709	0.64
Entire State	80,438	1.49
Don't Know	147,901	2.74
Total	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	No.	Pct.
Native Americans:		
0%	560	31.50
0.01%-5.00%	945	53.16
5.01%-10.00%	138	7.79
10.01%-25.00%	27	1.53
25.01%-50.00%	16	0.92
50.01%-75.00%	8	0.47
75.01%-90.00%	0	0
Greater than 90.00%	82	4.63
Total	1777	100.00
Blacks:		
0%	272	15.29
0.01%-5.00%	712	40.07
5.01%-10.00%	113	6.34
10.01%-25.00%	216	12.15
25.01%-50.00%	201	11.28
50.01%-75.00%	158	8.89
75.01%-90.00%	83	4.70
Greater than 90.00%	23	1.28
Total	1777	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	No.	Pct.
Whites:		
0%	12	0.65
0.01%-5.00%	145	8.18
5.01%-10.00%	76	4.30
10.01%-25.00%	135	7.61
25.01%-50.00%	246	13.86
50.01%-75.00%	267	15.02
75.01%-90.00%	314	17.69
Greater than 90.00%	581	32.69
Total	1777	100.00
Asians:		
0%	498	28.04
0.01%-5.00%	1147	64.53
5.01%-10.00%	58	3.29
10.01%-25.00%	61	3.46
25.01%-50.00%	9	0.52
50.01%-75.00%	3	0.18
75.01%-90.00%	0	0
Greater than 90.00%	0	0
Total	1777	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	No.	Pct.
Hispanics:		
0%	256	14.43
0.01%-5.00%	909	51.17
5.01%-10.00%	150	8.45
10.01%-25.00%	160	9.02
25.01%-50.00%	151	8.50
50.01%-75.00%	69	3.88
75.01%-90.00%	45	2.54
Greater than 90.00%	36	2.01
Total	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	No.	Pct.
Native Americans:		
0%	905,262	16.77
0.01%-5.00%	4,255,251	78.85
5.01%-10.00%	131,365	2.43
10.01%-25.00%	11,496	0.21
25.01%-50.00%	5,387	0.10
50.01%-75.00%	8,529	0.16
75.01%-90.00%	0	0
Greater than 90.00%	79,279	1.47
Total	5,396,569	100.00
Blacks:		
0%	246,466	4.57
0.01%-5.00%	1,387,881	25.72
5.01%-10.00%	536,853	9.95
10.01%-25.00%	797,130	14.77
25.01%-50.00%	1,159,487	21.49
50.01%-75.00%	921,626	17.08
75.01%-90.00%	315,787	5.85
Greater than 90.00%	31,339	0.58
Total	5,396,569	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 5
Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served
Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	No.	Pct.
Whites:		
0%	139,987	2.59
0.01%-5.00%	682,269	12.64
5.01%-10.00%	462,117	8.56
10.01%-25.00%	598,388	11.09
25.01%-50.00%	1,177,768	21.82
50.01%-75.00%	866,838	16.06
75.01%-90.00%	723,848	13.41
Greater than 90.00%	745,355	13.81
Total	5,396,569	100.00
Asians:		
0%	566,714	10.50
0.01%-5.00%	4,396,397	81.47
5.01%-10.00%	245,123	4.54
10.01%-25.00%	122,559	2.27
25.01%-50.00%	43,759	0.81
50.01%-75.00%	22,017	0.41
75.01%-90.00%	0	0
Greater than 90.00%	0	0
Total	5,396,569	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	No.	Pct.
Hispanics:		
0%	178,568	3.31
0.01%-5.00%	2,439,007	45.20
5.01%-10.00%	415,180	7.69
10.01%-25.00%	531,332	9.85
25.01%-50.00%	752,732	13.95
50.01%-75.00%	346,270	6.42
75.01%-90.00%	424,422	7.86
Greater than 90.00%	309,057	5.73
Total	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table IA.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Native Americans:										
0%	58	10.34	36	6.44	466	83.23	560	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	27	2.88	35	3.73	882	93.39	945	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	30	21.92	0	0	108	78.08	138	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	27	100.00	27	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	16	100.00	16	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	8	100.00	8	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	7	8.84	75	91.16	82	100.00		
Blacks:										
0%	56	20.43	23	8.40	193	71.17	272	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	21	2.89	21	2.89	671	94.22	712	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	9	8.16	104	91.85	113	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	20	9.41	10	4.70	185	85.90	216	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	201	100.00	201	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	16	9.82	3	1.59	140	88.59	158	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	4	4.25	13	15.95	67	79.80	83	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	23	100.00	23	100.00		

(CONTINUED)

Table 1A.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FWS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Whites:										
0%	0	0	0	0	12	100.00	12	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	6	4.26	7	5.00	132	90.75	145	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	0	0	76	100.00	76	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	23	17.35	112	82.65	135	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	16	6.30	3	1.02	228	92.68	246	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	9	3.39	0	0	258	96.61	267	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	10	3.06	0	0	305	96.94	314	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	75	12.93	45	7.80	461	79.28	581	100.00		
Asians:										
0%	64	12.76	37	7.45	398	79.79	498	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	35	3.04	41	3.61	1070	93.35	1147	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	17	29.16	0	0	41	70.84	58	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	61	100.00	61	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	9	100.00	9	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	3	100.00	3	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

(CONTINUED)

Table 1A.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FNS-191)							
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Hispanics:								
0%	39	15.20	11	4.20	207	80.61	256	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	68	7.51	58	6.34	783	86.15	909	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	2	1.33	0	0	148	98.67	150	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	4	2.21	0	0	157	97.79	160	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	151	100.00	151	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	10	14.69	59	85.31	69	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	3	5.85	0	0	43	94.15	45	100.00
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	36	100.00	36	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 1A.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)							
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Native Americans:								
0%	21,125	2.33	72,134	7.97	812,003	89.70	905,262	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	69,687	1.64	19,425	0.46	4,166,139	97.91	4,255,251	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	2,087	1.59	0	0	129,278	98.41	131,365	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	11,496	100.00	11,496	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	5,387	100.00	5,387	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	8,529	100.00	8,529	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	11,185	14.11	68,094	85.89	79,279	100.00
Blacks:								
0%	5,141	2.09	13,330	5.41	227,996	92.51	246,466	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	12,298	0.89	17,640	1.27	1,357,943	97.84	1,387,881	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	8,140	1.52	528,713	98.48	536,853	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	52,615	6.60	9,822	1.23	734,693	92.17	797,130	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	1,159,487	100.00	1,159,487	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	4,626	0.50	26,402	2.86	890,598	96.63	921,626	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	18,220	5.77	27,410	8.68	270,157	85.55	315,787	100.00
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	31,339	100.00	31,339	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table IA.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Whites:										
0%	0	0	0	0	139,987	100.00	139,987	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	43,752	6.41	11,185	1.64	627,331	91.95	682,269	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	0	0	462,117	100.00	462,117	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	37,232	6.22	561,155	93.78	598,388	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	4,626	0.39	26,402	2.24	1,146,741	97.37	1,177,768	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	22,956	2.65	0	0	843,882	97.35	866,838	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	8,011	1.11	0	0	715,837	98.89	723,848	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	13,554	1.82	27,925	3.75	703,876	94.44	745,355	100.00		
Asians:										
0%	14,012	2.47	34,858	6.15	517,844	91.38	566,714	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	59,728	1.36	67,886	1.54	4,268,783	97.10	4,396,397	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	19,159	7.82	0	0	225,964	92.18	245,123	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	122,559	100.00	122,559	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	43,759	100.00	43,759	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	22,017	100.00	22,017	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

(CONTINUED)

Table IA.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	No.	Pct.
Hispanics:										
0%	6,213	3.48	7,947	4.45	164,408	92.07		178,568		100.00
0.01%-5.00%	24,963	1.02	84,975	3.48	2,329,068	95.49		2,439,007		100.00
5.01%-10.00%	17,970	4.33	0	0	397,210	95.67		415,180		100.00
10.01%-25.00%	18,220	3.43	0	0	513,112	96.57		531,332		100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	752,732	100.00		752,732		100.00
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	9,822	2.84	336,448	97.16		346,270		100.00
75.01%-90.00%	25,532	6.02	0	0	398,890	93.98		424,422		100.00
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	309,057	100.00		309,057		100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 18.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Current Operating Level											
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity		Total					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.				
Native Americans:												
0%	191	34.10	286	51.09	83	14.81	560	100.00				
0.01%-5.00%	254	26.88	463	48.97	228	24.14	945	100.00				
5.01%-10.00%	39	28.20	87	62.95	12	8.86	138	100.00				
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	27	100.00	27	100.00				
25.01%-50.00%	16	100.00	0	0	0	0	16	100.00				
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	8	100.00	0	0	8	100.00				
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Greater than 90.00%	37	45.07	35	42.15	11	12.78	82	100.00				
Blacks:												
0%	116	42.72	130	47.81	26	9.47	272	100.00				
0.01%-5.00%	172	24.13	408	57.31	132	18.56	712	100.00				
5.01%-10.00%	46	41.10	50	44.06	17	14.84	113	100.00				
10.01%-25.00%	57	26.47	100	46.54	58	26.99	216	100.00				
25.01%-50.00%	40	20.12	87	43.58	73	36.30	201	100.00				
50.01%-75.00%	64	40.33	58	36.80	36	22.87	158	100.00				
75.01%-90.00%	32	38.72	32	38.30	19	22.98	83	100.00				
Greater than 90.00%	10	42.20	13	57.80	0	0	23	100.00				

(CONTINUED)

Table IB.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Current Operating Level											
	Below Capacity			At Capacity			Above Capacity			Total		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Whites:												
0%	0	0	1	8.69		11	91.31				12	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	69	47.37	57	38.91		20	13.72				145	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	21	26.93	34	44.46		22	28.61				76	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	41	30.60	55	40.59		39	28.81				135	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	101	41.05	95	38.50		50	20.45				246	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	69	25.97	105	39.39		92	34.64				267	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	66	21.10	176	56.03		72	22.87				314	100.00
Greater than 90.00%	170	29.21	356	61.32		55	9.47				581	100.00
Asians:												
0%	172	34.46	252	50.56		75	14.98				498	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	320	27.90	569	49.59		258	22.51				1147	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	17	29.16	18	30.83		23	40.01				58	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	16	26.70	40	65.49		5	7.82				61	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	9	100.00	0	0		0	0				9	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	3	100.00	0	0		0	0				3	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0		0	0				0	0
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0		0	0				0	0

(CONTINUED)

Table 1B.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Current Operating Level									
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Hispanics:										
0%	106	41.38	104	40.55	46	18.07	256	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	253	27.80	507	55.77	149	16.43	909	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	37	24.36	74	49.51	39	26.13	150	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	50	30.91	82	51.02	29	18.07	160	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	60	39.46	45	29.67	47	30.88	151	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	2	2.77	41	59.33	26	37.90	69	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	16	34.67	15	33.66	14	31.68	45	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	15	42.36	11	29.78	10	27.86	36	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table IB.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Current Operating Level											
	Below Capacity			At Capacity			Above Capacity			Total		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Native Americans:												
0%	267,679	29.57	557,282	61.56		80,301	8.87		905,262	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	1,284,994	30.20	1,549,684	36.42	1,420,573	33.38	4,255,251	100.00				
5.01%-10.00%	57,283	43.61	49,343	37.56	24,740	18.83	131,365	100.00				
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	0	11,496	100.00	11,496	100.00			
25.01%-50.00%	5,387	100.00	0	0	0	0	5,387	100.00				
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	8,529	100.00	0	0	8,529	100.00				
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Greater than 90.00%	13,443	16.96	58,667	74.00	7,169	9.04	79,279	100.00				
Blacks:												
0%	27,593	11.20	206,485	83.78	12,388	5.03	246,466	100.00				
0.01%-5.00%	455,136	32.79	634,937	45.75	297,808	21.46	1,387,881	100.00				
5.01%-10.00%	122,463	22.81	270,562	50.40	143,828	26.79	536,853	100.00				
10.01%-25.00%	303,632	38.09	230,171	28.87	263,327	33.03	797,130	100.00				
25.01%-50.00%	265,934	22.94	491,487	42.39	402,066	34.68	1,159,487	100.00				
50.01%-75.00%	328,673	35.66	241,476	26.20	351,477	38.14	921,626	100.00				
75.01%-90.00%	119,024	37.69	123,380	39.07	73,384	23.24	315,787	100.00				
Greater than 90.00%	6,330	20.20	25,008	79.80	0	0	31,339	100.00				

(CONTINUED)

Table IB.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Current Operating Level									
	Below Capacity			At Capacity			Above Capacity		Total	
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Whites:										
0%	0	0	132,818	94.88	7,169	5.12	139,987	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	234,095	34.31	311,605	45.67	136,568	20.02	682,269	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	138,939	30.07	87,114	18.85	236,064	51.08	462,117	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	184,048	30.76	219,716	36.72	194,624	32.52	598,388	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	374,722	31.82	430,309	36.54	372,738	31.65	1,177,768	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	234,460	27.05	288,912	33.33	343,466	39.62	866,838	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	229,996	31.77	367,759	50.81	126,093	17.42	723,848	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	232,526	31.20	385,271	51.69	127,558	17.11	745,355	100.00		
Asians:										
0%	165,271	29.16	322,559	56.92	78,884	13.92	566,714	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	1,373,192	31.23	1,667,867	37.94	1,355,337	30.83	4,396,397	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	19,159	7.82	137,725	56.19	88,239	36.00	245,123	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	5,387	4.40	95,355	77.80	21,818	17.80	122,559	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	43,759	100.00	0	0	0	0	43,759	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	22,017	100.00	0	0	0	0	22,017	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

(CONTINUED)

Table 18.6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Current Operating Level							
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Hispanics:								
0%	58,952	33.01	96,826	54.22	22,791	12.76	178,568	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	767,833	31.48	1,073,162	44.00	598,012	24.52	2,439,007	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	151,650	36.53	93,902	22.62	169,628	40.86	415,180	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	106,927	20.12	275,630	51.88	148,776	28.00	531,332	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	275,937	36.66	205,401	27.29	271,394	36.05	752,732	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	56,048	16.19	134,703	38.90	155,519	44.91	346,270	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	78,343	18.46	173,737	40.93	172,342	40.61	424,422	100.00
Greater than 90.00%	133,095	43.06	170,145	55.05	5,817	1.88	309,057	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 6

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Size of WIC Local Agency

Agencies

Total Number of Sites Providing WIC Services	Caseload Size																Total	
	0-99	100-999	1000-1999	2000-9999	10000-24999	25000-49999	50000 or More	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1 Site	99	19.54	296	58.22	84	16.48	29	5.76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509	100.00
2-3 Sites	0	0	230	43.75	162	30.75	134	25.49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525	100.00
4-5 Sites	0	0	65	24.92	81	31.15	113	43.17	2	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	100.00
6-10 Sites	0	0	26	9.14	58	20.38	173	60.73	27	9.40	1	0.35	0	0	0	0	284	100.00
11-25 Sites	0	0	10	5.47	20	11.30	89	50.97	44	25.57	11	6.12	1	0.58	1	0.58	174	100.00
Over 25 Sites	0	0	0	0	8	33.99	1	4.27	7	31.83	3	12.82	4	17.09	23	100.00	23	100.00

Participants

Total Number of Sites Providing WIC Services	Caseload Size																Total	
	0-99	100-999	1000-1999	2000-9999	10000-24999	25000-49999	50000 or More	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1 Site	7,125	2.02	163,997	46.58	110,983	31.52	69,987	19.88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	352,092	100.00
2-3 Sites	0	0	117,516	14.65	225,653	28.13	459,094	57.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802,263	100.00
4-5 Sites	0	0	41,959	6.13	141,160	20.62	466,695	68.18	34,709	5.07	0	0	0	0	0	0	684,523	100.00
6-10 Sites	0	0	18,550	1.47	81,672	6.46	748,752	59.26	376,307	29.78	38,164	3.02	0	0	0	0	1,263,445	100.00
11-25 Sites	0	0	8,512	0.55	35,438	2.28	529,097	33.98	574,288	36.88	353,745	22.72	55,945	3.59	1,557,026	100.00	1,557,026	100.00
Over 25 Sites	0	0	0	0	10,714	1.45	3,885	0.53	128,658	17.45	121,967	16.54	471,997	64.02	737,220	100.00	737,220	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 7

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Perceived Caseload Change Since 1988 and Actual Growth

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Perceived Caseload Change Since 1988							
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	17	4.35	65	17.04	298	78.61	379	100.00
15% to 33%	0	0	61	15.39	336	84.61	398	100.00
33% to 50%	3	0.92	0	0	314	99.08	317	100.00
50% to 100%	9	1.73	0	0	485	98.27	493	100.00
Greater than 100%	0	0	0	0	146	100.00	146	100.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	43	100.00	43	100.00

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Perceived Caseload Change Since 1988							
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	60,571	8.93	76,761	11.32	540,676	79.74	678,008	100.00
15% to 33%	0	0	73,243	6.13	1,121,167	93.87	1,194,411	100.00
33% to 50%	27,168	2.63	0	0	1,006,317	97.37	1,033,484	100.00
50% to 100%	33,267	1.80	0	0	1,813,858	98.20	1,847,125	100.00
Greater than 100%	0	0	0	0	607,400	100.00	607,400	100.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	36,141	100.00	36,141	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 8

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Agency Sponsorship

Agencies

Sponsorship Type	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FNS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Health Agencies	112	7.36	79	5.16	1330	87.48	1521	100.00		
Hospitals	0	0	0	0	40	100.00	40	100.00		
CAA	4	2.83	0	0	122	97.17	125	100.00		
Other	0	0	0	0	91	100.00	91	100.00		

Participants

Sponsorship Type	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FNS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Health Agencies	89,560	2.07	102,744	2.38	4,126,603	95.55	4,318,906	100.00		
Hospitals	0	0	0	0	187,704	100.00	187,704	100.00		
CAA	3,339	0.97	0	0	342,023	99.03	345,363	100.00		
Other	0	0	0	0	544,596	100.00	544,596	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 9

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Catchment Area

Agencies

Catchment Area	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FNS-191)									
	Decreased			Stayed About the Same			Increased			Total
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Single Neighborhood	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100.00	11	100.00
Group of Neighborhoods	3	4.77	0	0	0	0	53	95.23	55	100.00
City	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	100.00	73	100.00
Portion of One County	0	0	10	12.55	71	87.45	81	100.00	81	100.00
One County	83	8.87	44	4.74	809	86.39	937	100.00	937	100.00
Portions of Several Counties	25	14.05	0	0	154	85.95	179	100.00	179	100.00
Multiple Counties	1	0.36	11	3.84	268	95.80	280	100.00	280	100.00
State Designated Health District	4	2.51	6	4.19	132	93.30	141	100.00	141	100.00
Special Populations	0	0	0	0	2	100.00	2	100.00	2	100.00
Entire State	0	0	7	63.84	4	36.16	11	100.00	11	100.00
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	6	100.00	6	100.00	6	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 9

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Catchment Area

Participants

Catchment Area	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FNS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	No.	Pct.
Single Neighborhood	0	0	0	0	0	0	37,568	100.00	37,568	100.00
Group of Neighborhoods	25,532	14.81	0	0	0	0	146,913	85.19	172,444	100.00
City	0	0	0	0	0	0	599,629	100.00	599,629	100.00
Portion of One County	0	0	9,822	2.18	440,990	97.82	450,812	100.00	450,812	100.00
One County	42,208	2.21	27,565	1.45	1,837,515	96.34	1,907,288	100.00	1,907,288	100.00
Portions of Several Counties	3,054	2.41	0	0	123,478	97.59	126,531	100.00	126,531	100.00
Multiple Counties	3,885	0.48	7,947	0.98	796,054	98.54	807,885	100.00	807,885	100.00
State Designated Health District	18,220	1.77	46,226	4.48	966,917	93.75	1,031,363	100.00	1,031,363	100.00
Special Populations	0	0	0	0	34,709	100.00	34,709	100.00	34,709	100.00
Entire State	0	0	11,185	13.90	69,253	86.10	80,438	100.00	80,438	100.00
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	147,901	100.00	147,901	100.00	147,901	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Native Americans:										
0%	58	10.34	36	6.44	466	83.23	560	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	27	2.88	35	3.73	882	93.39	945	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	30	21.92	0	0	108	78.08	138	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	27	100.00	27	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	16	100.00	16	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	8	100.00	8	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	7	8.84	75	91.16	82	100.00		
Blacks:										
0%	56	20.43	23	8.40	193	71.17	272	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	21	2.89	21	2.89	671	94.22	712	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	9	8.16	104	91.85	113	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	20	9.41	10	4.70	185	85.90	216	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	201	100.00	201	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	16	9.82	3	1.59	140	88.59	158	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	4	4.25	13	15.95	67	79.80	83	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	23	100.00	23	100.00		

(CONTINUED)

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Agencies

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	No.	Pct.
Whites:										
0%	0	0	0	0	12	100.00			12	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	6	4.26	7	5.00	132	90.75			145	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	0	0	76	100.00			76	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	23	17.35	112	82.65			135	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	16	6.30	3	1.02	228	92.68			246	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	9	3.39	0	0	258	96.61			267	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	10	3.06	0	0	305	96.94			314	100.00
Greater than 90.00%	75	12.93	45	7.80	461	79.28			581	100.00
Asians:										
0%	64	12.76	37	7.45	398	79.79			498	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	35	3.04	41	3.61	1070	93.35			1147	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	17	29.16	0	0	41	70.84			58	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	61	100.00			61	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	9	100.00			9	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	3	100.00			3	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0

(CONTINUED)

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)									
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Native Americans:										
0%	21,125	2.33	72,134	7.97	812,003	89.70	905,262	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	69,687	1.64	19,425	0.46	4,166,139	97.91	4,255,251	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	2,087	1.59	0	0	129,278	98.41	131,365	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	11,496	100.00	11,496	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	5,387	100.00	5,387	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	8,529	100.00	8,529	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	11,185	14.11	68,094	85.89	79,279	100.00		
Blacks:										
0%	5,141	2.09	13,330	5.41	227,996	92.51	246,466	100.00		
0.01%-5.00%	12,298	0.89	17,640	1.27	1,357,943	97.84	1,387,881	100.00		
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	8,140	1.52	528,713	98.48	536,853	100.00		
10.01%-25.00%	52,615	6.60	9,822	1.23	734,693	92.17	797,130	100.00		
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	1,159,487	100.00	1,159,487	100.00		
50.01%-75.00%	4,626	0.50	26,402	2.86	890,598	96.63	921,626	100.00		
75.01%-90.00%	18,220	5.77	27,410	8.68	270,157	85.55	315,787	100.00		
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	31,339	100.00	31,339	100.00		

(CONTINUED)

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)					
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Whites:						
0%	0	0	0	0	139,987	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	43,752	6.41	11,185	1.64	627,331	91.95
5.01%-10.00%	0	0	0	0	462,117	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	37,232	6.22	561,155	93.78
25.01%-50.00%	4,626	0.39	26,402	2.24	1,146,741	97.37
50.01%-75.00%	22,956	2.65	0	0	843,882	97.35
75.01%-90.00%	8,011	1.11	0	0	715,837	98.89
Greater than 90.00%	13,554	1.82	27,925	3.75	703,876	94.44
Asians:						
0%	14,012	2.47	34,858	6.15	517,844	91.38
0.01%-5.00%	59,728	1.36	67,886	1.54	4,268,783	97.10
5.01%-10.00%	19,159	7.82	0	0	225,964	92.18
10.01%-25.00%	0	0	0	0	122,559	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	43,759	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	0	0	22,017	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0

(CONTINUED)

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Ethnic Populations Served

Participants

Percentage Ethnic Participants Served	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FNS-191)							
	Decreased		Stayed About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Hispanics:								
0%	6,213	3.48	7,947	4.45	164,408	92.07	178,568	100.00
0.01%-5.00%	24,963	1.02	84,975	3.48	2,329,068	95.49	2,439,007	100.00
5.01%-10.00%	17,970	4.33	0	0	397,210	95.67	415,180	100.00
10.01%-25.00%	18,220	3.43	0	0	513,112	96.57	531,332	100.00
25.01%-50.00%	0	0	0	0	752,732	100.00	752,732	100.00
50.01%-75.00%	0	0	9,822	2.84	336,448	97.16	346,270	100.00
75.01%-90.00%	25,532	6.02	0	0	398,890	93.98	424,422	100.00
Greater than 90.00%	0	0	0	0	309,057	100.00	309,057	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 11

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Agency Size

Agencies

Agency Size (in No. of Participants)	Current Operating Level								Total	
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0-99	60	60.49	39	39.51	0	0.00	99	100.00		
100-999	159	25.38	369	58.81	99	15.81	627	100.00		
1000-1999	128	30.94	184	44.71	100	24.35	412	100.00		
2000-9999	155	28.74	252	46.75	132	24.51	538	100.00		
10000-24999	30	37.58	31	38.35	19	24.07	81	100.00		
25000-49999	6	37.73	2	13.67	7	48.60	15	100.00		
50000 or More	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00	5	100.00		

Participants

Agency Size (in No. of Participants)	Current Operating Level								Total	
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0-99	4,345	60.99	2,780	39.01	0	0.00	7,125	100.00		
100-999	73,857	21.07	216,841	61.86	59,837	17.07	350,534	100.00		
1000-1999	183,554	30.31	268,613	44.35	153,453	25.34	605,621	100.00		
2000-9999	751,636	33.00	959,774	42.14	566,100	24.86	2,277,510	100.00		
10000-24999	417,389	37.47	433,334	38.90	263,239	23.63	1,113,962	100.00		
25000-49999	198,004	38.53	82,797	16.11	233,074	45.36	513,875	100.00		
50000 or More	0	0.00	259,366	49.13	268,576	50.87	527,942	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 12 (Row Pcts)

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Percentage Growth

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level										Total	
	Below Capacity				At Capacity							
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	141	37.30	195	51.47	43	11.23	379	100.00				
15% to 33%	71	17.87	220	55.39	106	26.74	398	100.00				
33% to 50%	111	34.95	119	37.62	87	27.44	317	100.00				
50% to 100%	138	28.07	274	55.57	81	16.36	493	100.00				
Greater than 100%	59	40.43	54	36.82	33	22.75	146	100.00				
Not Applicable	16	37.81	16	36.82	11	25.38	43	100.00				

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level										Total	
	Below Capacity				At Capacity				Above Capacity			
	No.		No.		No.		No.		No.		No.	
Less than 15%	225,485	33.26	301,781	44.51	150,743	22.23	678,008	100.00				
15% to 33%	262,128	21.95	473,092	39.61	459,192	38.45	1,194,411	100.00				
33% to 50%	306,195	29.63	442,974	42.86	284,315	27.51	1,033,484	100.00				
50% to 100%	566,704	30.68	765,131	41.42	515,290	27.90	1,847,125	100.00				
Greater than 100%	262,888	43.28	218,841	36.03	125,671	20.69	607,400	100.00				
Not Applicable	5,387	14.91	21,687	60.01	9,067	25.09	36,141	100.00				

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 12 (Column Pcts)

Number and Percentage of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Percentage Growth

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level								Total	
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	141	26.33	195	22.22	43	11.80	379	21.35		
15% to 33%	71	13.22	220	25.07	106	29.47	398	22.38		
33% to 50%	111	20.64	119	13.59	87	24.13	317	17.86		
50% to 100%	138	25.77	274	31.20	81	22.36	493	27.76		
Greater than 100%	59	10.98	54	6.11	33	9.20	146	8.21		
Not Applicable	16	3.05	16	1.82	11	3.05	43	2.44		
Total	537	100.00	879	100.00	361	100.00	1777	100.00		

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level								Total	
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	225,485	13.84	301,781	13.57	150,743	9.76	678,008	12.56		
15% to 33%	262,128	16.09	473,092	21.28	459,192	29.74	1,194,411	22.13		
33% to 50%	306,195	18.80	442,974	19.92	284,315	18.41	1,033,484	19.15		
50% to 100%	566,704	34.79	765,131	34.41	515,290	33.37	1,847,125	34.23		
Greater than 100%	262,888	16.14	218,841	9.84	125,671	8.14	607,400	11.26		
Not Applicable	5,387	0.33	21,687	0.98	9,067	0.59	36,141	0.67		
Total	1,628,786	100.00	2,223,505	100.00	1,544,278	100.00	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 13

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Caseload Fluctuations

Agencies

Caseload Fluctuation Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.				
Caseload Increases	1523	85.70	208	11.71	30	1.67	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Caseload Decreases	535	30.12	428	24.11	797	44.85	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Reprioritizing or Targeting Caseload	1069	60.18	365	20.53	326	18.36	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Other	29	1.61	12	0.68	1720	96.78	16	0.92	1777	100.00		

Participants

Caseload Fluctuation Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Caseload Increases	5,084,011	94.21	244,082	4.52	63,089	1.17	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Caseload Decreases	2,185,469	40.50	878,375	16.28	2,327,338	43.13	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Reprioritizing or Targeting Caseload	3,902,603	72.32	752,032	13.94	736,547	13.65	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	125,074	2.32	6,426	0.12	5,259,683	97.46	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Local agencies were asked to indicate all factors which impacted their operations. Consequently, responses are not mutually exclusive. For instance, in the 5 year period under study, some agencies experienced both caseload increases and decreases.

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 14

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Factors Related to Economic Factors

Agencies

Economic Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Federal Funding	1379	77.61	331	18.65	50	2.82	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Availability of State Funds for WIC	1117	62.88	288	16.18	356	20.02	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Availability of Local Funds for WIC	663	37.30	345	19.41	753	42.37	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Downturn in Local Economy	1374	77.30	258	14.55	129	7.23	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
State Budget Cuts	794	44.69	563	31.70	403	22.69	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Food Cost Fluctuations	1241	69.84	414	23.29	106	5.95	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Infant Formula Rebates	1527	85.94	208	11.70	26	1.44	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Other	8	0.45	0	0	1753	98.62	16	0.92	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Local agencies were asked to indicate all factors which impacted their operations. Consequently, responses are not mutually exclusive. For instance, in the 5 year period under study, some agencies experienced both caseload increases and decreases.

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 14

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Factors Related to Economic Factors

Participants

Economic Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Federal Funding	4,682,071	86.76	598,100	11.08	111,011	2.06	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Availability of State Funds for WIC	3,060,375	56.71	888,466	16.46	1,442,341	26.73	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Availability of Local Funds for WIC	1,748,515	32.40	909,794	16.86	2,732,873	50.64	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Downturn in Local Economy	4,420,592	81.91	680,426	12.61	290,164	5.38	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
State Budget Cuts	2,563,392	47.50	1,832,567	33.96	995,224	18.44	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Food Cost Fluctuations	4,210,605	78.02	1,049,313	19.44	131,263	2.43	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Infant Formula Rebates	4,877,876	90.39	440,888	8.17	72,418	1.34	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	77,413	1.43	0	0	5,313,769	98.47	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Local agencies were asked to indicate all factors which impacted their operations. Consequently, responses are not mutually exclusive. For instance, in the 5 year period under study, some agencies experienced both caseload increases and decreases.

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 15

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements

Agencies

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations									
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	1561	87.86	160	9.01	39	2.21	16	0.92	1777	100.00
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	1006	56.63	605	34.03	150	8.42	16	0.92	1777	100.00
Homeless Service Requirements	601	33.84	1002	56.36	158	8.88	16	0.92	1777	100.00
Vendor Management Initiatives	823	46.33	738	41.50	200	11.24	16	0.92	1777	100.00
Other	89	4.99	21	1.20	1650	92.88	16	0.92	1777	100.00

Participants

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations									
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	5,002,793	92.70	377,628	7.00	10,761	0.20	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	3,610,358	66.90	1,594,469	29.55	186,356	3.45	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00
Homeless Service Requirements	2,847,169	52.76	2,256,237	41.81	287,776	5.33	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00
Vendor Management Initiatives	3,091,690	57.29	1,775,230	32.90	524,262	9.71	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00
Other	246,967	4.58	72,100	1.34	5,072,115	93.99	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Local agencies were asked to indicate all factors which impacted their operations. Consequently, responses are not mutually exclusive. For instance, in the 5 year period under study, some agencies experienced both caseload increases and decreases.

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 16
Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors

Agencies

Other Initiatives and Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	Total
Medicaid Expansion	1370	77.09	349	19.62	42	2.37	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Coordination/Integration of Services	1062	59.74	394	22.17	305	17.16	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Other Initiatives	28	1.59	5	0.27	1727	97.21	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Shortages of Physicians	697	39.20	733	41.23	331	18.64	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Shortages of Nutritionists	997	56.13	531	29.91	232	13.04	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Increases in Non-English Speaking Pop.	867	48.76	494	27.80	400	22.52	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	1209	68.01	291	16.35	261	14.71	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Agency Reorganization	563	31.71	505	28.39	693	38.98	16	0.92	1777	100.00		
Other Factors	38	2.16	10	0.56	1712	96.36	16	0.92	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Local agencies were asked to indicate all factors which impacted their operations. Consequently, responses are not mutually exclusive. For instance, in the 5 year period under study, some agencies experienced both caseload increases and decreases.

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 16

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors

Participants

Other Initiatives and factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Medicaid Expansion	4,478,646	82.99	826,154	15.31	86,382	1.60	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Coordination/Integration of Services	3,368,365	62.42	1,231,795	22.83	791,022	14.66	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Other Initiatives	106,792	1.98	67,363	1.25	5,217,027	96.67	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Shortages of Physicians	1,937,045	35.89	2,264,081	41.95	1,190,056	22.05	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Shortages of Nutritionists	3,986,070	73.86	944,388	17.50	460,724	8.54	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Increases in Non-English Speaking Pop.	3,435,621	63.66	1,109,062	20.55	846,499	15.69	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	4,279,939	79.31	465,653	8.63	645,590	11.96	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Agency Reorganization	1,920,685	35.59	1,470,970	27.26	1,999,528	37.05	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Other Factors	204,297	3.79	7,976	0.15	5,178,909	95.97	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Local agencies were asked to indicate all factors which impacted their operations. Consequently, responses are not mutually exclusive. For instance, in the 5 year period under study, some agencies experienced both caseload increases and decreases.

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 17

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agency Having Selected Operating Characteristics

Agencies

Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agencies Having Selected Operating Characteristics	Providing Cert, Nutrition Educ, & Food Issuance Svc			Providing Health Care Services on Site			Providing Social Services on Site			Operating Part Time			Extended Hours			Established Since 1988			Eliminated or Consolidated Since 1988		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
No Sites	8	0.45		246	13.83		776	43.68		459	25.85		983	55.30		731	41.16		1421	79.98	
Less than 33.3% of Sites	6	0.32		149	8.38		279	15.68		134	7.53		383	21.55		295	16.59		209	11.76	
33.3% to 66.6% of Sites	128	7.19		336	18.90		277	15.59		434	24.45		198	11.12		222	12.51		72	4.06	
66.7% to 99% of Sites	96	5.38		126	7.07		66	3.69		255	14.36		14	0.77		94	5.31		6	0.33	
All Sites	1540	86.67		921	51.82		380	21.36		494	27.81		200	11.26		434	24.42		69	3.88	
Total	1777	100.00		1777	100.00		1777	100.00		1777	100.00		1777	100.00		1777	100.00		1777	100.00	

Participants

Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agencies Having Selected Operating Characteristics	Providing Cert, Nutrition Educ, & Food Issuance Svc			Providing Health Care Services on Site			Providing Social Services on Site			Operating Part Time			Extended Hours			Established Since 1988			Eliminated or Consolidated Since 1988		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
No Sites	10,714	0.20		486,558	9.02		1,466,037	27.17		872,140	16.16		2,089,374	38.72		1,283,453	23.78		3,348,493	62.05	
Less than 33.3% of Sites	58,419	1.08		733,402	13.59		1,533,272	28.41		1,355,794	25.12		1,979,055	36.67		1,786,731	33.11		1,526,585	28.29	
33.3% to 66.6% of Sites	289,176	5.36		1,009,433	18.71		1,111,561	20.60		1,318,730	24.44		742,653	13.76		915,799	16.97		372,876	6.91	
66.7% to 99% of Sites	414,905	7.69		1,069,408	19.82		616,656	11.43		1,083,982	20.09		244,484	4.53		557,321	10.33		50,316	0.93	
All Sites	4,623,355	85.67		2,097,768	38.87		669,043	12.40		765,923	14.19		341,003	6.32		853,266	15.81		98,298	1.82	
Total	5,396,569	100.00		5,396,569	100.00		5,396,569	100.00		5,396,569	100.00		5,396,569	100.00		5,396,569	100.00		5,396,569	100.00	

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 18

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants
in Agencies by Use of Vans, Mobile Units, or Other Motorized Facilities

	VANS					
	Using Vans, Mobile Units, or Other Motorized Facilities			Not Using Vans, Mobile Units or Other Motorized Facilities		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	118	6.64	1659	93.36	1777	100.00
Participants	594,228	11.01	4,802,341	88.99	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 19

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Whether the Agencies Uses Non-WIC Funded Medical Providers for Certification and Consulting Staff to Provide WIC Services

	Uses Non-WIC Funded Medical Providers Performing Certifications		Uses Contract or Consulting Staff to Provide WIC Services	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	282	15.87	496	27.91
Participants	1,452,164	26.91	2,035,388	37.72

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,560 participants.

Table 20

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Consultants or Contracting Staff to Provide WIC Services

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Use Consultants or Contracting Staff to Provide WIC Services	
	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	84	4.71
15% to 33%	89	5.02
33% to 50%	100	5.63
50% to 100%	148	8.34
Greater than 100%	69	3.89
Not Applicable	6	0.32
Total	496	27.91

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Use Consultants or Contracting Staff to Provide WIC Services	
	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	279,343	5.18
15% to 33%	430,629	7.98
33% to 50%	278,049	5.15
50% to 100%	775,738	14.37
Greater than 100%	257,386	4.77
Not Applicable	14,243	0.26
Total	2,035,388	37.72

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 21

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Itinerant Professional, Paraprofessional, or Clerical/Support Staff**

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency	Professional		Paraprofessional		Clerical/Support	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	233	13.14	109	6.13	165	9.28
15% to 33%	287	16.17	128	7.18	204	11.47
33% to 50%	225	12.65	117	6.61	157	8.82
50% to 100%	396	22.27	238	13.38	234	13.17
Greater than 100%	73	4.12	72	4.04	81	4.57
Not Applicable	17	0.94	6	0.32	17	0.94
Total	1231	69.29	669	37.66	857	48.24

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency	Professional		Paraprofessional		Clerical/Support	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	559,385	10.37	233,922	4.33	430,560	7.98
15% to 33%	1,023,744	18.97	521,039	9.65	830,993	15.40
33% to 50%	925,533	17.15	534,538	9.91	726,710	13.47
50% to 100%	1,678,584	31.10	915,900	16.97	1,366,627	25.32
Greater than 100%	480,946	8.91	354,556	6.57	494,637	9.17
Not Applicable	23,310	0.43	14,243	0.26	23,310	0.43
Total	4,691,501	86.93	2,574,197	47.70	3,872,835	71.76

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 22

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agency Non-Labor Items and Funding Source

Agencies

Space and Facilities	Funding Source											
	Exclusively Funded by WIC			Exclusively Funded by Non-WIC Gov't Source			Exclusively Charitable			Funded by a Combination of Sources		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
Space	415	23.34		349	19.66		73	4.08		935	52.61	
										0	0	
										5	0.31	
Utilities	418	23.51		336	18.90		86	4.86		932	52.43	
										0	0	
										5	0.31	
Computer Equipment	964	54.28		183	10.29		7	0.40		432	24.33	
										185	10.40	
										5	0.31	
Medical Equipment	877	49.37		154	8.66		3	0.14		669	37.65	
										69	3.87	
										5	0.31	
Educational Equipment	1102	62.00		58	3.27		7	0.42		604	34.00	
										0	0	
										5	0.31	
Other	47	2.67		17	0.98		12	0.66		65	3.68	
										1630	91.70	
										5	0.31	
										1777	100.00	

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 23

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical Support Staff

Participants

Number and Appropriateness of Staff	Suitability of Staff											
	More than Sufficient			Sufficient			Less than Sufficient			Not Applicable		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Sufficiency of Number of Staff												
Professional	716,148	13.27	1,307,130	24.22	3,311,135	61.36	42,084	0.78	20,071	0.37	5,396,569	100.00
Paraprofessional	176,832	3.28	1,434,936	26.59	2,009,267	37.23	1,775,534	32.90	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Clerical/Support	589,455	10.92	1,623,971	30.09	3,136,527	58.12	46,616	0.86	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Appropriateness of Skills/Experience in Providing Nutrition Education												
Professional	1,999,077	37.04	2,567,559	47.58	748,718	13.87	81,215	1.50	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Paraprofessional	445,371	8.25	1,723,968	31.95	1,170,349	21.69	2,056,881	38.11	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Clerical/Support	572,172	10.60	2,012,631	37.29	1,033,651	19.15	1,766,865	32.74	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Appropriateness of Skills/Experience in Providing Non-Nutrition Services												
Professional	1,513,215	28.04	2,871,831	53.22	860,472	15.94	130,980	2.43	20,071	0.37	5,396,569	100.00
Paraprofessional	478,631	8.87	1,995,086	36.97	871,208	16.14	2,031,573	37.65	20,071	0.37	5,396,569	100.00
Clerical/Support	783,413	14.52	2,812,416	52.11	1,260,177	23.35	520,491	9.64	20,071	0.37	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 24

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees for
Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees	Professional		Paraprofessional		Clerical/Support	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0.00	1245	70.06	750	42.19	1298	73.03
Less than 0.10	44	2.47	22	1.25	68	3.84
0.10 to 0.25	154	8.67	57	3.20	107	6.03
0.25 to 0.50	118	6.62	61	3.45	63	3.53
More than 0.50	126	7.11	24	1.36	104	5.83
Not Applicable	72	4.04	858	48.27	119	6.69
Don't Know	18	1.03	5	0.29	18	1.03
Total	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00

Affected Participants

Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees	Professional		Paraprofessional		Clerical/Support	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0.00	2,739,268	50.76	2,672,757	49.53	3,120,248	57.82
Less than 0.10	567,764	10.52	294,292	5.45	1,092,053	20.24
0.10 to 0.25	1,034,915	19.18	366,264	6.79	535,788	9.93
0.25 to 0.50	572,121	10.60	178,822	3.31	213,980	3.97
More than 0.50	311,780	5.78	93,082	1.72	200,214	3.71
Not Applicable	134,295	2.49	1,776,270	32.91	197,861	3.67
Don't Know	36,426	0.67	15,082	0.28	36,426	0.67
Total	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 25

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Recruiting Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Recruiting Staff	Professional Staff			Paraprofessional Staff			Clerical/Support Staff		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
No Vacancies	579	32.60	903	50.80	631	35.52			
Not Difficult	265	14.94	481	27.09	875	49.24			
Difficult	927	52.15	270	15.18	253	14.26			
Not Applicable	0	0	123	6.93	0	0			
Don't Know	5	0.31	0	0	17	0.98			
Total	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00			

Affected Participants

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Recruiting Staff	Professional Staff		Paraprofessional Staff		Clerical/Support Staff	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No Vacancies	1,066,962	19.77	1,870,141	34.65	1,156,160	21.42
Not Difficult	557,481	10.33	1,907,750	35.35	3,427,741	63.52
Difficult	3,760,876	69.69	1,196,634	22.17	796,035	14.75
Not Applicable	0	0	422,044	7.82	0	0
Don't Know	11,250	0.21	0	0	16,633	0.31
Total	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 26

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Retaining
Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Retaining Staff	Professional Staff			Paraprofessional Staff			Clerical/Support Staff		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
Not Difficult	1146	64.50	1001	56.33	1417	79.71			
Difficult	605	34.02	230	12.97	327	18.39			
Not Applicable	21	1.17	546	30.71	28	1.59			
Don't Know	5	0.31	0	0	5	0.31			
Total	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00			

Affected Participants

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Retaining Staff	Professional Staff			Paraprofessional Staff			Clerical/Support Staff		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
Not Difficult	2,840,791	52.64	3,465,781	64.22	4,296,471	79.61			
Difficult	2,521,860	46.73	651,020	12.06	1,076,141	19.94			
Not Applicable	22,668	0.42	1,279,767	23.71	12,707	0.24			
Don't Know	11,250	0.21	0	0	11,250	0.21			
Total	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 27

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Perceived Reasons for Not Filling Vacant Positions

Agencies

Reasons for Not Filling Vacant Positions	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Hiring Freeze	1495	84.13	282	15.87	1777	100.00
Shortage of Certain Types of Staff:						
Bilingual	1663	93.56	114	6.44	1777	100.00
Nutritionist	1403	78.95	374	21.05	1777	100.00
Nurse	1651	92.90	126	7.10	1777	100.00
Dietician	1528	86.00	249	14.00	1777	100.00
Other	1438	80.90	339	19.10	1777	100.00
Salary and/or Benefits not Competitive	747	42.04	1030	57.96	1777	100.00
Poor Working Conditions	1600	90.02	177	9.98	1777	100.00
Safety of Facility and/or Neighborhood	1641	92.34	136	7.66	1777	100.00
Other	1557	87.59	220	12.41	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 27

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Perceived Reasons for Not Filling Vacant Positions**

Participants

Reasons for Not Filling Vacant Positions	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Hiring Freeze	3,638,820	67.43	1,757,749	32.57	5,396,569	100.00
Shortage of Certain Types of Staff:						
Bilingual	4,792,430	88.81	604,139	11.19	5,396,569	100.00
Nutritionist	3,656,566	67.76	1,740,003	32.24	5,396,569	100.00
Nurse	5,027,386	93.16	369,183	6.84	5,396,569	100.00
Dietician	4,610,486	85.43	786,083	14.57	5,396,569	100.00
Other	4,246,871	78.70	1,149,698	21.30	5,396,569	100.00
Salary and/or Benefits not Competitive	1,878,863	34.82	3,517,706	65.18	5,396,569	100.00
Poor Working Conditions	4,223,590	78.26	1,172,979	21.74	5,396,569	100.00
Safety of Facility and/or Neighborhood	4,600,621	85.25	795,948	14.75	5,396,569	100.00
Other	4,605,971	85.35	790,598	14.65	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 28

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Perceived Reasons for Not Retaining Staff**

Agencies

Reasons for Turnover	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Salary and/or Benefits not Competitive	1017	57.24	760	42.76	1777	100.00
Poor Working Conditions	1574	88.58	203	11.42	1777	100.00
Safety of Facility and/or Neighborhood	1706	96.02	71	3.98	1777	100.00
Work Load	1214	68.32	563	31.68	1777	100.00
Low Morale	1452	81.69	325	18.31	1777	100.00
Other	1618	91.05	159	8.95	1777	100.00

Participants

Reasons for Turnover	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Salary and/or Benefits not Competitive	2,610,777	48.38	2,785,792	51.62	5,396,569	100.00
Poor Working Conditions	4,375,730	81.08	1,020,839	18.92	5,396,569	100.00
Safety of Facility and/or Neighborhood	4,963,582	91.98	432,987	8.02	5,396,569	100.00
Work Load	3,020,990	55.98	2,375,579	44.02	5,396,569	100.00
Low Morale	4,059,146	75.22	1,337,423	24.78	5,396,569	100.00
Other	4,607,214	85.37	789,355	14.63	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 29

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Languages Available at Agency

Agencies

Languages	Interpreters Available		Nutrition Education Provided	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Spanish	844	47.48	1032	58.09
Vietnamese	67	3.76	138	7.75
Cambodian/Khmer	38	2.14	126	7.10
Laotian	76	4.26	157	8.84
Thai	17	0.93	48	2.69
Hmong	92	5.17	88	4.96
Chinese	44	2.47	62	3.47
Haitian/Creole	41	2.30	50	2.83
French	117	6.57	59	3.33
Portugese	45	2.55	58	3.27
Native American Language	107	6.02	67	3.78
Sign Language	159	8.96	119	6.70
Other	160	9.03	102	5.72

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 29

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Languages Available at Agency**

Affected Participants

Languages	Interpreters Available		Nutrition Education Provided	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Spanish	3,808,564	70.57	4,164,792	77.17
Vietnamese	524,493	9.72	966,898	17.92
Cambodian/Khmer	318,616	5.90	764,325	14.16
Laotian	374,142	6.93	712,268	13.20
Thai	154,997	2.87	276,976	5.13
Hmong	102,379	1.90	388,581	7.20
Chinese	594,821	11.02	462,735	8.57
Haitian/Creole	290,307	5.38	337,601	6.26
French	677,221	12.55	318,148	5.90
Portugese	234,072	4.34	195,541	3.62
Native American Language	267,685	4.96	151,326	2.80
Sign Language	910,780	16.88	559,586	10.37
Other	894,149	16.57	632,809	11.73

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 30

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Perceived Adequacy of Current Space

	Perceived Adequacy of Current Space						Total	
	Adequate			Inadequate				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	595	33.50	1182	66.50	1777	100.00		
Affected Participants	979,645	18.15	4,416,924	81.85	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 31

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service

Agencies

Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service	Certification		Group Nutrition Education		Individual Nutrition Education		Food Instrument Issuance		Food Pick Up	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0 to 5 minutes	427	24.04	599	33.70	663	37.29	744	41.89	153	8.58
5 to 10 minutes	536	30.15	302	16.98	518	29.17	510	28.69	54	3.04
10 to 15 minutes	368	20.72	175	9.86	297	16.72	272	15.31	40	2.27
15 to 30 minutes	229	12.87	90	5.04	201	11.33	122	6.87	19	1.10
More than 30 minutes	217	12.21	46	2.60	57	3.20	24	1.35	11	0.62
Not Applicable	0	0	565	31.82	41	2.29	105	5.89	1500	84.39
Total	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00

Participants

Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service	Certification		Group Nutrition Education		Individual Nutrition Education		Food Instrument Issuance		Food Pick Up	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0 to 5 minutes	625,744	11.60	1,350,802	25.03	1,252,555	23.21	1,275,962	23.64	313,354	5.81
5 to 10 minutes	1,062,503	19.69	1,105,762	20.49	1,371,152	25.41	1,390,419	25.76	430,418	7.98
10 to 15 minutes	1,040,151	19.27	1,073,078	19.88	941,734	17.45	1,176,733	21.81	172,607	3.20
15 to 30 minutes	1,256,356	23.28	688,332	12.75	1,171,936	21.72	1,098,267	20.35	170,035	3.15
More than 30 minutes	1,411,815	26.16	239,801	4.44	474,302	8.79	255,871	4.74	161,693	3.00
Not Applicable	0	0	938,794	17.40	184,891	3.43	199,317	3.69	4,148,463	76.87
Total	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 32

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service

Agencies

Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service	Certification		Group Nutrition Educ (not high risk)		Group Nutrition Educ (high risk)		Individual Nutrition Educ (not high risk)		Individual Nutrition Educ (high risk)		Food Instrument Issuance		Food Pick Up	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0 to 5 minutes	30	1.70	10	0.58	0	0	216	12.16	73	4.11	726	40.86	106	5.99
5 to 10 minutes	166	9.32	109	6.14	67	3.77	645	36.30	354	19.92	606	34.08	96	5.41
10 to 15 minutes	181	10.17	283	15.95	55	3.08	538	30.27	471	26.52	226	12.69	23	1.28
15 to 30 minutes	813	45.76	628	35.34	359	20.20	225	12.67	727	40.91	82	4.59	10	0.57
More than 30 minutes	584	32.88	200	11.25	137	7.70	35	1.96	121	6.82	26	1.49	1	0.06
Not Applicable	0	0	543	30.57	1156	65.08	115	6.47	28	1.55	109	6.13	1538	86.53
Don't Know	3	0.17	3	0.17	3	0.17	3	0.17	3	0.17	3	0.17	3	0.17
Total	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00

Participants

Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service	Certification		Group Nutrition Educ (not high risk)		Group Nutrition Educ (high risk)		Individual Nutrition Educ (not high risk)		Individual Nutrition Educ (high risk)		Food Instrument Issuance		Food Pick Up	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0 to 5 minutes	372,583	6.90	73,585	1.36	0	0	894,367	16.57	201,052	3.73	2,469,479	45.76	432,997	8.02
5 to 10 minutes	395,768	7.33	392,362	7.27	202,884	3.76	1,760,059	32.61	1,147,784	21.27	1,599,789	29.64	437,103	8.10
10 to 15 minutes	873,150	16.18	1,190,609	22.06	367,375	6.81	1,649,862	30.57	1,208,811	22.40	672,457	12.46	210,386	3.90
15 to 30 minutes	2,507,536	46.47	2,444,162	45.29	1,514,972	28.07	624,095	11.56	2,239,633	41.50	354,584	6.57	71,257	1.32
More than 30 minutes	1,210,461	22.43	384,749	7.13	364,085	6.75	145,363	2.69	508,086	9.41	81,478	1.51	37,798	0.70
Not Applicable	0	0	874,030	16.20	2,910,181	53.93	285,753	5.30	54,132	1.00	181,711	3.37	4,169,958	77.27
Don't Know	37,071	0.69	37,071	0.69	37,071	0.69	37,071	0.69	37,071	0.69	37,071	0.69	37,071	0.69
Total	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 33

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Method of Obtaining Hematological Measurements

Methods	Number of Principal Clinic Sites										Total	
	Typically Used				Not Used				Don't Know			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
On-Site by WIC Staff	4145	70.56	1124	19.14	605	10.30	5874	100.00				
On-Site by Non-WIC Staff	1682	28.64	2640	44.95	1551	26.41	5874	100.00				
Off-Site by Health Care Personnel:												
Results Brought in By Applicant	2509	42.71	1952	33.24	1413	24.05	5874	100.00				
Results Brought in By Someone Other than Applicant	532	9.06	3349	57.02	1992	33.92	5874	100.00				
Other	139	2.37	95	1.62	5639	96.01	5874	100.00				
Coordinated with Lead Screening	1289	21.95	3602	61.31	983	16.74	5874	100.00				

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 34

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Specified Health Services Available on Site

Health Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites								
	Available on Site			Not Available on Site			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	Total
Dental Care	927	15.78		4549	77.44		398	6.78	5874
Obstetrical/Gynecological Care	2230	37.97		3310	56.35		334	5.68	5874
Breastfeeding Support Program	4147	70.60		1316	22.41		411	6.99	5874
Pediatric Care	2604	44.33		2840	48.34		430	7.32	5874
Family Planning Services	2963	50.45		2555	43.49		356	6.06	5874
Immunizations	3926	66.83		1652	28.13		296	5.04	5874
EPST	2776	47.27		2324	39.56		774	13.17	5874
Other Health Screening	2807	47.79		2403	40.91		664	11.30	5874
Medicaid Screening	2258	38.44		3022	51.45		594	10.11	5874

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 35

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Specified Non-Health Referral Services Available on Site

Non-Health Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites								
	Available on Site			Not Available on Site			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	Total
AFDC	952	16.21		4608	78.46		313	5.33	5874
Food Assistance Programs	1177	20.04		4361	74.24		336	5.72	5874
Social Services Programs	1725	29.37		3770	64.18		379	6.45	5874
Head Start	683	11.63		4947	84.22		244	4.15	5874
Child Care	603	10.27		5023	85.51		248	4.22	5874
Transportation	1127	19.19		4347	74.01		399	6.80	5874
Substance Abuse Counseling	1746	29.73		3729	63.48		399	6.79	5874
Housing	736	12.53		4712	80.23		425	7.24	5874
Adult Education/Job Training	525	8.93		4852	82.60		497	8.46	5874

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 36

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Opportunity to Apply for Selected Non-Health Services on Site

Non-Health Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites								Total	
	Typically Offered				Not Offered					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
AFDC	1486	25.29	3910	66.57	478	8.14	5874	100.00		
Food Assistance Programs	1863	31.71	3454	58.80	557	9.49	5874	100.00		
Social Services Programs	2079	35.39	3182	54.17	613	10.43	5874	100.00		
Head Start	1318	22.43	3980	67.75	577	9.82	5874	100.00		
Child Care	912	15.53	4474	76.17	487	8.30	5874	100.00		
Transportation	1173	19.97	4190	71.33	511	8.70	5874	100.00		
Substance Abuse Counseling	1670	28.42	3638	61.93	566	9.64	5874	100.00		
Housing	908	15.46	4407	75.02	559	9.52	5874	100.00		
Adult Education/Job Training	625	10.65	4614	78.55	634	10.80	5874	100.00		
Child Support	693	11.79	3907	66.52	1274	21.69	5874	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 37

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics in
Which Obtaining Health Care and Non-Health Care Services is a Problem

Type of Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites								Total	
	Typically a Problem				Not a Problem					Don't Know
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Health Care Service	1718	29.24	3480	59.24	676	11.52	5874	100.00		
Non-Health Care Service	1873	31.89	2872	48.89	1129	19.22	5874	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 38

Number and Percentage of Agencies by Reported Problems in Referring Clients to Other Agencies

Agencies

Referral Barriers	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Services Not Available/Available on Limited Basis	1065	59.95	712	40.05	1777	100.00
Waiting List for Services	1348	75.87	429	24.13	1777	100.00
WIC Participants Not Eligible	1471	82.80	306	17.20	1777	100.00
Services Not Offered During Convenient Times	1456	81.93	321	18.07	1777	100.00
Lack of/Limited Transportation to Svcs	960	54.01	817	45.99	1777	100.00
Other	1607	90.41	170	9.59	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 39

Number and Percentage of Agencies by
Ratio of Type of Nutrition Staff to Total Nutritional Staff Levels
Agencies

Ratio	Staff Relationships					
	Licensed Staff to Total Nutritional Staff		Paraprofessional Staff to Total Nutritional Staff		Other Professionals to Total Nutritional Staff	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0.00	436	24.55	1181	66.47	567	31.90
0.01 to 0.10	33	1.84	32	1.80	36	2.02
0.10 to 0.25	306	17.19	109	6.15	127	7.13
0.25 to 0.50	460	25.89	213	11.97	440	24.76
0.50 to 0.75	151	8.48	194	10.94	211	11.86
0.75 to 1.00	392	22.05	47	2.67	397	22.33
Total	1777	100.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 40

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Topics Covered and Methods Used

Agencies

Topics Covered	Methods Used											
	Not Offered			Verbal Presentation			Printed Materials			Audio Visual		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Management of Individual Nutrition Risk	16	0.88	1730	97.35	1599	90.00	618	34.76	6	0.36		
Importance of Nutrition to Health Status	15	0.84	1711	96.27	1506	84.73	816	45.94	0	0		
Description of Basic Good Diet	1	0.06	1728	97.22	1693	95.25	871	48.99	6	0.35		
Major Nutrients Provided by WIC Package	33	1.85	1691	95.18	1420	79.91	631	35.53	10	0.58		
Other Sources of Particular Nutrients	5	0.30	1704	95.89	1726	97.11	665	37.40	16	0.88		
Importance of Diet for Fetal Growth	4	0.20	1726	97.12	1605	90.34	961	54.06	0	0		
Breastfeeding	1	0.06	1758	98.94	1733	97.50	1423	80.08	0	0		
Handling of Infant Formula	51	2.87	1655	93.14	1448	81.48	474	26.68	10	0.58		
Use of Whole Cows's Milk	155	8.74	1579	88.88	1202	67.66	313	17.61	0	0		
Solid and Table Foods	13	0.75	1707	96.06	1688	94.98	833	46.85	0	0		
Importance of Nutrition for Growth	18	1.00	1730	97.34	1620	91.17	839	47.23	6	0.35		
Nutritious Snacks	8	0.45	1730	97.37	1715	96.51	877	49.38	3	0.15		
Dental Health	71	4.00	1659	93.35	1563	87.95	752	42.34	0	0		
Risks of Substance Abuse	22	1.23	1686	94.88	1650	92.86	817	46.00	0	0		
Food Preparation/Shopping/Safety	1686	94.91	87	4.90	91	5.09	45	2.54	0	0		
Other	1615	90.91	147	8.27	126	7.06	81	4.54	4	0.23		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 40

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Topics Covered and Methods Used**

Affected Participants

Topics Covered	Methods Used											
	Not Offered			Verbal Presentation			Printed Materials			Audio Visual		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Management of Individual Nutrition Risk	154,550	2.86	5,151,077	95.45	4,731,001	87.67	2,340,363	43.37	96,324	1.78		
Importance of Nutrition to Health Status	156,412	2.90	5,128,746	95.04	4,481,526	83.04	3,021,061	55.98	0	0		
Description of Basic Good Diet	132,818	2.46	5,092,867	94.37	5,039,606	93.39	3,339,823	61.89	12,085	0.22		
Major Nutrients Provided by WIC Package	269,266	4.99	4,885,712	90.53	4,255,393	78.85	2,408,219	44.62	31,507	0.58		
Other Sources of Particular Nutrients	151,970	2.82	4,971,135	92.12	5,003,023	92.71	2,740,879	50.79	48,970	0.91		
Importance of Diet for Fetal Growth	163,291	3.03	5,059,811	93.76	4,702,154	87.13	3,285,283	60.88	0	0		
Breastfeeding	132,818	2.46	5,172,322	95.84	5,115,885	94.80	4,518,330	83.73	0	0		
Handling of Infant Formula	236,256	4.38	4,980,259	92.29	4,633,469	85.86	2,069,512	38.35	7,444	0.14		
Use of Whole Cows' Milk	690,461	12.79	4,554,521	84.40	3,358,534	62.23	1,378,534	25.54	0	0		
Solid and Table Foods	159,972	2.96	5,012,107	92.88	4,961,287	91.93	3,189,778	59.11	0	0		
Importance of Nutrition for Growth	220,588	4.09	5,081,527	94.16	4,843,365	89.75	3,303,131	61.21	12,085	0.22		
Nutritious Snacks	143,316	2.66	5,096,432	94.44	5,040,963	93.41	3,203,955	59.37	25,532	0.47		
Dental Health	391,760	7.26	4,806,701	89.07	4,677,363	86.67	2,675,718	49.58	0	0		
Risks of Substance Abuse	302,851	5.61	4,969,384	92.08	4,820,738	89.33	2,644,150	49.00	0	0		
Food Preparation/Shopping/Safety	4,996,248	92.58	378,427	7.01	400,321	7.42	261,876	4.85	0	0		
Other	4,816,859	89.26	553,610	10.26	529,137	9.81	347,562	6.44	18,931	0.35		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 41

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Whether Nutrition Services Covered by Medicaid

	Nutrition Services Reimbursed by Medicaid										Total	
	Yes, Reimbursed				No, Not Reimbursed							
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	251	14.13	1410	79.34	116	6.53	1777	100.00				
Affected Participants	862,083	15.97	4,248,421	78.72	286,066	5.30	5,396,569	100.00				

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 42

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Frequency of Nutrition Education Contacts**

Agencies

Frequency	High Risk Participant		Non-High Risk Participant	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Once Per Certification Period	192	10.81	521	29.33
Twice Per Certification Period	773	43.47	956	53.78
Monthly	753	42.36	171	9.62
Bi-Monthly	678	38.17	400	22.53
Other	151	8.50	52	2.94
Don't Know	0	0	16	0.89

Affected Participants

Frequency	High Risk Participant		Non-High Risk Participant	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Once Per Certification Period	446,426	8.27	1,121,735	20.79
Twice Per Certification Period	2,491,058	46.16	3,048,740	56.49
Monthly	1,913,772	35.46	493,274	9.14
Bi-Monthly	2,196,914	40.71	1,649,554	30.57
Other	884,300	16.39	236,795	4.39
Don't Know	0	0	65,099	1.21

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 43

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Group Size for Providing Nutrition Education

Agencies

Group Size	No.	Pct.
Individual	1744	98.16
Small Group (2-9)	1008	56.71
Medium Group (10-19)	831	46.75
Large Group (20-29)	369	20.76
Very Large Group (30+)	168	9.45

Affected Participants

Group Size	No.	Pct.
Individual	5,308,187	98.36
Small Group (2-9)	3,432,874	63.61
Medium Group (10-19)	3,341,338	61.92
Large Group (20-29)	2,560,359	47.44
Very Large Group (30+)	955,502	17.71

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 44

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Agencies

Materials Used in Individual Instruction	Use in Individual Nutrition Education Sessions						Total	
	Used			Not Used			No.	Pct.
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.		
Verbal Discussion/Counseling	1777	100.00	0	0	0	1777	100.00	100.00
Pamphlets	1777	100.00	0	0	0	1777	100.00	100.00
Food Models	1492	83.96	285	16.04	16.04	1777	100.00	100.00
Food Demonstrations	455	25.59	1322	74.41	74.41	1777	100.00	100.00
Tests	453	25.51	1324	74.49	74.49	1777	100.00	100.00
Audio Tapes	427	24.03	1350	75.97	75.97	1777	100.00	100.00
Slides	255	14.36	1522	85.64	85.64	1777	100.00	100.00
Films/Videos	1110	62.46	667	37.54	37.54	1777	100.00	100.00
Flip Charts	1022	57.53	755	42.47	42.47	1777	100.00	100.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	57	3.22	1720	96.78	96.78	1777	100.00	100.00
Other	39	2.19	1738	97.81	97.81	1777	100.00	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 44

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Affected Participants

Materials Used in Individual Instruction	Use in Individual Nutrition Education Sessions						Total	
	Used			Not Used			No.	Pct.
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.		
Verbal Discussion/Counseling	5,396,569	100.00	0	0	0	5,396,569	100.00	100.00
Pamphlets	5,396,569	100.00	0	0	0	5,396,569	100.00	100.00
Food Models	4,860,210	90.06	536,359	9.94	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Food Demonstrations	1,366,249	25.32	4,030,320	74.68	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Tests	1,780,997	33.00	3,615,572	67.00	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Audio Tapes	1,321,460	24.49	4,075,109	75.51	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Slides	1,099,946	20.38	4,296,623	79.62	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Films/Videos	2,795,461	51.80	2,601,108	48.20	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Flip Charts	3,623,625	67.15	1,772,944	32.85	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	141,893	2.63	5,254,676	97.37	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00
Other	112,402	2.08	5,284,167	97.92	5,396,569	100.00	100.00	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 45

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Agencies

Materials Used in Group Instruction	Use in Group Nutrition Education Sessions									
	Used				Not Used				Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Lectures/Oral Discussions	1370	77.08	407	22.92	1777		1777	100.00		
Pamphlets	1419	79.86	358	20.14	1777		1777	100.00		
Food Models	1189	66.89	588	33.11	1777		1777	100.00		
Food Demonstrations	909	51.14	868	48.86	1777		1777	100.00		
Tests	692	38.95	1085	61.05	1777		1777	100.00		
Audio Tapes	411	23.14	1366	76.86	1777		1777	100.00		
Slides	628	35.32	1149	64.68	1777		1777	100.00		
Films/Videos	1364	76.73	413	23.27	1777		1777	100.00		
Flip Charts	1081	60.82	696	39.18	1777		1777	100.00		
Computer Assisted Instruction	41	2.32	1736	97.68	1777		1777	100.00		
Other	85	4.80	1692	95.20	1777		1777	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 45

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods**

Affected Participants

Materials Used in Group Instruction	Use in Group Nutrition Education Sessions							
	Used				Not Used			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lectures/Oral Discussions	4,872,806	90.29	523,763	9.71	5,396,569	100.00		
Pamphlets	4,947,223	91.67	449,346	8.33	5,396,569	100.00		
Food Models	4,034,782	74.77	1,361,787	25.23	5,396,569	100.00		
Food Demonstrations	3,207,034	59.43	2,189,535	40.57	5,396,569	100.00		
Tests	2,473,823	45.84	2,922,746	54.16	5,396,569	100.00		
Audio Tapes	1,663,434	30.82	3,733,135	69.18	5,396,569	100.00		
Slides	2,526,187	46.81	2,870,382	53.19	5,396,569	100.00		
Films/Videos	4,764,305	88.28	632,264	11.72	5,396,569	100.00		
Flip Charts	3,860,803	71.54	1,535,766	28.46	5,396,569	100.00		
Computer Assisted Instruction	61,993	1.15	5,334,576	98.85	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	376,083	6.97	5,020,486	93.03	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 46

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Factors that May Act as Barriers to Providing High Quality Nutrition Education

Agencies

Barriers	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Space	734	41.29	1043	58.71	1777	100.00
Too few Staff	910	51.20	867	48.80	1777	100.00
Too Little Staff Time per Participant	753	42.39	1024	57.61	1777	100.00
Participant Interest	639	35.97	1138	64.03	1777	100.00
Transportation	968	54.50	809	45.50	1777	100.00
Child Care	952	53.57	825	46.43	1777	100.00
Participant Time	881	49.59	896	50.41	1777	100.00
Cultural Issues/Language Difficulties	1297	73.00	480	27.00	1777	100.00
Difficulty Recruiting Qualified Staff	1436	80.79	341	19.21	1777	100.00
Other	1635	92.00	142	8.00	1777	100.00

Participants

Barriers	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Space	1,243,769	23.05	4,152,800	76.95	5,396,569	100.00
Too few Staff	1,959,494	36.31	3,437,075	63.69	5,396,569	100.00
Too Little Staff Time per Participant	1,728,079	32.02	3,668,490	67.98	5,396,569	100.00
Participant Interest	2,340,166	43.36	3,056,403	56.64	5,396,569	100.00
Transportation	3,471,065	64.32	1,925,504	35.68	5,396,569	100.00
Child Care	2,358,867	43.71	3,037,702	56.29	5,396,569	100.00
Participant Time	2,393,793	44.36	3,002,776	55.64	5,396,569	100.00
Cultural Issues/Language Difficulties	3,455,699	64.04	1,940,870	35.96	5,396,569	100.00
Difficulty Recruiting Qualified Staff	3,664,330	67.90	1,732,239	32.10	5,396,569	100.00
Other	5,049,011	93.56	347,558	6.44	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 47
Number and Percentage of Agencies by
Children Provided Nutrition Education
Agencies

Person to Whom Nutrition Education is Directed	Extent to Which Nutrition Education is Provided to Children												Total	
	None		A Few		Some		Most		All					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Children	542	30.51	478	26.88	427	24.01	153	8.61	177	9.98	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 48

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Factors Ranked Most Often as Promoting High Quality WIC Services
Agencies

Most Important Factors	No.	Pct.
Caring, Concerned Staff	1232	69.35
Qualified, Well Trained Staff	939	52.85
Quality Nutrition Services	879	49.44
Quality Operations of Clinic	667	37.52
Referrals/Integration	544	30.62
Adequate Facilities	526	29.60
Community Support	495	27.84
Ongoing Training/Instruction for Staff	300	16.88
Staff - General	271	15.24
Participant Support	111	6.23
Vendor Monitoring/Cooperation	37	2.09
Other	403	22.71

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 48

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors Ranked Most Often as Promoting High Quality MIC Services

Participants

Most Important Factors	No.	Pct.
Caring, Concerned Staff	3,536,883	65.54
Qualified, Well Trained Staff	3,355,250	62.17
Quality Nutrition Services	2,682,548	49.71
Quality Operations of Clinic	2,396,977	44.42
Referrals/Integration	1,930,865	35.78
Adequate Facilities	1,575,889	29.20
Community Support	1,685,702	31.24
Ongoing Training/Instruction for Staff	994,114	18.42
Staff - General	1,055,763	19.56
Participant Support	327,283	6.06
Vendor Monitoring/Cooperation	68,289	1.27
Other	1,353,849	25.09

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 49

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors Ranked Most Often as Hindering High Quality WIC Services

Agencies

Most Important Factors	No.	Pct.
Inadequate Facilities/Materials	1151	64.78
Shortage of Staff	694	39.05
Not Enough Time	658	37.03
Geographical/Transportation Issues	650	36.57
Unresponsive Participants	592	33.31
Lack of Funding/Funding Fluctuates	447	25.13
Too Many Requirements/Paperwork	430	24.19
Inefficient Operations	425	23.93
Staff Attitude/Turnover	306	17.23
Lack of Support/Training	181	10.19
Language/Literacy Barriers	158	8.89
Staff - General	129	7.24
Lack of Services for Participants	55	3.07
Lack of Community Support	40	2.23
Not Enough/Poor Education	32	1.82
Other	473	26.62

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 49

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Factors Ranked Most Often as Hindering High Quality WIC Services

Participants

Most Important Factors	No.	Pct.
Inadequate Facilities/Materials	3,940,382	73.02
Shortage of Staff	2,850,500	52.82
Not Enough Time	2,054,208	38.07
Geographical/Transportation Issues	1,274,188	23.61
Unresponsive Participants	1,464,153	27.13
Lack of Funding/Funding Fluctuates	1,375,413	25.49
Too Many Requirements/Paperwork	1,744,336	32.32
Inefficient Operations	1,919,715	35.57
Staff Attitude/Turnover	1,078,533	19.99
Lack of Support/Training	521,302	9.66
Language/Literacy Barriers	576,346	10.68
Staff - General	869,571	16.11
Lack of Services for Participants	206,183	3.82
Lack of Community Support	57,165	1.06
Not Enough/Poor Education	121,310	2.25
Other	1,172,864	21.73

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 50

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Certification Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Certification Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
Stopped Doing walk-in certifications	368	20.72	1409	79.28	1777	100.00		
Started Doing walk-in certifications	461	25.93	1316	74.07	1777	100.00		
Scheduled less time per certification	1016	57.17	761	42.83	1777	100.00		
Scheduled more time per certification	255	14.33	1522	85.67	1777	100.00		
Replaced interview with self-admin form	248	13.96	1529	86.04	1777	100.00		
Conducted group certifications	282	15.85	1495	84.15	1777	100.00		
Dropped group certifications	131	7.35	1646	92.65	1777	100.00		
Reduced priorities served	683	38.44	1094	61.56	1777	100.00		
Limited caseload to certain priorities	771	43.41	1006	56.59	1777	100.00		
Added priorities served	757	42.57	1020	57.43	1777	100.00		
Other	43	2.42	1734	97.58	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 50

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Certification Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Certification Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
Stopped Doing walk-in certifications	1,401,689	25.97	3,994,880	74.03	5,396,569	100.00		
Started Doing walk-in certifications	1,500,661	27.81	3,895,908	72.19	5,396,569	100.00		
Scheduled less time per certification	3,381,956	62.67	2,014,613	37.33	5,396,569	100.00		
Scheduled more time per certification	1,075,673	19.93	4,320,896	80.07	5,396,569	100.00		
Replaced interview with self-admin form	1,166,181	21.61	4,230,388	78.39	5,396,569	100.00		
Conducted group certifications	1,278,980	23.70	4,117,589	76.30	5,396,569	100.00		
Dropped group certifications	372,065	6.89	5,024,504	93.11	5,396,569	100.00		
Reduced priorities served	2,608,348	48.33	2,788,221	51.67	5,396,569	100.00		
Limited caseload to certain priorities	2,931,595	54.32	2,464,974	45.68	5,396,569	100.00		
Added priorities served	2,385,021	44.20	3,011,548	55.80	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	353,640	6.55	5,042,929	93.45	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 51

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Nutrition Education Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Nutrition Education Operations	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No			No.	Pct.
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Increased group nutrition education	1012	56.95	765	43.05	1777	100.00		
Canceled/postponed group nutrition educ	349	19.62	1428	80.38	1777	100.00		
Canceled individual sessions	113	6.35	1664	93.65	1777	100.00		
More group nutrition, fewer indiv sess	465	26.17	1312	73.83	1777	100.00		
More indiv nutrition, fewer group sess	476	26.78	1301	73.22	1777	100.00		
Placed more emphasis on breastfeeding	1724	97.03	53	2.97	1777	100.00		
More staff time per partic, nutrit educ	592	33.31	1185	66.69	1777	100.00		
Less staff time per partic, nutrit educ	614	34.57	1163	65.43	1777	100.00		
Paraprofessionals deliver nutrit educ	667	37.53	1110	62.47	1777	100.00		
More handouts and pamphlets	992	55.83	785	44.17	1777	100.00		
Increased class sizes	720	40.53	1057	59.47	1777	100.00		
Decreased class sizes	125	7.06	1652	92.94	1777	100.00		
Other	56	3.17	1721	96.83	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 51

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Nutrition Education Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Nutrition Education Operations	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Increased group nutrition education	3,584,708	66.43	1,811,861	33.57	5,396,569	100.00		
Canceled/postponed group nutrition educ	1,464,992	27.15	3,931,577	72.85	5,396,569	100.00		
Canceled individual sessions	462,724	8.57	4,933,845	91.43	5,396,569	100.00		
More group nutrition, fewer indiv sess	2,320,592	43.00	3,075,977	57.00	5,396,569	100.00		
More indiv nutrition, fewer group sess	1,196,923	22.18	4,199,646	77.82	5,396,569	100.00		
Placed more emphasis on breastfeeding	5,278,178	97.81	118,391	2.19	5,396,569	100.00		
More staff time per partic, nutrit educ	1,759,373	32.60	3,637,196	67.40	5,396,569	100.00		
Less staff time per partic, nutrit educ	2,411,615	44.69	2,984,954	55.31	5,396,569	100.00		
Paraprofessionals deliver nutrit educ	2,530,095	46.88	2,866,474	53.12	5,396,569	100.00		
More handouts and pamphlets	3,279,805	60.78	2,116,764	39.22	5,396,569	100.00		
Increased class sizes	3,163,283	58.62	2,233,286	41.38	5,396,569	100.00		
Decreased class sizes	515,872	9.56	4,880,697	90.44	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	411,899	7.63	4,984,670	92.37	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 52

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Food Instrument Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Food Instrument Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No			No.	Pct.
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Issued multiple food instruments	1119	62.96	658	37.04	1777	100.00		
Issued single food instruments	283	15.94	1494	84.06	1777	100.00		
Issued standard packages more often	914	51.45	863	48.55	1777	100.00		
Prepared instruments before determ elig	102	5.74	1675	94.26	1777	100.00		
Implemented classes on using instruments	491	27.60	1286	72.40	1777	100.00		
Wrote instrument at local agency level	793	44.62	984	55.38	1777	100.00		
Computer-generated food instruments	683	38.44	1094	61.56	1777	100.00		
Other	37	2.06	1740	97.94	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 52

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Food Instrument Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Food Instrument Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Issued multiple food instruments	3,680,935	68.21	1,715,634	31.79	5,396,569	100.00		
Issued single food instruments	939,622	17.41	4,456,947	82.59	5,396,569	100.00		
Issued standard packages more often	2,971,564	55.06	2,425,005	44.94	5,396,569	100.00		
Prepared instruments before determining eligibility	320,848	5.95	5,075,721	94.05	5,396,569	100.00		
Implemented classes on using instruments	1,763,229	32.67	3,633,340	67.33	5,396,569	100.00		
Wrote instrument at local agency level	2,273,802	42.13	3,122,767	57.87	5,396,569	100.00		
Computer-generated food instruments	2,375,910	44.03	3,020,659	55.97	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	240,524	4.46	5,156,045	95.54	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 53

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Scheduling Practices

Agencies

Specific Changes in Scheduling Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Implemented/continued appointments	974	54.83	803	45.17	1777	100.00		
Over-booked WIC participant appointments	1255	70.62	522	29.38	1777	100.00		
Less flexible clinic activity schedules	660	37.14	1117	62.86	1777	100.00		
More flexible clinic activity schedules	817	45.96	960	54.04	1777	100.00		
Extended clinic hours beyond regular hrs	789	44.41	988	55.59	1777	100.00		
Shortened clinic hours	21	1.19	1756	98.81	1777	100.00		
Extended clinic days of service	906	50.99	871	49.01	1777	100.00		
Cut back on days of service	142	8.00	1635	92.00	1777	100.00		
Other	48	2.68	1729	97.32	1777	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 53

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Scheduling Practices**

Participants

Specific Changes in Scheduling Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Implemented/continued appointments	3,118,091	57.78	2,278,478	42.22	5,396,569	100.00		
Over-booked WIC participant appointments	4,517,054	83.70	879,515	16.30	5,396,569	100.00		
Less flexible clinic activity schedules	2,241,601	41.54	3,154,968	58.46	5,396,569	100.00		
More flexible clinic activity schedules	2,679,316	49.65	2,717,253	50.35	5,396,569	100.00		
Extended clinic hours beyond regular hrs	3,452,598	63.98	1,943,971	36.02	5,396,569	100.00		
Shortened clinic hours	91,243	1.69	5,305,326	98.31	5,396,569	100.00		
Extended clinic days of service	3,088,681	57.23	2,307,888	42.77	5,396,569	100.00		
Cut back on days of service	782,451	14.50	4,614,118	85.50	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	155,903	2.89	5,240,666	97.11	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 54

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Staffing Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Staffing Practices	Implemented Changes				Total	
	Yes	No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Used volunteer staff to greater extent	445	25.01	1332	74.99	1777	100.00
Used volunteer staff to lesser extent	52	2.90	1725	97.10	1777	100.00
Used contract/consult staff-greater ext	582	32.74	1195	67.26	1777	100.00
Used contract/consult staff-lesser ext	94	5.26	1683	94.74	1777	100.00
Used more itinerant staff (site travel)	746	42.01	1031	57.99	1777	100.00
Used less itinerant staff (site travel)	55	3.08	1722	96.92	1777	100.00
Used more paraprofessional staff	697	39.20	1080	60.80	1777	100.00
Used fewer paraprofessional staff	65	3.64	1712	96.36	1777	100.00
Used more clerical staff	1084	61.01	693	38.99	1777	100.00
Used fewer clerical staff	103	5.77	1674	94.23	1777	100.00
Used more professional staff	950	53.48	827	46.52	1777	100.00
Used fewer professional staff	150	8.42	1627	91.58	1777	100.00
Curtailed or canceled staff meetings	612	34.44	1165	65.56	1777	100.00
Cut back training activities for staff	595	33.47	1182	66.53	1777	100.00
Increased training activities for staff	568	31.94	1209	68.06	1777	100.00
Other	24	1.37	1753	98.63	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 54

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Changes in Staffing Practices Since 1988

Specific Changes in Staffing Practices	Participants					
	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Used volunteer staff to greater extent	1,783,516	33.05	3,613,053	66.95	5,396,569	100.00
Used volunteer staff to lesser extent	225,878	4.19	5,170,691	95.81	5,396,569	100.00
Used contract/consult staff-greater ext	2,259,506	41.87	3,137,063	58.13	5,396,569	100.00
Used contract/consult staff-lesser ext	230,238	4.27	5,166,331	95.73	5,396,569	100.00
Used more itinerant staff (site travel)	3,055,260	56.61	2,341,309	43.39	5,396,569	100.00
Used less itinerant staff (site travel)	439,650	8.15	4,956,919	91.85	5,396,569	100.00
Used more paraprofessional staff	2,960,788	54.86	2,435,781	45.14	5,396,569	100.00
Used fewer paraprofessional staff	220,643	4.09	5,175,926	95.91	5,396,569	100.00
Used more clerical staff	4,068,830	75.40	1,327,739	24.60	5,396,569	100.00
Used fewer clerical staff	468,512	8.68	4,928,057	91.32	5,396,569	100.00
Used more professional staff	3,742,214	69.34	1,654,355	30.66	5,396,569	100.00
Used fewer professional staff	437,393	8.11	4,959,176	91.89	5,396,569	100.00
Curtailed or canceled staff meetings	2,733,353	50.65	2,663,216	49.35	5,396,569	100.00
Cut back training activities for staff	2,452,369	45.44	2,944,200	54.56	5,396,569	100.00
Increased training activities for staff	2,212,886	41.01	3,183,683	58.99	5,396,569	100.00
Other	170,907	3.17	5,225,662	96.83	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 55

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Waiting List Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Waiting List Practices	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Initiated/increased use of waiting list	709	39.88	1068	60.12	1777	100.00		
Dropped waiting lists	582	32.75	1195	67.27	1777	100.00		
Other	9	0.48	1768	99.52	1777	100.00		

Participants

Specific Changes in Waiting List Practices	Implemented Changes							
	Yes				No			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Initiated/increased use of waiting list	2,199,050	40.75	3,197,519	59.25	5,396,569	100.00		
Dropped waiting lists	1,959,151	36.30	3,437,418	63.70	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	34,097	0.63	5,362,472	99.37	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 56

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes		No		Pct.		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Postponed or canceled special projects	770	43.32	1007	56.68	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Delayed completion of paperwork/reports	1095	61.62	682	38.38	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Streamlined recordkeeping	904	50.90	873	49.10	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Streamlined case management	629	35.42	1148	64.58	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Made greater use of computers	1203	67.72	574	32.28	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Increased paperwork	1044	58.75	733	41.25	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Decreased paperwork	307	17.30	1470	82.70	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Expanded case management	824	46.39	953	53.61	1777	100.00	1777	100.00
Other	18	1.00	1759	99.00	1777	100.00	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 56

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No			No.	Pct.
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Postponed or canceled special projects	3,010,442	55.78	2,386,127	44.22	5,396,569	100.00		
Delayed completion of paperwork/reports	3,690,656	68.39	1,705,913	31.61	5,396,569	100.00		
Streamlined recordkeeping	3,126,916	57.94	2,269,653	42.06	5,396,569	100.00		
Streamlined case management	2,156,741	39.97	3,239,828	60.03	5,396,569	100.00		
Made greater use of computers	4,298,974	79.66	1,097,595	20.34	5,396,569	100.00		
Increased paperwork	3,468,429	64.27	1,928,140	35.73	5,396,569	100.00		
Decreased paperwork	1,181,761	21.90	4,214,808	78.10	5,396,569	100.00		
Expanded case management	2,829,336	52.43	2,567,233	47.57	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	54,255	1.01	5,342,314	98.99	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 57

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Facilities Since 1988**

Agencies

Specific Changes in Facilities	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Moved to new facilities	858	48.30	919	51.70	1777	100.00		
Added clinic sites	713	40.11	1064	59.89	1777	100.00		
Eliminated clinic sites	285	16.06	1492	83.94	1777	100.00		
Made more efficient use of space	1283	72.19	494	27.81	1777	100.00		
Co-located with health-care provider	570	32.08	1207	67.92	1777	100.00		
Other	91	0.48	1768	99.52	1777	100.00		

Participants

Specific Changes in Facilities	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Moved to new facilities	3,571,995	66.19	1,824,574	33.81	5,396,569	100.00		
Added clinic sites	3,560,364	65.97	1,836,205	34.03	5,396,569	100.00		
Eliminated clinic sites	1,625,573	30.12	3,770,996	69.88	5,396,569	100.00		
Made more efficient use of space	4,221,388	78.22	1,175,181	21.78	5,396,569	100.00		
Co-located with health-care provider	2,381,803	44.14	3,014,766	55.86	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	82,395	1.53	5,314,174	98.47	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 58
Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Other Changes Made Since 1988

Agencies

Other Changes	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Initiated special projects	898	50.53	879	49.47	1777	100.00		
Planned and held regular staff meetings	1044	58.75	733	41.25	1777	100.00		
Other	68	3.85	1709	96.15	1777	100.00		

Participants

Other Changes	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No				
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Initiated special projects	3,672,539	68.05	1,724,030	31.95	5,396,569	100.00		
Planned and held regular staff meetings	4,088,972	75.77	1,307,597	24.23	5,396,569	100.00		
Other	462,803	8.58	4,933,766	91.42	5,396,569	100.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 59

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Funding Sources for Labor and Non-Labor Items Compared to 1988

Agencies

Labor and Non-Labor Items	Agency's Perception of Level Now in Comparison to 1988															
	More			About the Same			Less			Not Applicable			Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
WIC Funded Staff	1225	68.95		391	22.00		153	8.58		8	0.46		0	0	1777	100.00
Non-WIC Funded Staff	310	17.44		434	24.41		94	5.32		939	52.84		0	0	1777	100.00
WIC Funded Non-Labor Items:																
Space	550	30.94		736	41.44		89	5.01		396	22.31		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Utilities	471	26.52		850	47.82		81	4.57		370	20.80		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Computer Equipment	871	48.99		378	21.25		64	3.60		460	25.86		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Medical Equipment	604	33.97		820	46.14		88	4.95		260	14.63		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Educational Equipment	825	46.45		764	42.99		125	7.04		57	3.22		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Other	669	37.66		679	38.24		160	9.03		263	14.77		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Non-WIC Funded Non-Labor Items:																
Space	311	17.48		785	44.17		147	8.29		529	29.75		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Utilities	296	16.65		823	46.29		115	6.46		538	30.30		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Computer Equipment	341	19.21		359	20.21		88	4.98		983	55.29		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Medical Equipment	200	11.26		665	37.44		117	6.61		789	44.38		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Educational Equipment	247	13.89		563	31.68		168	9.47		793	44.65		5	0.31	1777	100.00
Other	243	13.67		449	25.27		164	9.23		916	51.53		5	0.31	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 59

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Funding Sources for Labor and Non-Labor Items Compared to 1988

Participants

Labor and Non-Labor Items	Agency's Perception of Level Now in Comparison to 1988											
	More			About the Same			Less			Not Applicable		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
WIC Funded Staff	4,500,011	83.39	500,212	9.27	386,989	7.17	9,357	0.17	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Non-WIC Funded Staff	1,056,458	19.58	964,670	17.88	445,244	8.25	2,930,196	54.30	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
WIC Funded Non-Labor Items:												
Space	2,611,958	48.40	1,538,887	28.52	400,485	7.42	833,989	15.45	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Utilities	2,312,193	42.85	1,752,318	32.47	225,073	4.17	1,095,735	20.30	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Computer Equipment	3,504,662	64.94	695,962	12.90	201,988	3.74	982,708	18.21	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Medical Equipment	2,670,890	49.49	1,567,024	29.04	258,393	4.79	889,012	16.47	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Educational Equipment	3,079,586	57.07	1,790,233	33.17	315,725	5.85	199,775	3.70	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Other	2,568,712	47.60	1,523,073	28.22	481,455	8.92	812,078	15.05	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Non-WIC Funded Non-Labor Items:												
Space	1,290,877	23.92	1,565,862	29.02	1,008,543	18.69	1,520,037	28.17	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Utilities	1,171,450	21.71	1,695,528	31.42	853,107	15.81	1,665,235	30.86	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Computer Equipment	918,858	17.03	756,977	14.03	331,188	6.14	3,378,296	62.60	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Medical Equipment	728,540	13.50	1,151,163	21.33	825,734	15.30	2,679,882	49.66	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Educational Equipment	636,346	11.79	1,122,499	20.80	624,028	11.56	3,002,446	55.64	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00
Other	637,014	11.80	977,038	18.10	761,744	14.12	3,009,523	55.77	11,250	0.21	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 60

**Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Number and Appropriateness of Staff**

Agencies

Number and Appropriateness of Staff	Agency's Perception of Level Now in Comparison to 1988											
	More than Sufficient		No Change		Less than Sufficient		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Number of Staff												
Professional	437	24.58	785	44.18	483	27.19	72	4.05	0	0	1777	100.00
Paraprofessional	224	12.59	523	29.44	271	15.23	760	42.74	0	0	1777	100.00
Clerical/Support	341	19.20	879	49.46	428	24.06	113	6.36	16	0.92	1777	100.00
Skills and Experiences in Providing Nutrition Education/Nutrition Services												
Professional	759	42.72	798	44.88	175	9.87	45	2.53	0	0	1777	100.00
Paraprofessional	334	18.79	434	24.41	119	6.69	891	50.12	0	0	1777	100.00
Clerical/Support	320	18.00	855	48.12	101	5.67	493	27.77	8	0.45	1777	100.00
Skills and Experiences in Providing Non-Nutritional Services												
Professional	708	39.86	818	46.01	180	10.15	64	3.59	7	0.40	1777	100.00
Paraprofessional	331	18.60	456	25.66	109	6.11	875	49.23	7	0.40	1777	100.00
Clerical/Support	437	24.58	915	51.46	145	8.14	268	15.09	13	0.72	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 60

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change in Number and Appropriateness of Staff

Participants

Number and Appropriateness of Staff	Agency's Perception of Level Now in Comparison to 1988											
	More than Sufficient		No Change		Less than Sufficient		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Number of Staff												
Professional	1,355,799	25.12	1,995,386	36.98	1,964,206	36.40	81,178	1.50	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Paraprofessional	559,583	10.37	1,767,351	32.75	1,270,518	23.54	1,799,117	33.34	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Clerical/Support	1,225,811	22.71	2,166,381	40.14	1,905,253	35.30	93,737	1.74	5,387	0.10	5,396,569	100.00
Skills and Experiences in Providing Nutrition Education/Nutrition Services												
Professional	2,280,063	42.25	2,321,255	43.01	745,356	13.81	49,896	0.92	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Paraprofessional	1,019,056	18.88	1,652,983	30.63	611,000	11.32	2,113,530	39.16	0	0	5,396,569	100.00
Clerical/Support	783,993	14.53	2,432,431	45.07	452,299	8.38	1,685,667	31.24	42,178	0.78	5,396,569	100.00
Skills and Experiences in Providing Non-Nutritional Services												
Professional	2,166,439	40.14	2,152,634	39.89	956,216	17.72	109,499	2.03	11,781	0.22	5,396,569	100.00
Paraprofessional	978,068	18.12	1,747,990	32.39	622,598	11.54	2,036,134	37.73	11,781	0.22	5,396,569	100.00
Clerical/Support	1,462,931	27.11	2,579,868	47.81	860,814	15.95	466,170	8.64	26,786	0.50	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 61

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by Degree of Change Perceived in Recruiting and Retaining Staff

Agencies

Degree of Difficulty	Agency's Perception of Level of Difficulty Now in Comparison to 1988									
	More Difficult		About the Same		Less Difficult		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Recruiting Staff and Filling Vacancies	497	27.98	1154	64.96	120	6.77	5	0.30	1777	100.00
Retaining Staff	259	14.57	1306	73.50	202	11.36	10	0.57	1777	100.00

Participants

Degree of Difficulty	Agency's Perception of Level of Difficulty Now in Comparison to 1988									
	More Difficult		About the Same		Less Difficult		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Recruiting Staff and Filling Vacancies	2,651,323	49.13	2,366,868	43.86	363,654	6.74	14,724	0.27	5,396,569	100.00
Retaining Staff	1,451,081	26.89	3,278,069	60.74	657,598	12.19	9,822	0.18	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 62

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Space Since 1988

	Agency's Perception of Change in Space Since 1988							
	Decreased		About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	686	38.59	485	27.31	606	34.10	1777	100.00
Participants	2,822,674	52.30	1,203,285	22.30	1,370,610	25.40	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 63

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Waiting Time and Time Spent Receiving Specific Services

Agencies

Type of Service	Agency's Perception of Change in Waiting and Receiving Times Since 1988											
	Decreased		About the Same		Increased		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Waiting Time for:												
Certifications	479	26.94	878	49.39	398	22.40	11	0.59	12	0.68	1777	100.00
Group Nutrition Education	269	15.15	808	45.46	103	5.78	597	33.61	0	0	1777	100.00
Individual Nutrition Education	375	21.11	1092	61.45	247	13.92	62	3.52	0	0	1777	100.00
Issuance	555	31.24	845	47.57	262	14.75	106	5.95	9	0.50	1777	100.00
Food Pick Up	99	5.59	176	9.93	20	1.11	1476	83.07	5	0.30	1777	100.00
Time Spent Receiving:												
Certifications	405	22.78	1034	58.18	333	18.73	2	0.13	3	0.18	1777	100.00
Group Nutrition Education	206	11.61	757	42.62	254	14.29	559	31.48	0	0	1777	100.00
Individual Nutrition Education	273	15.39	1063	59.82	424	23.86	17	0.93	0	0	1777	100.00
Issuance	585	32.91	891	50.13	203	11.43	95	5.34	3	0.19	1777	100.00
Food Pick Up	89	5.00	136	7.66	23	1.31	1514	85.21	15	0.82	1777	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 63

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Waiting Time and Time Spent Receiving Specific Services

Participants

Type of Service	Agency's Perception of Change in Waiting and Receiving Times Since 1988															
	Decreased			About the Same			Increased			Not Applicable			Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Waiting Time for:																
Certifications	1,287,264	23.85	2,425,618	44.95	1,636,580	30.33	41,723	0.77	5,383	0.10	5,396,569	100.00				
Group Nutrition Education	955,110	17.70	2,668,413	49.45	527,759	9.78	1,245,287	23.08	0	0	5,396,569	100.00				
Individual Nutrition Education	1,102,029	20.42	3,121,313	57.84	927,197	17.18	246,031	4.56	0	0	5,396,569	100.00				
Issuance	1,749,505	32.42	2,349,386	43.53	1,055,659	19.56	232,032	4.30	9,988	0.19	5,396,569	100.00				
Food Pick Up	482,195	8.94	644,641	11.95	129,856	2.41	4,127,898	76.49	11,979	0.22	5,396,569	100.00				
Time Spent Receiving:																
Certifications	1,327,732	24.60	3,015,835	55.88	986,089	18.27	32,367	0.60	34,547	0.64	5,396,569	100.00				
Group Nutrition Education	957,824	17.75	2,732,444	50.63	803,418	14.89	902,883	16.73	0	0	5,396,569	100.00				
Individual Nutrition Education	1,122,513	20.80	3,262,481	60.45	957,675	17.75	53,900	1.00	0	0	5,396,569	100.00				
Issuance	1,857,882	34.43	2,709,707	50.21	614,231	11.38	194,926	3.61	19,824	0.37	5,396,569	100.00				
Food Pick Up	401,557	7.44	665,322	12.33	157,283	2.91	4,125,687	76.45	46,721	0.87	5,396,569	100.00				

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 64

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Degree of Change in Staff Time Spent on Referrals

	Change in Amount of Staff Time Spent on Referrals												Total	
	Substantially Less		Somewhat Less		About the Same		Somewhat More		Substantially More		Don't Know			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Principal Clinics	193	3.28	293	4.99	1907	32.46	2156	36.71	1195	20.34	131	2.22	5874	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 65

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in the Quality of Nutrition Education Since 1988

	Agency's Perception of Change in Quality of Nutrition Education Since 1988											
	Substantially Lower		Somewhat Lower		About the Same		Somewhat Higher		Substantially Higher		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	50	2.84	172	9.68	413	23.23	767	43.17	375	21.08	1777	100.00
Participants	147,974	2.74	826,603	15.32	895,878	16.60	2,535,081	46.98	991,033	18.36	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 66

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Change in Caseload Since 1988

	Agency's Perception of Change in Caseload Since 1988							
	Decreased		About the Same		Increased		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	28	1.57	126	7.08	1623	91.34	1777	100.00
Participants	121,006	2.24	150,005	2.78	5,125,559	94.98	5,396,569	100.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Section 3

Standard Errors Tables

Table 1

Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by Percentage Growth

Agencies

Percentage Growth in Participants	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	50.18	2.82
15% to 33%	52.49	2.95
33% to 50%	48.27	2.72
50% to 100%	54.82	3.08
Greater than 100%	31.79	1.79
Not Applicable	21.83	1.23
Total	0.00	0.00

Participants

Percentage Growth in Participants	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	80172.51	1.49
15% to 33%	104297.3	1.93
33% to 50%	98918.57	1.83
50% to 100%	122063.9	2.26
Greater than 100%	72516.40	1.34
Not Applicable	17909.05	0.33
Total	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 2

Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by Size of WIC Local Agency

Agencies

Total Number of Sites Providing WIC Services	Caseload Size															
	0-99		100-999		1000-1999		2000-9999		10000-24999		25000-49999		50000 or More		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1 Site	51.76	9.10	53.06	8.55	21.86	4.39	11.95	2.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.88	0.00
2-3 Sites	0.00	0.00	44.89	5.81	29.18	4.97	21.28	3.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	55.90	0.00
4-5 Sites	0.00	0.00	25.99	7.74	18.20	6.39	19.05	6.92	1.62	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.26	0.00
6-10 Sites	0.00	0.00	15.64	5.08	19.83	5.84	23.06	6.33	7.07	2.41	0.03	0.04	0.00	0.00	36.68	0.00
11-25 Sites	0.00	0.00	9.06	4.96	10.22	5.36	15.79	6.37	6.56	4.25	2.39	1.47	0.03	0.07	22.08	0.00
Over 25 Sites	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.43	21.37	0.03	1.45	2.91	13.14	0.09	4.36	0.12	5.82	8.02	0.00

Participants

Total Number of Sites Providing WIC Services	Caseload Size															
	0-99		100-999		1000-1999		2000-9999		10000-24999		25000-49999		50000 or More		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1 Site	3954.61	1.14	29312.00	6.77	28742.67	7.12	28376.78	7.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	46870.82	0.00
2-3 Sites	0.00	0.00	26314.75	3.16	40064.67	4.58	71069.04	5.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	84529.16	0.00
4-5 Sites	0.00	0.00	16621.43	2.41	31648.72	4.66	80209.74	6.04	28369.76	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	89562.00	0.00
6-10 Sites	0.00	0.00	10835.77	0.86	27315.27	2.13	91664.50	5.53	92691.47	5.76	641.65	0.32	0.00	0.00	129486.9	0.00
11-25 Sites	0.00	0.00	8103.49	0.52	18533.44	1.17	84868.06	4.61	81099.64	4.53	69050.18	3.90	940.62	0.30	122855.6	0.00
Over 25 Sites	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10009.02	1.34	65.30	0.04	51049.38	5.74	2051.24	1.17	7937.81	4.53	52422.27	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 3

Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by
Caseload Change Since 1988 and Agency Sponsorship

Agencies

Sponsorship Type	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)								
	Decreased			Stayed About the Same			Increased		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	Total
Health Agencies	42.96	2.81	27.01	1.77	51.26	2.90	33.49	0.00	
Hospitals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.15	0.00	15.15	0.00	
CAA	3.13	2.49	0.00	0.00	24.95	2.49	25.17	0.00	
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.21	0.00	21.21	0.00	

Participants

Sponsorship Type	Caseload Change Since 1988 (FMS-191)								
	Decreased			Stayed About the Same			Increased		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	Total
Health Agencies	29219.72	0.68	34110.09	0.79	109504.5	1.01	101692.4	0.00	
Hospitals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	64232.12	0.00	64232.12	0.00	
CAA	2963.80	0.87	0.00	0.00	68368.59	0.87	68483.00	0.00	
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	73225.51	0.00	73225.51	0.00	

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 4 (Row Pcts)

Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Percentage Growth

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level					
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	40.11	9.03	44.61	9.26	15.55	4.21
15% to 33%	20.65	4.60	41.85	6.77	25.42	5.86
33% to 50%	36.01	8.67	25.96	7.26	24.38	6.93
50% to 100%	29.83	5.40	51.19	6.75	19.14	4.18
Greater than 100%	21.23	11.15	19.50	10.57	14.41	8.94
Not Applicable	15.77	26.24	10.93	22.66	10.50	21.28
					21.83	0.00

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level					
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	52930.09	6.69	62867.87	6.75	36552.58	5.39
15% to 33%	66963.87	4.67	72172.63	5.08	59849.03	4.80
33% to 50%	69396.10	5.80	59203.06	4.99	64516.52	5.42
50% to 100%	89870.14	4.28	93732.47	4.25	85290.61	4.38
Greater than 100%	68162.98	9.85	54727.15	8.89	46588.58	6.66
Not Applicable	5194.20	14.12	14780.66	23.39	8649.62	20.96
					17909.05	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 4 (Column Pcts)

Standard Errors of Agencies and of Participants by
Operating Capacity and Percentage Growth

Agencies

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level					
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	40.11	6.31	44.61	4.85	15.55	3.91
15% to 33%	20.65	4.07	41.85	4.68	25.42	6.56
33% to 50%	36.01	6.34	25.96	2.94	24.38	6.33
50% to 100%	29.83	5.14	51.19	4.93	19.14	4.48
Greater than 100%	21.23	3.77	19.50	2.18	14.41	3.97
Not Applicable	15.77	2.87	10.93	1.23	10.50	2.92
Total	56.68	0.00	61.41	0.00	37.76	0.00

Participants

Growth in Participants Served by Agency (1988-1992)	Current Operating Level					
	Below Capacity		At Capacity		Above Capacity	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	52930.09	3.13	62867.87	2.63	36552.58	2.29
15% to 33%	66963.87	3.94	72172.63	2.93	59849.03	3.82
33% to 50%	69396.10	4.00	59203.06	2.66	64516.52	3.84
50% to 100%	89870.14	4.84	93732.47	3.63	85290.61	4.31
Greater than 100%	68162.98	3.81	54727.15	2.33	46588.58	2.90
Not Applicable	5194.20	0.32	14780.66	0.67	8649.62	0.56
Total	56.68	0.00	61.41	0.00	37.76	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 5

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Caseload Fluctuations

Agencies

Caseload Fluctuation Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Caseload Increases	52.93	2.98	48.23	2.71	16.54	0.93	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Caseload Decreases	53.98	3.04	57.77	3.25	63.32	3.56	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reprioritizing or Targeting Caseload	58.97	3.32	52.90	2.98	56.90	3.20	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other	11.78	0.66	11.68	0.66	12.53	0.71	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Participants

Caseload Fluctuation Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Caseload Increases	55441.11	1.03	53425.49	0.99	13257.21	0.25	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Caseload Decreases	128510.66	2.36	105147.29	1.95	127523.08	2.36	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reprioritizing or Targeting Caseload	119364.01	2.21	79314.45	1.47	99362.17	1.84	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other	47786.62	0.89	6193.64	0.11	47826.55	0.89	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 12

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Recruiting
Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Recruiting Staff	Professional Staff		Paraprofessional Staff		Clerical/Support Staff	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No Vacancies	59.18	3.33	63.79	3.59	60.99	3.43
Not Difficult	55.17	3.10	54.72	3.08	63.89	3.60
Difficult	61.13	3.44	41.05	2.31	38.05	2.14
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00	30.69	1.73	0.00	0.00
Don't Know	5.05	0.28	0.00	0.00	12.68	0.71
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Affected Participants

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Recruiting Staff	Professional Staff			Paraprofessional Staff			Clerical/Support Staff		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
No Vacancies	87893.92	1.63	126110.80	2.34	96942.89	1.80			
Not Difficult	93827.45	1.74	126200.39	2.34	128192.80	2.38			
Difficult	113207.07	2.10	118578.27	2.20	100514.34	1.86			
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00	57783.22	1.07	0.00	0.00			
Don't Know	10454.23	0.19	0.00	0.00	11686.81	0.22			
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 7

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements

Agencies

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations									
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	41.86	2.36	29.58	1.66	27.70	1.56	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	59.32	3.34	56.83	3.20	36.98	2.08	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00
Homeless Service Requirements	57.44	3.23	65.83	3.70	38.96	2.19	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00
Vendor Management Initiatives	63.08	3.55	59.89	3.37	43.90	2.47	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00
Other	25.71	1.45	11.45	0.64	32.25	1.81	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00

Participants

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations									
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	69749.04	1.29	68931.46	1.28	8419.73	0.16	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	122815.66	2.28	120165.40	2.23	42963.17	0.80	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00
Homeless Service Requirements	140784.07	2.61	139915.77	2.59	63088.59	1.17	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00
Vendor Management Initiatives	149189.23	2.76	145240.02	2.69	81051.61	1.50	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00
Other	62544.08	1.16	33241.25	0.62	70797.59	1.31	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 8

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors

Agencies

Other Initiatives and Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Medicaid Expansion	55.42	3.12	54.46	3.06	18.97	1.07	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coordination/Integration of Services	64.12	3.61	53.02	2.98	47.50	2.67	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Initiatives	10.85	0.61	2.75	0.15	19.31	1.09	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shortages of Physicians	58.04	3.27	62.05	3.49	47.54	2.68	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shortages of Nutritionists	62.78	3.53	53.07	2.99	49.87	2.81	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Increases in Non-English Speaking Pop.	62.55	3.52	61.11	3.44	58.08	3.27	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	63.39	3.57	56.25	3.17	45.61	2.57	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Agency Reorganization	57.30	3.22	56.74	3.19	60.56	3.41	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Factors	13.21	0.74	9.51	0.53	22.64	1.27	15.77	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 8

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors

Participants

Other Initiatives and Factors	Perceived Impact on Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Don't Know		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Medicaid Expansion	111033.87	2.06	108795.37	2.02	33439.84	0.62	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coordination/Integration of Services	139366.93	2.58	123435.72	2.29	97067.01	1.80	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Initiatives	39129.44	0.73	37747.38	0.70	54649.44	1.01	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shortages of Physicians	125549.02	2.33	132802.55	2.46	118585.29	2.20	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shortages of Nutritionists	119400.17	2.21	106647.54	1.98	84179.46	1.56	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Increases in Non-English Speaking Pop.	118686.74	2.20	101099.86	1.87	77779.13	1.44	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	105223.38	1.95	81250.20	1.51	92486.40	1.71	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Agency Reorganization	134739.92	2.50	125698.50	2.33	134612.56	2.49	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other factors	59689.83	1.11	7619.42	0.14	60425.92	1.12	5194.20	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 9

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agency Having Selected Operating Characteristics

Agencies

Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agencies Having Selected Operating Characteristics	Providing Certification, Nutrition Educ.		Providing Health Care Services on Site		Providing Social Services on Site		Operating Part Time		Extended Hours		Established Since 1988		Eliminated or Consolidated Since 1988	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No Sites	7.43	0.42	40.41	2.27	56.16	3.16	54.07	3.04	59.04	3.32	61.42	3.46	40.36	2.27
Less than 33.3% of Sites	3.61	0.20	25.94	1.46	33.97	1.91	20.89	1.18	41.89	2.36	42.51	2.39	27.59	1.55
33.3% to 66.6% of Sites	25.58	1.44	40.76	2.29	38.86	2.19	50.54	2.84	30.82	1.73	36.39	2.05	17.06	0.96
66.7% to 99% of Sites	22.53	1.27	22.33	1.26	13.51	0.76	30.77	1.73	6.26	0.35	20.45	1.15	3.49	0.20
All Sites	34.01	1.91	58.30	3.28	56.92	3.20	71.11	4.00	41.21	2.32	58.06	3.27	22.77	1.28
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Participants

Percentage of Clinics/Sites Within Agencies Having Selected Operating Characteristics	Providing Certification, Nutrition Educ.		Providing Health Care Services on Site		Providing Social Services on Site		Operating Part Time		Extended Hours		Established Since 1988		Eliminated or Consolidated Since 1988	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No Sites	10009.02	0.19	71601.14	1.33	104710.71	1.94	85736.91	1.59	128332.03	2.38	105219.60	1.95	136736.11	2.53
Less than 33.3% of Sites	35172.14	0.65	99712.41	1.85	126797.25	2.35	113599.94	2.11	147221.10	2.73	127007.17	2.35	124919.78	2.31
33.3% to 66.6% of Sites	59586.76	1.10	98995.20	1.83	100386.98	1.86	110865.49	2.05	88934.92	1.65	118889.65	2.20	77800.18	1.44
66.7% to 99% of Sites	79807.16	1.48	110720.33	2.05	80289.07	1.49	119461.69	2.21	42919.99	0.80	99273.12	1.84	29717.83	0.55
All Sites	97500.35	1.81	119664.06	2.22	85148.14	1.58	89192.33	1.65	59251.09	1.10	103488.38	1.92	31276.89	0.58
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 10

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical Support Staff
Agencies

Number and Appropriateness of Staff	Suitability of Staff											
	More than Sufficient		Sufficient		Less than Sufficient		Not Applicable		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Sufficiency of Number of Staff												
Professional	58.28	3.28	58.50	3.29	52.15	2.93	19.63	1.10	3.44	0.19	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessional	31.23	1.76	52.07	2.93	53.15	2.99	58.69	3.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clerical/Support	36.97	2.08	63.25	3.56	53.75	3.02	34.22	1.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Appropriateness of Skills/Experience in Providing Nutrition Education												
Professional	64.87	3.65	62.39	3.51	33.74	1.90	22.39	1.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessional	36.75	2.07	50.02	2.81	28.97	1.63	52.42	2.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clerical/Support	47.48	2.67	58.65	3.30	31.24	1.76	58.91	3.31	5.05	0.28	0.00	0.00
Appropriateness of Skills/Experience in Providing Non-Nutrition Services												
Professional	55.43	3.12	55.16	3.10	28.32	1.59	21.69	1.22	3.44	0.19	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessional	37.50	2.11	55.76	3.14	26.27	1.48	55.54	3.13	3.44	0.19	0.00	0.00
Clerical/Support	46.68	2.63	63.42	3.57	37.96	2.14	47.53	2.67	3.44	0.19	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical Support Staff

Participants

Number and Appropriateness of Staff	Suitability of Staff											
	More than Sufficient			Sufficient			Less than Sufficient			Not Applicable		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
Sufficiency of Number of Staff												
Professional	86421.20	1.60	119783.32	2.22	125524.19	2.33	21775.16	0.40	17712.08	0.33	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessional	57843.66	1.07	113523.84	2.10	130907.81	2.43	123220.40	2.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clerical/Support	83884.27	1.55	124016.93	2.30	128647.73	2.38	22381.73	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Appropriateness of Skills/Experience in Providing Nutrition Education												
Professional	122982.41	2.28	132328.19	2.45	91121.07	1.69	30990.34	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessional	81129.86	1.50	128510.66	2.38	103858.59	1.92	124293.24	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clerical/Support	89293.79	1.65	144391.68	2.68	109261.09	2.02	140710.68	2.61	10454.23	0.19	0.00	0.00
Appropriateness of Skills/Experience in Providing Non-Nutrition Services												
Professional	124512.88	2.31	142360.95	2.64	95572.70	1.77	45386.76	0.84	17712.08	0.33	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessional	81303.63	1.51	133777.71	2.48	76366.31	1.42	126972.09	2.35	17712.08	0.33	0.00	0.00
Clerical/Support	90510.18	1.68	139900.65	2.59	118326.79	2.19	79235.12	1.47	17712.08	0.33	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 11

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees for
Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees	Professional		Paraprofessional		Clerical/Support	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less than 0.10	8.51	0.48	6.45	0.36	9.15	0.52
0.10 to 0.25	24.91	1.40	15.13	0.85	21.60	1.22
0.25 to 0.50	25.70	1.45	19.55	1.10	20.42	1.15
More than 0.50	43.05	2.42	55.94	3.15	48.55	2.73
Not Applicable	24.29	1.37	54.94	3.09	38.54	2.17
Don't Know	10.02	0.56	4.72	0.27	10.02	0.56
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Affected Participants

Ratio of Vacant Positions to Current Full-Time Employees	Professional		Paraprofessional		Clerical/Support	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Less than 0.10	83532.95	1.55	63898.61	1.18	107662.63	2.00
0.10 to 0.25	113637.71	2.11	80335.48	1.49	98233.75	1.82
0.25 to 0.50	81139.03	1.50	58155.59	1.08	61006.05	1.13
More than 0.50	130912.13	2.43	129811.23	2.41	123616.51	2.29
Not Applicable	41968.58	0.78	116102.33	2.15	51862.11	0.96
Don't Know	19671.57	0.36	13706.21	0.25	19671.57	0.36
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 12

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Recruiting
Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Recruiting Staff	Professional Staff		Paraprofessional Staff		Clerical/Support Staff	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No Vacancies	59.18	3.33	63.79	3.59	60.99	3.43
Not Difficult	55.17	3.10	54.72	3.08	63.89	3.60
Difficult	61.13	3.44	41.05	2.31	38.05	2.14
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00	30.69	1.73	0.00	0.00
Don't Know	5.05	0.28	0.00	0.00	12.68	0.71
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Affected Participants

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Recruiting Staff	Professional Staff			Paraprofessional Staff			Clerical/Support Staff		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
No Vacancies	87893.92	1.63	126110.80	2.34	96942.89	1.80			
Not Difficult	93827.45	1.74	126200.39	2.34	128192.80	2.38			
Difficult	113207.07	2.10	118578.27	2.20	100514.34	1.86			
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00	57783.22	1.07	0.00	0.00			
Don't Know	10454.23	0.19	0.00	0.00	11686.81	0.22			
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 13

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agency in Retaining
Professional, Paraprofessional, and Clerical/Support Staff

Agencies

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Retaining Staff	Professional Staff		Paraprofessional Staff		Clerical/Support Staff	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Not Difficult	50.71	2.85	47.34	2.66	44.10	2.48
Difficult	52.92	2.98	59.88	3.37	47.86	2.69
Not Applicable	16.24	0.91	51.51	2.90	19.28	1.08
Don't Know	5.05	0.28	0.00	0.00	5.05	0.28
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Affected Participants

Degree of Difficulty Experienced by Agencies in Retaining Staff	Professional Staff		Paraprofessional Staff		Clerical/Support Staff	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Not Difficult	140832.64	2.61	91639.68	1.70	107046.88	1.98
Difficult	141523.40	2.62	130704.90	2.42	107987.50	2.00
Not Applicable	17376.95	0.32	102640.58	1.90	8631.81	0.16
Don't Know	10454.23	0.19	0.00	0.00	10454.23	0.19
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 14

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Languages Available at Agency

Agencies

Languages	Interpreters Available		Nutrition Education Provided	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Spanish	58.06	3.27	62.33	3.51
Vietnamese	19.75	1.11	26.12	1.47
Cambodian/Khmer	12.22	0.69	25.86	1.46
Laotian	21.38	1.20	24.95	1.40
Thai	7.87	0.44	16.38	0.92
Hmong	40.21	2.26	22.27	1.25
Chinese	9.93	0.56	17.85	1.00
Haitian/Creole	12.71	0.72	14.08	0.79
French	19.82	1.12	17.09	0.96
Portugese	13.85	0.78	16.43	0.92
Native American Language	26.83	1.51	22.65	1.27
Sign Language	27.18	1.53	21.73	1.22
Other	37.43	2.11	21.45	1.21

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 14

Number and Percentage of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Languages Available at Agency

Affected Participants

Languages	Interpreters Available		Nutrition Education Provided	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Spanish	103441.97	1.92	99384.29	1.84
Vietnamese	70308.66	1.30	86030.48	1.59
Cambodian/Khmer	54555.53	1.01	97469.59	1.81
Laotian	71128.94	1.32	87821.07	1.63
Thai	61045.99	1.13	62868.95	1.16
Hmong	36682.10	0.68	73805.10	1.37
Chinese	91202.56	1.69	70861.81	1.31
Haitian/Creole	72448.94	1.34	73371.21	1.36
French	90098.42	1.67	67423.65	1.25
Portugese	66190.54	1.23	50610.10	0.94
Native American Language	63695.70	1.18	46877.84	0.87
Sign Language	109179.61	2.02	94533.86	1.75
Other	95034.66	1.76	85803.29	1.59

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 15

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Perceived Adequacy of Current Space

	Perceived Adequacy of Current Space					
	Adequate			Inadequate		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Agencies	58.59	3.30	58.59	3.30	0.00	0.00
Affected Participants	103018.34	1.91	103018.34	1.91	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 16

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service

Agencies

Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service	Certification		Group Nutrition Education		Individual Nutrition Education		Food Instrument Issuance		Food Pick Up	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0 to 5 minutes	54.44	3.06	55.54	3.13	59.65	3.36	55.78	3.14	36.79	2.07
5 to 10 minutes	60.92	3.43	40.93	2.30	59.63	3.36	57.64	3.24	15.54	0.87
10 to 15 minutes	54.00	3.04	23.70	1.33	48.39	2.72	40.75	2.29	15.17	0.85
15 to 30 minutes	30.75	1.73	22.71	1.28	32.97	1.86	19.44	1.09	7.46	0.42
More than 30 minutes	32.02	1.80	14.31	0.81	15.12	0.85	8.75	0.49	6.94	0.39
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00	53.98	3.04	13.22	0.74	41.11	2.31	43.46	2.45
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Participants

Typical Number of Minutes Waiting for Service	Certification		Group Nutrition Education		Individual Nutrition Education		Food Instrument Issuance		Food Pick Up	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
0 to 5 minutes	82326.82	1.53	116452.02	2.16	105410.10	1.95	107805.10	2.00	67336.77	1.25
5 to 10 minutes	106382.56	1.97	92772.96	1.72	126063.31	2.34	120038.04	2.22	60807.46	1.13
10 to 15 minutes	106585.48	1.98	114960.41	2.13	119157.32	2.21	116603.67	2.16	57933.25	1.07
15 to 30 minutes	108518.53	2.01	86196.70	1.60	112552.46	2.09	116832.48	2.16	60456.14	1.12
More than 30 minutes	115122.85	2.13	49345.69	0.91	66098.26	1.22	65475.49	1.21	41208.74	0.76
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00	85294.39	1.58	61215.44	1.13	54382.31	1.01	115114.75	2.13
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 17

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Type of Service and Estimated Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service

Agencies

Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service	Certification			Group Nutrition Educ. (not high risk)			Group Nutrition Educ. (high risk)			Individual Nutrition Educ. (not high risk)			Individual Nutrition Educ. (high risk)			Food Instrument Issuance			Food Pick Up		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
0 to 5 minutes	9.23	0.52		5.64	0.32		0.00	0.00		40.17	2.26		30.87	1.74		53.73	3.02		26.13	1.47	
5 to 10 minutes	34.17	1.92		26.42	1.49		22.96	1.29		59.70	3.36		45.99	2.59		62.58	3.52		24.26	1.37	
10 to 15 minutes	34.02	1.91		38.00	2.14		19.11	1.08		58.40	3.29		58.87	3.31		41.87	2.36		10.17	0.57	
15 to 30 minutes	58.69	3.30		58.96	3.32		43.53	2.45		37.93	2.13		50.45	2.84		15.55	0.88		5.29	0.30	
More than 30 minutes	61.88	3.48		44.99	2.53		39.32	2.21		12.94	0.73		30.68	1.73		15.64	0.88		0.03	0.00	
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00		55.45	3.12		57.55	3.24		26.50	1.49		14.86	0.84		41.49	2.34		37.01	2.08	
Don't Know	2.60	0.15		2.60	0.15		2.60	0.15		2.60	0.15		2.60	0.15		2.60	0.15		2.60	0.15	
Total	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	

Participants

Typical Number of Minutes Receiving Service	Certification			Group Nutrition Educ. (not high risk)			Group Nutrition Educ. (high risk)			Individual Nutrition Educ. (not high risk)			Individual Nutrition Educ. (high risk)			Food Instrument Issuance			Food Pick Up		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
0 to 5 minutes	71291.91	1.32		37407.94	0.69		0.00	0.00		100929.87	1.87		67432.83	1.25		146975.02	2.72		90501.54	1.68	
5 to 10 minutes	74236.82	1.38		73281.09	1.36		56863.11	1.05		129696.28	2.40		121129.23	2.24		125852.85	2.33		60257.01	1.12	
10 to 15 minutes	112618.84	2.09		114803.91	2.13		68089.05	1.26		120373.71	2.23		114395.39	2.12		92550.08	1.71		39165.06	0.73	
15 to 30 minutes	142353.94	2.64		139514.26	2.59		103542.35	1.92		92822.61	1.72		123334.27	2.29		79332.80	1.47		35751.73	0.66	
More than 30 minutes	118443.36	2.19		61009.83	1.13		71056.08	1.32		51448.73	0.95		79106.15	1.47		26710.32	0.49		635.72	0.01	
Not Applicable	0.00	0.00		83675.42	1.55		127552.23	2.36		58449.70	1.08		26616.42	0.49		50657.59	0.94		114256.16	2.12	
Don't Know	31818.17	0.59		31818.17	0.59		31818.17	0.59		31818.17	0.59		31818.17	0.59		31818.17	0.59		31818.17	0.59	
Total	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 18

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Method of Obtaining Hematological Measurements

Methods	Number of Principal Clinic Sites									
	Typically Used		Not Used		Don't Know		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
On-Site by WIC Staff	198.30	2.41	134.36	2.32	83.49	1.42	156.37	0.00		
On-Site by Non-WIC Staff	150.65	2.60	193.23	2.74	138.65	2.34	156.37	0.00		
Results Brought in By Applicant	184.67	3.17	194.88	2.96	143.76	2.41	156.37	0.00		
Results Brought in By Someone Other than Client	99.24	1.72	213.84	2.98	157.86	2.65	156.37	0.00		
Other	52.19	0.89	44.94	0.76	167.14	1.17	156.37	0.00		
Coordinated with Lead Screening	121.46	2.15	224.76	2.97	119.05	2.06	156.37	0.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 19

**Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Specified Health Services Available on Site**

Health Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites									
	Available on Site			Not Available on Site			Don't Know			Total
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		
Dental Care	95.17	1.70		198.19	2.25		82.97	1.40		156.37
Obstetrical/Gynecological Care	132.83	2.40		192.44	2.49		70.10	1.17		156.37
Breastfeeding Support Program	187.70	2.48		136.60	2.28		80.06	1.35		156.37
Pediatric Care	139.02	2.58		200.31	2.69		65.75	1.11		156.37
Family Planning Services	156.82	2.60		185.18	2.74		73.54	1.23		156.37
Immunizations	167.02	2.31		139.38	2.19		56.94	0.97		156.37
EPSDT	138.35	2.25		178.30	2.51		103.16	1.81		156.37
Other Health Screening	161.10	2.66		177.63	2.62		93.07	1.56		156.37
Medicaid Screening	132.58	2.45		196.74	2.61		89.32	1.49		156.37

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 20

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Specified Non-Health Referral Services Available on Site

Non-Health Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites											
	Available on Site				Not Available on Site				Don't Know			
	No.	Pct.	SUM	No.	Pct.	SUM	No.	Pct.	SUM	No.	Pct.	SUM
AFDC	111.77	1.83	173.36	2.20	76.09	1.29	156.37	0.00				
Food Assistance Programs	131.54	2.14	180.28	2.47	73.15	1.24	156.37	0.00				
Social Services Programs	140.10	2.30	184.60	2.53	79.44	1.35	156.37	0.00				
Head Start	119.46	1.96	172.42	2.22	61.94	1.05	156.37	0.00				
Child Care	109.18	1.83	178.07	2.13	57.50	0.97	156.37	0.00				
Transportation	133.06	2.25	198.95	2.63	80.08	1.35	156.37	0.00				
Substance Abuse Counseling	153.19	2.51	196.16	2.90	88.52	1.48	156.37	0.00				
Housing	105.75	1.79	192.31	2.31	82.68	1.40	156.37	0.00				
Adult Education/Job Training	92.74	1.59	188.57	2.19	96.23	1.62	156.37	0.00				

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 21

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics by
Opportunity to Apply for Selected Non-Health Services on Site

Non-Health Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites									
	Typically Offered		Not Offered		Don't Know		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
AFDC	152.94	2.53	197.82	2.83	93.14	1.57	156.37	0.00		
Food Assistance Programs	166.99	2.67	189.96	2.91	97.80	1.65	156.37	0.00		
Social Services Programs	161.79	2.56	182.99	2.80	100.92	1.70	156.37	0.00		
Head Start	136.21	2.28	192.18	2.83	109.25	1.80	156.37	0.00		
Child Care	121.33	2.04	184.46	2.38	96.82	1.63	156.37	0.00		
Transportation	135.95	2.28	197.37	2.71	95.33	1.60	156.37	0.00		
Substance Abuse Counseling	153.78	2.57	197.42	2.88	98.62	1.64	156.37	0.00		
Housing	123.84	2.07	193.35	2.59	100.19	1.69	156.37	0.00		
Adult Education/Job Training	93.14	1.60	181.90	2.44	130.26	2.15	156.37	0.00		
Child Support	100.34	1.76	201.49	2.82	161.71	2.63	156.37	0.00		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 22

Number and Percentage of Principal Clinics in
Which Obtaining Health Care and Non-Health Care Services is a Problem

Type of Service	Number of Principal Clinic Sites							
	Typically a Problem		Not a Problem		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Health Care Service	153.84	2.53	188.73	2.80	109.03	1.82	156.37	0.00
Non-Health Care Service	178.17	2.89	206.11	3.21	129.70	2.19	156.37	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 23

Standard Errors of Agencies by Reported Problems in Referring Clients to Other Agencies

Agencies

Referral Barriers	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Svcs Not Available/Available on Limited Basis	54.86	3.09	54.86	3.09	0.00	0.00
Waiting List for Services	44.61	2.51	44.61	2.51	0.00	0.00
WIC Participants Not Eligible	48.27	2.72	48.27	2.72	0.00	0.00
Services Not Offered During Convenient Times	51.80	2.91	51.80	2.91	0.00	0.00
Lack of/Limited Transportation to Svcs	60.68	3.41	60.68	3.41	0.00	0.00
Other	31.93	1.80	31.93	1.80	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies

Table 24

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Topics Covered and Methods Used

Agencies

Topics Covered	Methods Used											
	Not Offered			Verbal Presentation			Printed Materials			Audio Visual		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Management of Individual Nutrition Risk	9.81	0.55	17.81	1.00	34.78	1.96	52.91	2.98	4.91	0.28		
Importance of Nutrition to Health Status	9.78	0.55	22.63	1.27	45.91	2.58	61.23	3.45	0.00	0.00		
Description of Basic Good Diet	0.03	0.00	17.02	0.96	25.23	1.42	66.11	3.72	5.80	0.33		
Major Nutrients Provided by WIC Package	12.19	0.69	20.99	1.18	41.09	2.31	53.84	3.03	6.93	0.39		
Other Sources of Particular Nutrients	3.89	0.22	20.22	1.14	18.19	1.02	60.80	3.42	8.50	0.48		
Importance of Diet for Fetal Growth	2.13	0.12	16.84	0.95	27.10	1.52	61.30	3.45	0.00	0.00		
Breastfeeding	0.03	0.00	9.67	0.54	10.31	0.58	48.33	2.72	0.00	0.00		
Handling of Infant Formula	17.13	0.96	28.27	1.59	56.19	3.16	47.05	2.65	9.62	0.54		
Use of Whole Cows' Milk	30.86	1.74	35.16	1.98	57.23	3.22	36.28	2.04	0.00	0.00		
Solid and Table Foods	8.32	0.47	20.16	1.13	21.62	1.22	62.33	3.51	0.00	0.00		
Importance of Nutrition for Growth	8.38	0.47	16.40	0.92	32.14	1.81	57.99	3.26	5.80	0.33		
Nutritious Snacks	6.45	0.36	15.61	0.88	17.20	0.97	58.25	3.28	2.20	0.12		
Dental Health	21.32	1.20	27.32	1.54	32.05	1.80	56.76	3.19	0.00	0.00		
Risks of Substance Abuse	9.24	0.52	22.38	1.26	25.54	1.44	58.98	3.32	0.00	0.00		
Food Preparation/Shopping/Safety	21.44	1.21	21.20	1.19	21.44	1.21	13.54	0.76	0.00	0.00		
Other	31.84	1.79	29.84	1.68	28.53	1.61	25.59	1.44	3.50	0.20		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 24

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Topics Covered and Methods Used

Affected Participants

Topics Covered	Methods Used											
	Not Offered			Verbal Presentation			Printed Materials			Audio Visual		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Management of Individual Nutrition Risk	14704.03	0.27	25636.40	0.48	79585.90	1.47	135559.11	2.51	15951.18	0.30		
Importance of Nutrition to Health Status	16621.43	0.31	30884.56	0.57	98153.88	1.82	127804.25	2.37	0.00	0.00		
Description of Basic Good Diet	2233.64	0.04	41813.70	0.77	48556.71	0.90	110277.81	2.04	11192.48	0.21		
Major Nutrients Provided by WIC Package	37051.76	0.69	71185.60	1.32	101547.24	1.88	131008.19	2.43	20624.07	0.38		
Other Sources of Particular Nutrients	17181.06	0.32	66837.59	1.24	52744.45	0.98	138743.09	2.57	26039.52	0.48		
Importance of Diet for Fetal Growth	25520.37	0.47	49353.78	0.91	78900.00	1.46	122016.96	2.26	0.00	0.00		
Breastfeeding	2233.64	0.04	24230.59	0.45	34594.71	0.64	93090.82	1.72	0.00	0.00		
Handling of Infant Formula	34400.97	0.64	53488.63	0.99	82204.86	1.52	126771.88	2.35	6974.53	0.13		
Use of Whole Cows's Milk	91658.03	1.70	98867.30	1.83	129908.37	2.41	105318.36	1.95	0.00	0.00		
Solid and Table Foods	18344.02	0.34	55932.74	1.04	51746.08	0.96	123244.68	2.28	0.00	0.00		
Importance of Nutrition for Growth	38976.72	0.72	44868.15	0.83	64488.46	1.19	128591.60	2.38	11192.48	0.21		
Nutritious Snacks	10045.71	0.19	39511.52	0.73	49156.27	0.91	132643.35	2.46	21213.37	0.39		
Dental Health	57305.09	1.06	85012.15	1.58	78338.21	1.45	116388.88	2.16	0.00	0.00		
Risks of Substance Abuse	41665.83	0.77	54263.58	1.01	65809.00	1.22	140562.27	2.60	0.00	0.00		
Food Preparation/Shopping/Safety	84199.97	1.56	82098.00	1.52	84199.97	1.56	71286.52	1.32	0.00	0.00		
Other	91097.86	1.69	89392.55	1.66	88791.91	1.65	72561.19	1.34	16495.69	0.31		

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 25

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Frequency of Nutrition Education Contacts

Agencies

Frequency	High Risk Participant		Non-High Risk Participant	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Once Per Certification Period	38.77	2.18	53.45	3.01
Twice Per Certification Period	62.66	3.53	63.30	3.56
Monthly	55.18	3.11	35.79	2.01
Bi-Monthly	63.91	3.60	52.28	2.94
Other	29.84	1.68	21.26	1.20
Don't Know	0.00	0.00	7.99	0.45

Affected Participants

Frequency	High Risk Participant		Non-High Risk Participant	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Once Per Certification Period	70981.07	1.32	107757.07	2.00
Twice Per Certification Period	120382.34	2.23	129199.80	2.39
Monthly	126859.85	2.35	71154.84	1.32
Bi-Monthly	136507.29	2.53	115802.82	2.15
Other	95838.21	1.78	39247.09	0.73
Don't Know	0.00	0.00	37038.81	0.69

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 26

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Group Size for Providing Nutrition Education

Agencies

Group Size	No.	Pct.
Individual	16.24	0.91
Small Group (2-9)	63.55	3.58
Medium Group (10-19)	59.99	3.38
Large Group (20-29)	42.78	2.41
Very Large Group (30+)	29.18	1.64

Affected Participants

Group Size	No.	Pct.
Individual	38726.86	0.72
Small Group (2-9)	122695.85	2.27
Medium Group (10-19)	124530.69	2.31
Large Group (20-29)	134177.59	2.49
Very Large Group (30+)	113691.14	2.11

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 27

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Agencies

Materials Used in Individual Instruction	Use in Individual Nutrition Education Se					
	Used		Not Used		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Verbal Discussion/Counseling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pamphlets	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Food Models	43.40	2.44	43.40	2.44	0.00	0.00
Food Demonstrations	54.12	3.05	54.12	3.05	0.00	0.00
Tests	54.16	3.05	54.16	3.05	0.00	0.00
Audio Tapes	51.29	2.89	51.29	2.89	0.00	0.00
Slides	42.78	2.41	42.78	2.41	0.00	0.00
Films/Videos	60.39	3.40	60.39	3.40	0.00	0.00
Flip Charts	53.57	3.01	53.57	3.01	0.00	0.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	20.83	1.17	20.83	1.17	0.00	0.00
Other	14.85	0.84	14.85	0.84	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 27

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Affected Participants

Materials Used in Individual Instruction	Use in Individual Nutrition Education Se					
	Used	Not Used	Total	Used	Not Used	Total
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Verbal Discussion/Counseling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pamphlets	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Food Models	71453.81	1.32	71453.81	1.32	0.00	0.00
Food Demonstrations	118620.36	2.20	118620.36	2.20	0.00	0.00
Tests	119151.39	2.21	119151.39	2.21	0.00	0.00
Audio Tapes	101107.96	1.87	101107.96	1.87	0.00	0.00
Slides	95627.20	1.77	95627.20	1.77	0.00	0.00
Films/Videos	129617.49	2.40	129617.49	2.40	0.00	0.00
Flip Charts	127679.04	2.37	127679.04	2.37	0.00	0.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	45514.66	0.84	45514.66	0.84	0.00	0.00
Other	39265.44	0.73	39265.44	0.73	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 28

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Agencies

Materials Used in Group Instruction	Use in Group Nutrition Education Session					
	Used		Not Used		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lectures/Oral Discussions	55.45	3.12	55.45	3.12	0.00	0.00
Pamphlets	52.94	2.98	52.94	2.98	0.00	0.00
Food Models	60.38	3.40	60.38	3.40	0.00	0.00
Food Demonstrations	59.84	3.37	59.84	3.37	0.00	0.00
Tests	56.39	3.17	56.39	3.17	0.00	0.00
Audio Tapes	49.29	2.77	49.29	2.77	0.00	0.00
Slides	57.26	3.22	57.26	3.22	0.00	0.00
Films/Videos	53.81	3.03	53.81	3.03	0.00	0.00
Flip Charts	62.67	3.53	62.67	3.53	0.00	0.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	19.62	1.10	19.62	1.10	0.00	0.00
Other	23.43	1.32	23.43	1.32	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 28

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Use of Nutrition Education Materials and Methods

Affected Participants

Materials Used in Group Instruction	Use in Group Nutrition Education Session					
	Used			Not Used		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lectures/Oral Discussions	60357.93	1.12	60357.93	1.12	0.00	0.00
Pamphlets	55315.37	1.03	55315.37	1.03	0.00	0.00
Food Models	110863.34	2.05	110863.34	2.05	0.00	0.00
Food Demonstrations	129773.99	2.40	129773.99	2.40	0.00	0.00
Tests	128792.36	2.39	128792.36	2.39	0.00	0.00
Audio Tapes	127284.56	2.36	127284.56	2.36	0.00	0.00
Slides	130172.26	2.41	130172.26	2.41	0.00	0.00
Films/Videos	76966.41	1.43	76966.41	1.43	0.00	0.00
Flip Charts	122405.52	2.27	122405.52	2.27	0.00	0.00
Computer Assisted Instruction	28867.33	0.53	28867.33	0.53	0.00	0.00
Other	63492.79	1.18	63492.79	1.18	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 29

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Factors that May Act as Barriers to Providing High Quality Nutrition Education

Agencies

Barriers	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Space	64.84	3.65	64.84	3.65	0.00	0.00
Too Few Staff	53.67	3.02	53.67	3.02	0.00	0.00
Too Little Staff Time per Participant	60.32	3.39	60.32	3.39	0.00	0.00
Participant Interest	60.33	3.39	60.33	3.39	0.00	0.00
Transportation	58.44	3.29	58.44	3.29	0.00	0.00
Child Care	63.47	3.57	63.47	3.57	0.00	0.00
Participant Time	56.15	3.16	56.15	3.16	0.00	0.00
Cultural Issues/Language Difficulties	49.78	2.80	49.78	2.80	0.00	0.00
Difficulty Recruiting Qualified Staff	45.80	2.58	45.80	2.58	0.00	0.00
Other	34.03	1.91	34.03	1.91	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 29

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Factors that May Act as Barriers to Providing High Quality Nutrition Education

Participants

Barriers	Not a Problem		Problem		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Space	118299.27	2.19	118299.27	2.19	0.00	0.00
Too Few Staff	129101.58	2.39	129101.58	2.39	0.00	0.00
Too Little Staff Time per Participant	129687.65	2.40	129687.65	2.40	0.00	0.00
Participant Interest	134912.07	2.50	134912.07	2.50	0.00	0.00
Transportation	128921.34	2.39	128921.34	2.39	0.00	0.00
Child Care	133477.66	2.47	133477.66	2.47	0.00	0.00
Participant Time	143064.12	2.65	143064.12	2.65	0.00	0.00
Cultural Issues/Language Difficulties	138109.53	2.56	138109.53	2.56	0.00	0.00
Difficulty Recruiting Qualified Staff	114133.12	2.11	114133.12	2.11	0.00	0.00
Other	69589.84	1.29	69589.84	1.29	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 30

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Certification Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Certification Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Stopped Doing walk-in certifications	53.81	3.03	53.81	3.03	0.00	0.00
Started Doing walk-in certifications	51.88	2.92	51.88	2.92	0.00	0.00
Scheduled less time per certification	60.12	3.38	60.12	3.38	0.00	0.00
Scheduled more time per certification	39.18	2.20	39.18	2.20	0.00	0.00
Replaced interview with self-admin form	40.16	2.26	40.16	2.26	0.00	0.00
Conducted group certifications	40.75	2.29	40.75	2.29	0.00	0.00
Dropped group certifications	33.80	1.90	33.80	1.90	0.00	0.00
Reduced priorities served	58.47	3.29	58.47	3.29	0.00	0.00
Limited caseload to certain priorities	55.92	3.15	55.92	3.15	0.00	0.00
Added priorities served	53.58	3.01	53.58	3.01	0.00	0.00
Other	14.91	0.84	14.91	0.84	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 30

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Certification Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Certification Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Stopped Doing walk-in certifications	116640.90	2.16	116640.90	2.16	0.00	0.00
Started Doing walk-in certifications	119325.16	2.21	119325.16	2.21	0.00	0.00
Scheduled less time per certification	115809.83	2.15	115809.83	2.15	0.00	0.00
Scheduled more time per certification	96384.34	1.79	96384.34	1.79	0.00	0.00
Replaced interview with self-admin form	113147.70	2.10	113147.70	2.10	0.00	0.00
Conducted group certifications	106311.87	1.97	106311.87	1.97	0.00	0.00
Dropped group certifications	64655.75	1.20	64655.75	1.20	0.00	0.00
Reduced priorities served	130082.68	2.41	130082.68	2.41	0.00	0.00
Limited caseload to certain priorities	112293.97	2.08	112293.97	2.08	0.00	0.00
Added priorities served	132328.19	2.45	132328.19	2.45	0.00	0.00
Other	57997.47	1.07	57997.47	1.07	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 31

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Nutrition Education Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Nutrition Education Operations	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	Total	No.	Pct.	Total
Increased group nutrition education	60.92	3.43	60.92	3.43	0.00	0.00
Canceled/postponed group nutrition educ	48.01	2.70	48.01	2.70	0.00	0.00
Canceled individual sessions	26.90	1.51	26.90	1.51	0.00	0.00
More group nutrition, fewer indiv sess	47.17	2.65	47.17	2.65	0.00	0.00
More indiv nutrition, fewer group sess	53.20	2.99	53.20	2.99	0.00	0.00
Placed more emphasis on breastfeeding	24.40	1.37	24.40	1.37	0.00	0.00
More staff time per partic, nutrit educ	56.97	3.21	56.97	3.21	0.00	0.00
Less staff time per partic, nutrit educ	55.64	3.13	55.64	3.13	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessionals deliver nutrit educ	56.09	3.16	56.09	3.16	0.00	0.00
More handouts and pamphlets	62.94	3.54	62.94	3.54	0.00	0.00
Increased class sizes	61.91	3.48	61.91	3.48	0.00	0.00
Decreased class sizes	30.52	1.72	30.52	1.72	0.00	0.00
Other	14.51	0.82	14.51	0.82	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 31

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Nutrition Education Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Nutrition Education Operations	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			Total		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Increased group nutrition education	117967.38	2.19	117967.38	2.19	0.00	0.00
Canceled/postponed group nutrition educ	129380.58	2.40	129380.58	2.40	0.00	0.00
Canceled individual sessions	78255.65	1.45	78255.65	1.45	0.00	0.00
More group nutrition, fewer indiv sess	128053.57	2.37	128053.57	2.37	0.00	0.00
More indiv nutrition, fewer group sess	115742.37	2.14	115742.37	2.14	0.00	0.00
Placed more emphasis on breastfeeding	44603.18	0.83	44603.18	0.83	0.00	0.00
More staff time per partic, nutrit educ	112419.17	2.08	112419.17	2.08	0.00	0.00
Less staff time per partic, nutrit educ	133662.22	2.48	133662.22	2.48	0.00	0.00
Paraprofessionals deliver nutrit educ	126911.11	2.35	126911.11	2.35	0.00	0.00
More handouts and pamphlets	133549.97	2.47	133549.97	2.47	0.00	0.00
Increased class sizes	136122.52	2.52	136122.52	2.52	0.00	0.00
Decreased class sizes	88023.44	1.63	88023.44	1.63	0.00	0.00
Other	93470.19	1.73	93470.19	1.73	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 32

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Food Instrument Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in food Instrument Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Issued multiple food instruments	67.22	3.78	67.22	3.78	0.00	0.00
Issued single food instruments	45.92	2.58	45.92	2.58	0.00	0.00
Issued standard packages more often	57.59	3.24	57.59	3.24	0.00	0.00
Prepared instruments before determ elig	27.90	1.57	27.90	1.57	0.00	0.00
Implemented classes on using instruments	55.64	3.13	55.64	3.13	0.00	0.00
Wrote instrument at local agency level	61.38	3.45	61.38	3.45	0.00	0.00
Computer-generated food instruments	54.43	3.06	54.43	3.06	0.00	0.00
Other	10.83	0.61	10.83	0.61	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 32

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Food Instrument Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Food Instrument Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	Total	No.	Pct.	Total
Issued multiple food instruments	123484.29	2.29	123484.29	2.29	0.00	0.00
Issued single food instruments	95017.39	1.76	95017.39	1.76	0.00	0.00
Issued standard packages more often	130708.68	2.42	130708.68	2.42	0.00	0.00
Prepared instruments before determ elig	57469.68	1.06	57469.68	1.06	0.00	0.00
Implemented classes on using instruments	127506.89	2.36	127506.89	2.36	0.00	0.00
Wrote instrument at local agency level	135936.87	2.52	135936.87	2.52	0.00	0.00
Computer-generated food instruments	123758.98	2.29	123758.98	2.29	0.00	0.00
Other	67356.74	1.25	67356.74	1.25	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 33

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Scheduling Practices

Agencies

Specific Changes in Scheduling Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Implemented/continued appointments	65.91	3.71	65.91	3.71	0.00	0.00
Over-booked WIC participant appointments	60.57	3.41	60.57	3.41	0.00	0.00
Less flexible clinic activity schedules	63.25	3.56	63.25	3.56	0.00	0.00
More flexible clinic activity schedules	62.58	3.52	62.58	3.52	0.00	0.00
Extended clinic hours beyond regular hrs	55.82	3.14	55.82	3.14	0.00	0.00
Shortened clinic hours	10.86	0.61	10.86	0.61	0.00	0.00
Extended clinic days of service	57.46	3.23	57.46	3.23	0.00	0.00
Cut back on days of service	32.54	1.83	32.54	1.83	0.00	0.00
Other	16.16	0.91	16.16	0.91	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 33

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Scheduling Practices

Participants

Specific Changes in Scheduling Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Implemented/continued appointments	140723.63	2.61	140723.63	2.61	0.00	0.00
Over-booked WIC participant appointments	107836.94	2.00	107836.94	2.00	0.00	0.00
Less flexible clinic activity schedules	141604.89	2.62	141604.89	2.62	0.00	0.00
More flexible clinic activity schedules	134378.89	2.49	134378.89	2.49	0.00	0.00
Extended clinic hours beyond regular hrs	122109.79	2.26	122109.79	2.26	0.00	0.00
Shortened clinic hours	19075.25	0.35	19075.25	0.35	0.00	0.00
Extended clinic days of service	136395.58	2.53	136395.58	2.53	0.00	0.00
Cut back on days of service	75644.79	1.40	75644.79	1.40	0.00	0.00
Other	47926.93	0.89	47926.93	0.89	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 34

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Staffing Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Staffing Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Used volunteer staff to greater extent	51.64	2.91	51.64	2.91	0.00	0.00
Used volunteer staff to lesser extent	15.61	0.88	15.61	0.88	0.00	0.00
Used contract/consult staff-greater ext	59.78	3.36	59.78	3.36	0.00	0.00
Used contract/consult staff-lesser ext	26.24	1.48	26.24	1.48	0.00	0.00
Used more itinerant staff (site travel)	61.61	3.47	61.61	3.47	0.00	0.00
Used less itinerant staff (site travel)	13.63	0.77	13.63	0.77	0.00	0.00
Used more paraprofessional staff	56.59	3.18	56.59	3.18	0.00	0.00
Used fewer paraprofessional staff	19.42	1.09	19.42	1.09	0.00	0.00
Used more clerical staff	63.14	3.55	63.14	3.55	0.00	0.00
Used fewer clerical staff	24.49	1.38	24.49	1.38	0.00	0.00
Used more professional staff	62.96	3.54	62.96	3.54	0.00	0.00
Used fewer professional staff	37.92	2.13	37.92	2.13	0.00	0.00
Curtailed or canceled staff meetings	54.20	3.05	54.20	3.05	0.00	0.00
Cut back training activities for staff	57.42	3.23	57.42	3.23	0.00	0.00
Increased training activities for staff	53.74	3.02	53.74	3.02	0.00	0.00
Other	8.38	0.47	8.38	0.47	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 34

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Staffing Practices Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Staffing Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Used volunteer staff to greater extent	128145.31	2.37	128145.31	2.37	0.00	0.00
Used volunteer staff to lesser extent	64198.12	1.19	64198.12	1.19	0.00	0.00
Used contract/consult staff-greater ext	126314.25	2.34	126314.25	2.34	0.00	0.00
Used contract/consult staff-lesser ext	56836.66	1.05	56836.66	1.05	0.00	0.00
Used more itinerant staff (site travel)	131107.49	2.43	131107.49	2.43	0.00	0.00
Used less itinerant staff (site travel)	66053.46	1.22	66053.46	1.22	0.00	0.00
Used more paraprofessional staff	126454.02	2.34	126454.02	2.34	0.00	0.00
Used fewer paraprofessional staff	61091.86	1.13	61091.86	1.13	0.00	0.00
Used more clerical staff	110527.13	2.05	110527.13	2.05	0.00	0.00
Used fewer clerical staff	62026.55	1.15	62026.55	1.15	0.00	0.00
Used more professional staff	118625.76	2.20	118625.76	2.20	0.00	0.00
Used fewer professional staff	44325.80	0.82	44325.80	0.82	0.00	0.00
Curtailed or canceled staff meetings	139321.06	2.58	139321.06	2.58	0.00	0.00
Cut back training activities for staff	127104.85	2.36	127104.85	2.36	0.00	0.00
Increased training activities for staff	133841.39	2.48	133841.39	2.48	0.00	0.00
Other	56184.22	1.04	56184.22	1.04	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 35

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Waiting List Practices Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Waiting List Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Initiated/increased use of waiting list	55.10	3.10	55.10	3.10	0.00	0.00
Dropped waiting lists	58.70	3.30	58.70	3.30	0.00	0.00
Other	5.59	0.31	5.59	0.31	0.00	0.00

Participants

Specific Changes in Waiting List Practices	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Initiated/increased use of waiting list	118908.00	2.20	118908.00	2.20	0.00	0.00
Dropped waiting lists	132492.24	2.46	132492.24	2.46	0.00	0.00
Other	21540.41	0.40	21540.41	0.40	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 36

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations	Implemented Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Postponed or canceled special projects	58.85	3.31	58.85	3.31	0.00	0.00
Delayed completion of paperwork/reports	66.33	3.73	66.33	3.73	0.00	0.00
Streamlined recordkeeping	62.58	3.52	62.58	3.52	0.00	0.00
Streamlined case management	57.48	3.23	57.48	3.23	0.00	0.00
Made greater use of computers	56.93	3.20	56.93	3.20	0.00	0.00
Increased paperwork	64.69	3.64	64.69	3.64	0.00	0.00
Decreased paperwork	44.62	2.51	44.62	2.51	0.00	0.00
Expanded case management	63.72	3.59	63.72	3.59	0.00	0.00
Other	10.32	0.58	10.32	0.58	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 36

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations Since 1988

Participants

Specific Changes in Administrative Practices and Operations	Implemented Changes						Total	
	Yes			No			No.	Pct.
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.
Postponed or canceled special projects	39.43	2.22	39.43	2.22	2.22	0.00	0.00	0.00
Delayed completion of paperwork/reports	40.87	2.30	40.87	2.30	2.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
Streamlined recordkeeping	45.40	2.55	45.40	2.55	2.55	0.00	0.00	0.00
Streamlined case management	44.84	2.52	44.84	2.52	2.52	0.00	0.00	0.00
Made greater use of computers	33.56	1.89	33.56	1.89	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.00
Increased paperwork	45.93	2.58	45.93	2.58	2.58	0.00	0.00	0.00
Decreased paperwork	39.13	2.20	39.13	2.20	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
Expanded case management	43.39	2.44	43.39	2.44	2.44	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other	9.77	0.55	9.77	0.55	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 37

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Changes in Facilities Since 1988

Agencies

Specific Changes in Facilities	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Moved to new facilities	59.83	3.37	59.83	3.37	0.00	0.00
Added clinic sites	58.74	3.31	58.74	3.31	0.00	0.00
Eliminated clinic sites	35.45	1.99	35.45	1.99	0.00	0.00
Made more efficient use of space	65.18	3.67	65.18	3.67	0.00	0.00
Co-located with health-care provider	47.83	2.69	47.83	2.69	0.00	0.00
Other	4.28	0.24	4.28	0.24	0.00	0.00

Participants

Specific Changes in Facilities	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Moved to new facilities	123695.84	2.29	123695.84	2.29	0.00	0.00
Added clinic sites	127490.17	2.36	127490.17	2.36	0.00	0.00
Eliminated clinic sites	117682.44	2.18	117682.44	2.18	0.00	0.00
Made more efficient use of space	105580.09	1.96	105580.09	1.96	0.00	0.00
Co-located with health-care provider	130235.94	2.41	130235.94	2.41	0.00	0.00
Other	40217.39	0.75	40217.39	0.75	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Table 38

Standard Errors of Agencies and Affected Participants by
Other Changes Made Since 1988

Agencies

Other Changes	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	Total	No.	Pct.	Total
Initiated special projects	62.04	3.49	62.04	3.49	0.00	0.00
Planned and held regular staff meetings	66.30	3.73	66.30	3.73	0.00	0.00
Other	19.95	1.12	19.95	1.12	0.00	0.00

Participants

Other Changes	Implemented Changes					
	Yes			No		
	No.	Pct.	Total	No.	Pct.	Total
Initiated special projects	113936.14	2.11	113936.14	2.11	0.00	0.00
Planned and held regular staff meetings	118785.50	2.20	118785.50	2.20	0.00	0.00
Other	61490.67	1.14	61490.67	1.14	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Based on 1777 local agencies and 5,396,569 participants

Section 4

State Agency Tables

Table 1
Number and Percentage of State Agencies by Selected Service Characteristics

	State Agencies	
	No.	Pct.
Areas of State in Which WIC Operates		
Operates in All Areas of State	67	87.01
Does Not Operate in All Areas of State	10	12.99
Total	77	100.00
Number of Counties Remaining Unserved		
0	67	89.33
1	2	2.67
2	2	2.67
3	1	1.33
4 - 10	2	2.67
Over 10	1	1.33
Not Applicable to ITO's	2	*
Total	77	100.00

(CONTINUED)

* Some questions were inappropriate or irrelevant to ITO's, and were not answered by some of the ITO's. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 1
Number and Percentage of State Agencies by Selected Service Characteristics

	State Agencies	
	No.	Pct.
Number of WIC Eligible Individuals Remaining Unserved		
0	1	1.30
1 - 100	2	2.60
101 - 1,000	4	5.19
1,001 - 10,000	7	9.09
10,001 - 25,000	6	7.79
25,001 - 100,000	20	25.97
101,000 - 500,000	5	6.49
Over 500,000	3	3.90
Don't Know	29	37.66
Total	77	100.00

Table 2

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Percentage Growth in Participation Since 1988

Percentage Growth in Participation Since 1988	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than 15%	16	20.78	88	5.11	140,493	2.66
15% to 33%	25	32.47	455	26.41	1,277,652	24.16
33% to 50%	16	20.78	670	38.89	1,715,195	32.44
50% to 100%	18	23.38	494	28.67	2,047,630	38.72
Greater than 100%	1	1.30	15	0.87	106,422	2.01
Not Applicable	1	1.30	1	0.06	577	0.01
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 3

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Caseload Fluctuations

State Agencies

Caseload Fluctuations	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations							
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Infant Formula Rebates	67	87.01	4	5.19	6	7.79	77	100.00
Other Caseload Increases or Decreases	67	87.01	8	10.39	2	2.60	77	100.00
Other Cost Containment Efforts	40	51.95	14	18.18	23	29.87	77	100.00
Other	7	9.09	1	1.30	69	89.61	77	100.00

Affected Local Agencies

Caseload Fluctuations	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations							
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Infant Formula Rebates	1702	98.78	4	0.23	17	0.99	1723	100.00
Other Caseload Increases or Decreases	1491	86.54	203	11.78	29	1.68	1723	100.00
Other Cost Containment Efforts	960	55.72	398	23.10	365	21.18	1723	100.00
Other	250	14.51	53	3.08	1420	82.41	1723	100.00

Affected Participants

Caseload Fluctuations	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations							
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Infant Formula Rebates	5,251,288	99.31	19,079	0.36	17,602	0.33	5,287,969	100.00
Other Caseload Increases or Decreases	4,880,454	92.29	390,488	7.38	17,027	0.32	5,287,969	100.00
Other Cost Containment Efforts	3,141,921	59.42	1,071,820	20.27	1,074,228	20.31	5,287,969	100.00
Other	752,548	14.23	100,438	1.90	4,434,983	83.87	5,287,969	100.00

Table 4

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Economic Factors
State Agencies

Economic Factors	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations							
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Federal Funding Policies	60	77.92	14	18.18	3	3.90	77	100.00
Availability of State Funds for WIC	28	36.36	12	15.58	37	48.05	77	100.00
Downturn in Local Economy	55	71.43	13	16.88	9	11.69	77	100.00
State Budget Cuts	31	40.26	15	19.48	31	40.26	77	100.00
Food Cost Fluctuations	71	92.21	4	5.19	2	2.60	77	100.00
Other	2	2.60	2	2.60	73	94.81	77	100.00

Affected Local Agencies

Economic Factors	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations							
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Federal Funding Policies	1462	84.85	253	14.68	8	0.46	1723	100.00
Availability of State Funds for WIC	856	49.68	226	13.12	641	37.20	1723	100.00
Downturn in Local Economy	1434	83.23	233	13.52	56	3.25	1723	100.00
State Budget Cuts	850	49.33	563	32.68	310	17.99	1723	100.00
Food Cost Fluctuations	1576	91.47	145	8.42	2	0.12	1723	100.00
Other	18	1.04	72	4.18	1633	94.78	1723	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 4

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
By Agencies' Perceived Impact of Economic Factors

Affected Participants

Economic Factors	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations									
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Total
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Federal Funding Policies	4,553,610	86.11	716,026	13.54	18,333	0.35	5,287,969	100.00		
Availability of State Funds for WIC	2,591,241	49.00	486,654	9.20	2,210,074	41.79	5,287,969	100.00		
Downturn in Local Economy	4,561,524	86.26	477,317	9.03	249,128	4.71	5,287,969	100.00		
State Budget Cuts	3,067,186	58.00	1,510,991	28.57	709,792	13.42	5,287,969	100.00		
Food Cost Fluctuations	5,069,545	95.87	202,970	3.84	15,454	0.29	5,287,969	100.00		
Other	32,337	0.61	226,702	4.29	5,028,930	95.10	5,287,969	100.00		

Table 5

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements

State Agencies

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations										
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Total	
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	68	88.31		9	11.69		0	0		77	100.00
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	53	68.83		22	28.57		2	2.60		77	100.00
Homeless Service Requirements	48	62.34		25	32.47		4	5.19		77	100.00
Immunization Requirements	58	75.32		18	23.38		1	1.30		77	100.00
Prenatal Care Initiatives	53	68.83		23	29.87		1	1.30		77	100.00
Vendor Management Initiatives	59	76.62		15	19.48		3	3.90		77	100.00
Other	4	5.19		1	1.30		72	93.51		77	100.00

Affected Local Agencies

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations									
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Total
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	1592	92.40	131	7.60	0	0	1723	100.00		
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	1356	78.70	365	21.18	2	0.12	1723	100.00		
Homeless Service Requirements	1309	75.97	410	23.80	4	0.23	1723	100.00		
Immunization Requirements	1448	84.04	190	11.03	85	4.93	1723	100.00		
Prenatal Care Initiatives	1402	81.37	300	17.41	21	1.22	1723	100.00		
Vendor Management Initiatives	1480	85.90	210	12.19	33	1.92	1723	100.00		
Other	46	2.67	53	3.08	1624	94.25	1723	100.00		

(CONTINUED)

Table 5

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Agencies' Perceived Impact of New Program Requirements

Affected Participants

New Program Requirements	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations									
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total			
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Breastfeeding Promotion Requirements	5,082,739	96.12	205,230	3.88	0	0	0	5,287,969	100.00	
Drug Abuse Education Requirements	3,878,296	73.34	1,331,099	25.17	78,574	1.49	5,287,969	100.00		
Homeless Service Requirements	4,194,744	79.33	1,091,401	20.64	1,824	0.03	5,287,969	100.00		
Immunization Requirements	4,366,506	82.57	767,648	14.52	153,815	2.91	5,287,969	100.00		
Prenatal Care Initiatives	4,078,105	77.12	1,149,268	21.73	60,596	1.15	5,287,969	100.00		
Vendor Management Initiatives	4,637,862	87.71	524,518	9.92	125,589	2.37	5,287,969	100.00		
Other	215,819	4.08	100,438	1.90	4,971,712	94.02	5,287,969	100.00		

Table 6

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors

State Agencies

Other Initiatives and Factors	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations							
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Medicaid Expansion	51	66.23	21	27.27	5	6.49	77	100.00
Coordination/Integration of Services	54	70.13	19	24.68	4	5.19	77	100.00
Other Federal Initiatives	3	3.90	1	1.30	73	94.81	77	100.00
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	62	80.52	10	12.99	5	6.49	77	100.00
Other Factors	5	6.49	1	1.30	71	92.21	77	100.00

Affected Local Agencies

Other Initiatives and Factors	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations								Total	
	Impact		No Impact		Not Applicable					
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.				
Medicaid Expansion	1408	81.72	267	15.50	48	2.79	1723	100.00		
Coordination/Integration of Services	1559	90.48	160	9.29	4	0.23	1723	100.00		
Other Federal Initiatives	52	3.02	53	3.08	1618	93.91	1723	100.00		
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	1580	91.70	79	4.59	64	3.71	1723	100.00		
Other Factors	127	7.37	53	3.08	1543	89.55	1723	100.00		

(CONTINUED)

Table 6

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
By Agencies' Perceived Impact of Other Initiatives and Factors

Affected Participants

Other Initiatives and Factors	Perceived Impact on State Agency Operations											
	Impact			No Impact			Not Applicable			Total		
	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.	
Medicaid Expansion	4,390,001	83.02		696,851	13.18		201,117	3.80		5,287,969	100.00	
Coordination/Integration of Services	4,634,131	87.64		651,361	12.32		2,477	0.05		5,287,969	100.00	
Other Federal Initiatives	121,182	2.29		100,438	1.90		5,066,349	95.81		5,287,969	100.00	
Computerization/Automation Initiatives	4,971,614	94.02		236,558	4.47		79,797	1.51		5,287,969	100.00	
Other Factors	506,707	9.58		100,438	1.90		4,680,824	88.52		5,287,969	100.00	

Table 7

**Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Other Non-Federal Sources of Funding for WIC**

Sources of Non-Federal WIC Funding	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
None	33	42.86	420	24.38	1,023,778	19.36
State Appropriations	21	27.27	653	37.90	2,059,166	38.94
Private Grants	4	5.19	86	4.99	230,776	4.36
County or Local Funds	17	22.08	774	44.92	1,947,932	36.84
Other Sources:						
Infant Formula Rebates	11	14.29	499	28.96	1,769,746	33.47
Tribal Funds	4	5.19	11	0.64	24,708	0.47
In-Kind (Private/Govt)	5	6.49	109	6.33	260,981	4.94
Federal Grants	4	5.19	132	7.66	633,756	11.98
Other	5	6.49	133	7.72	603,263	11.41

NOTE: Based on 77 state agencies, 1723 affected local agencies, and 5,287,969 affected participants

Table 8

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Whether Unspent State-Appropriated Funds Can be Carried Forward

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Carried Forward to Next Year	6	10.71	75	4.41	126,579	2.40
Returned	20	35.71	564	33.14	1,840,127	34.96
Not Applicable - No State Funds	27	48.21	965	56.70	2,887,857	54.86
Other	2	3.57	97	5.70	395,084	7.51
Don't Know	1	1.79	1	0.06	14,624	0.28
Not Applicable to ITO's	21	*	21	*	23,698	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some questions were inappropriate or irrelevant to ITO's, and were not answered by some of the ITO's. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 9

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Change in the Availability and Amount of Funding from Other Non-Federal Sources Since 1988

Availability and Amount of Funding	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Availability						
Additional Funding Sources Became Available	18	23.38	624	36.22	2,083,026	39.39
Fewer Funding Sources Were Available	6	7.79	265	15.38	589,957	11.16
Funding Sources Remained the Same	53	68.83	834	48.40	2,614,986	49.45
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Amount of Funding						
More Funding Became Available	17	22.08	544	31.57	1,662,881	31.45
Less Funding Became Available	17	22.08	607	35.23	2,146,918	40.60
Amount of Funding Remained the Same	43	55.84	572	33.20	1,478,170	27.95
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 10

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Whether State Agency Uses an Administrative Cost Per Participant
to Allocate Administrative Funds

	State Agencies			Affected Local Agencies			Affected Participants		
	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	No.	Pct.	
Uses a Cost/Participant Formula									
Yes	33	45.21	1246	72.48	4,074,278	77.10			
No	40	54.79	473	27.52	1,210,348	22.90			
Not applicable to ITO's or S/L's	4	*	4	*	3,343	*			
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00			
Average Cost Per Participants									
Less than \$6.00	2	2.63	2	0.12	263,670	4.99			
\$6.00 - \$6.99	10	13.16	257	14.92	1,109,347	20.98			
\$7.00 - \$7.99	10	13.16	361	20.96	1,095,351	20.72			
\$8.00 - \$8.99	16	21.05	659	38.27	1,914,302	36.20			
\$9.00 - \$9.99	6	7.89	204	11.85	639,419	12.09			
\$10.00 - \$14.99	14	18.42	142	8.25	218,763	4.14			
\$15.00 - \$19.99	9	11.84	9	0.52	8,304	0.16			
\$20.00 or more	9	11.84	88	5.11	38,495	0.73			
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	1	*	1	*	318	*			
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00			
Change in Method of Computing Administrative Costs Per Participant									
Yes	13	17.33	322	18.71	1,133,000	21.43			
No	62	82.67	1399	81.29	4,153,894	78.57			
Not applicable to ITO's or S/L's	2	*	2	*	1,075	*			
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00			

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 11

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Methods Used to Compute Administrative Funding for Local Agencies

Methods	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Historical Performance Criteria	7	13.73	174	10.12	282,637	5.57
Factors Based on Needs of Population	3	5.88	109	6.47	182,858	3.60
Considers Both Factors Listed Above	27	52.94	915	54.27	3,048,572	60.04
Other	14	27.45	488	28.94	1,563,434	30.79
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	26	*	37	*	210,468	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Length of Time Method Has Been in Place						
Within the Last 6 Months	1	2.08	8	0.48	42,993	0.86
7 to 12 months	2	4.17	79	4.71	79,289	1.59
13 to 24 months	4	8.33	198	11.81	550,593	11.03
25 to 48 months	9	18.75	182	10.86	881,165	17.66
Greater than 4 years	31	64.58	1195	71.30	3,426,083	68.63
Don't Know	1	2.08	14	0.84	11,564	0.23
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	29	*	47	*	296,082	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 12
Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Funding Allocation Practices

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No. of Times Agency Reallocated Administrative Funds						
None	6	13.33	235	14.03	888,412	18.32
One	6	13.33	225	13.43	931,687	19.22
Two	14	31.11	406	24.24	1,335,326	27.54
Three	8	17.78	288	17.19	603,907	12.46
Four	6	13.33	305	18.21	516,681	10.66
Five or More	5	11.11	216	12.90	572,172	11.80
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	32	*	48	*	439,784	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 13

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Funding Allocation Practices

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Pct. Administrative Funds Used for Local Level Expenses						
0%-20.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0
20.01%-40.00%	6	10.17	6	0.35	135,605	2.58
40.01%-60.00%	6	10.17	44	2.58	75,074	1.43
60.01%-80.00%	33	55.93	1103	64.69	3,870,178	73.76
80.01%-100.00%	14	23.73	552	32.38	1,166,016	22.22
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	18	*	18	*	41,096	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Pct. Administrative Funds Used for State Level Expenses						
0%-20.00%	21	32.31	729	42.61	1,574,619	29.91
20.01%-40.00%	27	41.54	945	55.23	3,516,424	66.80
40.01%-60.00%	6	9.23	26	1.52	21,105	0.40
60.01%-80.00%	5	7.69	5	0.29	134,725	2.56
80.01%-100.00%	6	9.23	6	0.35	17,060	0.32
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	12	*	12	*	24,036	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 14

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Methods for Allocating Caseload

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Maximum Caseload Assigned on the Basis of:						
Number of Pregnant Women and/or Infants on Waiting Lists	3	5.56	3	0.18	163,441	3.17
Number of Eligibles Meeting Specific Priorities	11	20.37	509	30.39	1,444,810	27.98
Assignment on Another Basis	13	24.07	293	17.49	1,251,163	24.23
Negotiated Basis	5	9.26	188	11.22	354,283	6.86
Other:						
Caseload Not Assigned to Locals	3	5.56	90	5.37	270,473	5.24
Based on Historic Levels/Ability to Serve/Current Levels	4	7.41	213	12.72	251,448	4.87
Based on Priorities Served	3	5.56	43	2.57	267,490	5.18
Based on Eligibles	1	1.85	14	0.84	121,850	2.36
Based on Several Factors	3	5.56	108	6.45	192,019	3.72
Based on Food Costs	1	1.85	1	0.06	6,005	0.12
Other Basis	6	11.11	192	11.46	780,236	15.11
Don't Know	1	1.85	21	1.25	60,596	1.17
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	23	*	48	*	124,155	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 15

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Methods for Allocating Caseload

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Length of Time Method Has Been Used:						
1 or 2 years	5	8.47	214	12.55	1,015,064	19.54
3 or 4 years	4	6.78	225	13.20	542,105	10.44
5 or 6 years	10	16.95	122	7.16	408,243	7.86
7 or 8 years	9	15.25	350	20.53	896,771	17.27
9 or 10 years	16	27.12	470	27.57	1,156,146	22.26
11 to 15 years	7	11.86	108	6.33	423,167	8.15
16 to 20 years	6	10.17	185	10.85	636,907	12.26
Don't Know	2	3.39	31	1.82	115,748	2.23
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	18	*	18	*	93,818	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 16

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
By Factors Used in Assigning Caseload Increases or Decreases to a Local Agency

Factors	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Local Agency's Affirmative Action Ranking						
Important	24	40.00	876	51.68	2,627,381	50.73
Not Important	36	60.00	819	48.32	2,551,437	49.27
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Percent of Potentially Eligible Being Served						
Important	43	71.67	1271	74.99	4,240,630	81.88
Not Important	17	28.33	424	25.01	938,188	18.12
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Local Agency's Historical Ability to Serve						
Important	48	80.00	1467	86.55	4,541,974	87.70
Not Important	12	20.00	228	13.45	636,844	12.30
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
WIC Priority Groups						
Important	45	75.00	1121	66.14	4,017,512	77.58
Not Important	15	25.00	574	33.86	1,161,306	22.42
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

(CONTINUED)

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 16

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Factors Used in Assigning Caseload Increases or Decreases to a Local Agency

Factors	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
New or Expanded Services for High Risk						
Important	36	60.00	1123	66.25	3,225,125	62.28
Not Important	24	40.00	572	33.75	1,953,893	37.72
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Co-location of Maternity Care						
Important	24	40.00	673	39.71	2,017,101	38.95
Not Important	36	60.00	1022	60.29	3,161,717	61.05
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Unserviced Areas in the State						
Important	21	35.00	485	28.61	1,074,954	20.76
Not Important	39	65.00	1210	71.39	4,103,864	79.24
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Average Food Cost Per Participant						
Important	15	25.00	241	14.22	530,203	10.24
Not Important	45	75.00	1454	85.78	4,648,615	89.76
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

(CONTINUED)

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 16

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Factors Used in Assigning Caseload Increases or Decreases to a Local Agency

Factors	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Local Agency's Proven Ability to Grow						
Important	40	66.67	1151	67.91	3,817,836	73.72
Not Important	20	33.33	544	32.09	1,360,982	26.28
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Management or Staffing Problems						
Important	41	68.33	1307	77.11	3,918,238	75.66
Not Important	19	31.67	388	22.89	1,260,580	24.34
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	60	100.00	1695	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Other Factors						
Important	20	33.33	584	34.45	1,749,412	33.78
Not Important	40	66.67	1111	65.55	3,429,406	66.22
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	17	*	28	*	109,151	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 17

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Most Frequently Used Method for Allocating Caseload Under Conditions of Rapid Growth

Methods	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Allocated Proportionately for All Agencies	11	17.46	386	23.38	1,107,280	22.09
Used Requested and Agency Projections of Total Number They Could Serve	19	30.16	685	41.49	1,967,661	39.25
Allocated Only if Agencies Met Certain Conditions	4	6.35	32	1.94	75,252	1.50
Other:						
Combination of Above	3	4.76	131	7.93	307,903	6.14
Based on Priority Levels Served	3	4.76	64	3.88	150,119	2.99
Based on Historic Levels/Ability to Serve	2	3.17	48	2.91	70,223	1.40
Other	5	7.94	197	11.93	1,110,141	22.14
Not Had Rapid Participant Growth	16	25.40	108	6.54	224,874	4.49
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	14	*	72	*	274,516	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 18

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Whether State Agency Developed Participant-to-Staff Ratios Are Used

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Participant to Professional Staff Ratio (Median Ratio = 760)						
1-250	0	0	0	0	0	0
251-500	2	2.60	2	0.12	18,333	0.35
501-750	5	6.49	204	11.84	630,940	11.93
751-1000	4	5.19	164	9.52	342,337	6.47
More Than 1000	3	3.90	185	10.74	581,844	11.00
Don't Know	24	31.17	674	39.12	2,048,268	38.73
Participant-to-Staff Ratios Not Used	39	50.65	494	28.67	1,666,247	31.51
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Participant to Paraprofessional/ Clerical Staff Ratio (Median Ratio = 500)						
1-250	1	1.30	57	3.31	74,227	1.40
251-500	6	7.79	148	8.59	190,158	3.60
501-750	4	5.19	174	10.10	465,891	8.81
751-1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
More Than 1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't Know	27	35.06	850	49.33	2,891,446	54.68
Participant-to-Staff Ratios Not Used	39	50.65	494	28.67	1,666,247	31.51
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 18

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Whether State Agency Developed Participant-to-Staff Ratios Are Used

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Participant to General Staff Ratio (Median Ratio = 500)						
1-250	3	3.90	44	2.55	54,705	1.03
251-500	11	14.29	416	24.14	1,442,349	27.28
501-750	1	1.30	79	4.59	118,574	2.24
751-1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
More Than 1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't Know	23	29.87	690	40.05	2,006,094	37.94
Participant-to-Staff Ratios Not Used	39	50.65	494	28.67	1,666,247	31.51
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Length of Time Participant-to-Staff Ratios Have Been in Effect						
1 or 2 Years	5	6.49	91	5.28	539,122	10.20
3 or 4 Years	5	6.49	137	7.95	501,260	9.48
5 or 6 Years	10	12.99	314	18.22	566,846	10.72
7 or 8 Years	5	6.49	198	11.49	526,120	9.95
9 or 10 Years	9	11.69	309	17.93	702,008	13.28
More Than 10 Years	3	3.90	179	10.39	785,670	14.86
Don't Know	1	1.30	1	0.06	696	0.01
Not Applicable	39	50.65	494	28.67	1,666,247	31.51
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Since 1988 — State administrative rules, regulations, and policies: _____

Since 1988 — Quality of service: _____

Since 1988 — Other operational changes: _____

Table 20

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by the Presence of Program Performance Standards

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Performance Standards are Developed and in Use in State	47	61.04	1231	71.45	3,766,659	71.23
Performance Standards are Under Development	12	15.58	256	14.86	922,491	17.45
Performance Standards Have Not Been Developed	18	23.38	236	13.70	598,819	11.32
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 21

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by the Presence of Performance Standards for Nutrition Education

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Do Not Use Any Performance Standards	15	19.48	290	16.83	701,117	13.26
Performance Standards Focus Primarily on Nutrition Education	27	35.06	587	34.07	1,836,206	34.72
Performance Standards Focus Somewhat on Nutrition Education	33	42.86	844	48.98	2,748,750	51.98
Performance Standards Do Not Address Nutrition Education	2	2.60	2	0.12	1,896	0.04
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 22

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by the Use of Program Performance Standards

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Do Not Use Standards	17	22.37	292	16.96	703,013	13.30
Used for Monitoring	19	25.00	456	26.48	1,442,467	27.28
Used for Evaluation	8	10.53	22	1.28	206,342	3.90
Used both for Monitoring and Evaluation	30	39.47	950	55.17	2,934,586	55.50
Used for Other Activities	2	2.63	2	0.12	1,007	0.02
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	1	*	1	*	554	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 23

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by State Sponsorship of Breastfeeding Promotional Activities

Breastfeeding Promotional Activities	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Providing Materials	76	98.70	1722	99.94	5,287,453	99.99
Co-Sponsoring Local Activities	51	66.23	1438	83.46	4,427,600	83.73
Hot Lines	12	15.58	410	23.80	914,762	17.30
Public Service Announcements	22	28.57	503	29.19	1,638,112	30.98
Coordinating with Hospital Maternity Wards	41	53.25	1015	58.91	2,880,026	54.46
In-Service Training Programs	70	90.91	1644	95.41	5,176,146	97.89
Peer Counseling Program Training	36	46.75	886	51.42	3,593,025	69.84
Other:						
Coalitions/Task Forces	4	5.19	51	2.96	169,447	3.20
General Media Activities	2	2.60	77	4.47	470,707	8.90
Lactation Consultants/Breastfeeding Consultants	5	6.49	75	4.35	231,981	4.19
Staff Training on Breastfeeding	1	1.30	59	3.42	81,128	1.53
Manual/Curriculum for Staff	2	2.60	15	0.87	107,154	2.03
Other	6	7.79	161	9.34	452,298	8.55

NOTE: Based on 77 state agencies, 1723 affected local agencies, and 5,287,969 affected participants

Table 24

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Food Voucher or Instrument Practices

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Frequency of Issuing Food Vouchers or Instruments						
Less Than One Time a Month	0	0	0	0	0	0
Once Per Month	33	42.86	638	37.03	1,100,000	20.80
Once Every 6 Weeks	0	0	0	0	0	0
Once Every 2 Months	30	38.96	696	40.39	2,556,045	48.34
Once Every 3 Months	6	7.79	268	15.55	821,807	15.54
No Issue Schedule	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	3	3.90	86	4.98	683,887	12.93
Not Applicable - Direct Distribution	5	6.49	35	2.03	126,230	2.39
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Issuance Variation Across Agency						
Varies Significantly	2	4.65	73	4.38	360,351	7.44
Varies Somewhat	20	46.51	778	46.70	2,215,149	45.76
Does Not Vary	21	48.84	815	48.92	2,265,492	46.80
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	34	*	57	*	446,977	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 25

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Food Voucher or Instrument Practices

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Change in Issuance Schedule Since 1988						
Yes	49	63.64	1166	67.67	4,135,373	78.20
No	28	36.36	557	32.33	1,152,596	21.80
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Number of Years Using Current Issuance Policies and Procedures						
1 Year	9	11.69	206	11.96	948,630	17.94
2 Years	16	20.78	182	10.56	857,085	16.21
3 Years	11	14.29	388	22.52	1,267,821	23.98
4 Years	5	6.49	102	5.92	235,352	4.45
5 Years	8	10.39	101	5.86	217,805	4.12
6 to 10 Years	15	19.48	369	21.42	823,963	15.58
Over 10 Years	11	14.29	373	21.65	919,683	17.39
Don't Know	2	2.60	2	0.12	17,630	0.33
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 26

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Proportion of Agencies Using PC or Mini-Computers Versus Mainframe Computers

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Proportion Using PC or Mini-Computers						
All	34	45.33	678	39.40	2,547,983	48.19
Most	5	6.67	171	9.94	575,720	10.89
Some	8	10.67	257	14.93	775,617	14.67
Few	17	22.67	593	34.46	1,359,621	25.71
None	11	14.67	22	1.28	28,387	0.54
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	2	*	2	*	641	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Proportion Using Mainframe Computers						
All	31	41.33	851	49.45	2,929,240	55.41
Most	4	5.33	213	12.38	388,913	7.36
Some	1	1.33	15	0.87	106,422	2.01
Few	12	16.00	274	15.92	1,003,678	18.98
None	27	36.00	368	21.38	858,652	16.24
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	2	*	2	*	1,064	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 27

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Current Usage of Automation for WIC Functions

Current Usage of Automation	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Enrollment						
Local Agencies Fill Out Paper Forms and Send to State for Key Entry into a Central Database	34	44.16	822	47.71	2,278,795	43.09
Local Agencies Key Data on Terminals Linked to a Central Computer	11	14.29	312	18.11	1,079,926	20.42
Local Agencies Key Data on Micro- or Mini-Computer and Transmit to Central Database	22	28.57	481	27.92	1,697,701	32.10
In Process	2	2.60	5	0.29	13,502	0.26
Manual Only	2	2.60	2	0.12	1,113	0.02
Other	6	7.79	101	5.86	216,932	4.10
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Food Instrument Production						
State Produces Bulk Automated Checks/Drafts/Vouchers:						
Local Agencies Write Manual Checks/Drafts/Vouchers	34	44.16	965	56.01	2,762,485	52.24
Local Agencies Produce First Visit Food Instrument Using On-Line Terminals or Computers	7	9.09	202	11.72	606,194	11.46
Local Agencies Produce All Food Instruments On-Site Using Computers or Terminals	18	23.38	329	19.09	863,983	16.34
Electronic Benefit Transfer Card is Used	1	1.30	15	0.87	10,056	0.19
All Manual Production	6	7.79	6	0.35	7,439	0.14
Other	9	11.69	174	10.10	912,400	17.25
Not Applicable - Direct Distribution	2	2.60	32	1.86	125,412	2.37
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 27

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Current Usage of Automation for WIC Functions

Current Usage of Automation	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Appointment Scheduling						
Manual Scheduling Only	60	77.92	1148	66.63	3,759,142	71.09
Automated Scheduling at Local Level but Not Part of Statewide System	12	15.58	348	20.20	907,919	17.17
Automated Scheduling at Local Level as Part of Statewide System	3	3.90	141	8.18	465,571	8.80
Other	2	2.60	86	4.99	155,337	2.94
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 28

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Shifts in Automated Processing Since 1988

Shift in Automation Since 1988	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No Change	42	54.55	967	56.12	2,630,253	49.74
Shift from Local Recordkeeping to Centralized State Processing	8	10.39	69	4.00	357,274	6.76
Shift from Central State Processing to Locally Based Processing	27	35.06	687	39.87	2,100,442	43.50
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 29

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Shift in Type and Location of Computer Equipment Since 1988

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Shift in Mainframe Equipment Used Since 1988						
State Level:						
More Used	20	25.97	428	24.84	2,197,144	41.55
No Significant Change	47	61.04	943	54.73	1,940,053	36.69
Less Used	10	12.99	352	20.43	1,150,772	21.76
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Local Level:						
More Used	14	18.67	304	17.66	1,513,132	28.62
No Significant Change	53	70.67	1183	68.74	3,128,130	59.17
Less Used	8	10.67	234	13.60	645,643	12.21
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	2	*	2	*	1,064	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

(CONTINUED)

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 29

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Shift in Type and Location of Computer Equipment Since 1988

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Shift in PC/Mini-Computer Equipment Used Since 1988						
State Level:						
More Used	66	85.71	1665	96.63	5,152,674	97.44
No Significant Change	10	12.99	57	3.31	134,779	2.55
Less Used	1	1.30	1	0.06	516	0.01
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Local Level:						
More Used	47	62.67	1341	77.92	4,025,123	76.13
No Significant Change	27	36.00	379	22.02	1,261,651	23.86
Less Used	1	1.33	1	0.06	554	0.01
Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's	2	*	2	*	641	*
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

* Some state agencies and ITO's function as both state and local agencies; therefore, some questions were not answered because they were inappropriate or irrelevant to the respondent. These were treated as 'Not Applicable to ITO's or S/L's' and not included in percentage calculations.

Table 30

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Perceived Effect of Automation on Productivity and Quality of Program

Perceived Effect of Automation on Productivity and Quality	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Productivity						
No Effect	11	14.29	248	14.39	1,056,526	19.98
Substantial Improvement	40	51.95	930	53.98	2,921,280	55.24
Some Improvement	24	31.17	530	30.76	1,159,526	21.93
Some Decline	2	2.60	15	0.87	150,637	2.85
Substantial Decline	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Quality						
No Effect	15	19.48	335	19.44	1,226,982	23.20
Substantial Improvement	44	57.14	952	55.25	3,193,179	60.39
Some Improvement	17	22.08	422	24.49	849,477	16.06
Some Decline	1	1.30	14	0.81	18,331	0.35
Substantial Decline	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 31

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Change in WIC Coordination With Other Programs Since 1988

Change in Coordination Efforts Since 1988	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Coordination Efforts Have:						
Substantially Increased	40	51.95	1198	69.53	4,012,045	75.87
Somewhat Increased	29	37.66	477	27.68	1,032,047	19.52
Somewhat Decreased	2	2.60	9	0.52	7,557	0.14
Substantially Decreased	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stayed About the Same	6	7.79	39	2.26	236,320	4.47
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 12

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by State Program Initiatives and Activities

State Program Initiatives	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Medicaid Program Reimburses for WIC Services						
Yes	10	12.99	376	21.82	1,474,454	27.88
No	61	79.22	1341	77.83	3,792,559	71.72
Don't Know	6	7.79	6	0.35	20,956	0.40
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
WIC Participation in Joint Efforts with Health Dept. or Other Agencies Providing Services to Women and Young Children						
Yes	69	89.61	1567	90.95	4,667,842	88.27
No	8	10.39	156	9.05	620,127	11.73
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
WIC Participation in Immunization Programs						
Yes	75	97.40	1637	95.01	5,133,324	97.08
No	2	2.60	86	4.99	154,645	2.92
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
WIC Requirements to Visit Physician or Non-WIC Clinic to Obtain Biomedical and Anthropometric Data or to Verify Pregnancy						
Yes	28	36.36	498	28.90	2,181,258	41.25
No	49	63.64	1225	71.10	3,106,711	58.75
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

(CONTINUED)

Table 12

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by State Program Initiatives and Activities

State Program Initiatives	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
New Programs for Targeting Low Income Women and Young Children that Relate and Impact on WIC						
Yes	52	67.53	1428	82.88	4,522,121	85.52
No	24	31.17	294	17.06	765,193	14.47
Don't Know	1	1.30	1	0.06	655	0.01
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 33

Number and Percentage of State Agencies, Affected Local Agencies, and Affected Participants
by Current Capacity at Which Local Agencies in State Are Operating

	State Agencies		Affected Local Agencies		Affected Participants	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Capacity Level						
Far Above Capacity	12	15.58	416	24.14	1,649,351	31.19
Somewhat Above Capacity	21	27.27	596	34.59	1,567,256	29.64
At Capacity	20	25.97	555	32.21	1,378,899	26.08
Somewhat Below Capacity	23	29.87	155	9.00	688,768	13.03
Don't Know	1	1.30	1	0.06	3,695	0.07
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00
Maximum Increase in Caseload While Still Maintaining Current Level of Service						
0	27	35.06	645	37.43	2,114,421	39.99
1-100	9	11.69	9	0.52	5,303	0.10
101-1,000	13	16.88	125	7.25	170,051	3.22
1,001-10,000	17	22.08	389	22.58	1,064,311	20.13
10,001-100,000	8	10.39	460	26.70	1,560,300	29.51
More Than 100,000	3	3.90	95	5.51	373,583	7.06
Total	77	100.00	1723	100.00	5,287,969	100.00

Table 34

Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988

Operational Areas with Change	No.	Pct.
Staffing		
No change	8	10.39
Insufficient staff	11	14.29
Added staff in specific roles/programs	22	28.57
Staff size increased	23	29.87
Staff size decreased	13	16.88
Training increased	3	3.90
Training burdensome/infrequent	2	2.60
Turnover is high	10	12.99
Reorganized/increased staff job responsibilities	9	11.69
Hiring freeze	6	7.79
Other	2	2.60
Funding Policies		
No major changes	15	19.48
Insufficient funds	12	15.58
Developed/changed funding formula for local agencies	15	19.48
Infant formula rebate issues	12	15.58
Discretionary funding issues	4	5.19
Federal funding policies negatively impacted program	5	6.49
Increased level of funding	13	16.88
Other	12	15.58

(CONTINUED)

Table 34

Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988

Operational Areas with Change	No.	Pct.
Nutrition Education		
No major changes	5	6.49
Breastfeeding general	4	5.19
Increase in activities specifically targeting breastfeeding	41	53.25
Increase staff (lactation Consultant, Breastfeeding Counselor)	21	27.27
Increase nutrition education	10	12.99
Decrease nutrition education	4	5.19
Increase quality of nutrition education	8	10.39
Increase staff for nutrition education	3	3.90
Developed/changed guidelines/protocols	8	10.39
Decrease quality of nutrition education	1	1.30
Lack of staff to perform nutrition education duties	2	2.60
Used/changed nutrition standards	5	6.49
Increase staff training on nutrition education	7	9.09
Quality/quantity of nutrition education decreased to comply with new requirements	6	7.79
Other	5	6.49

(CONTINUED)

Table 34

Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988

Operational Areas with Change	No.	Pct.
Coordination with Other Agencies and Programs		
No major changes	2	2.60
Kinds/types of agencies and programs that are being coordinated with:		
Child health agencies	5	6.49
Health agencies general	11	14.29
Pre-natal services	9	11.69
Immunization initiatives	23	29.87
Substance abuse prevention and treatment	5	6.49
Social services (AFDC, Food Stamps, etc.)	23	29.87
Indian health services	11	14.29
Breastfeeding promotion group	2	2.60
Homeless initiatives	4	5.19
MCH	15	19.48
School programs including Head Start	10	12.99
Well-child care including EPSDT	6	7.79
Medicaid	30	38.96
CACFP	2	2.60
EFNEP	6	7.79
With unspecified agency/program	8	10.39
Adjunct eligibility/application with Medicaid, AFDC, or Food Stamps	5	6.49
Coordination is difficult/burdensome	7	9.09
Continuing to work on coordination (non-specific)	10	12.99
Other	12	15.58

(CONTINUED)

Table 34

Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988

Operational Areas with Change	No.	Pct.
Monitoring and Vendor Management Procedures	20	25.97
No major changes		
Increase scrutiny in general (including compliance buying)	24	31.17
Increase scrutiny of high-risk vendors	10	12.99
Increase vendor training	9	11.69
Streamline current monitoring	5	6.49
Increased state agency role in monitoring	7	9.09
Added staff for vendor management	11	14.29
Reduced number of authorized vendors	3	3.90
Vendor management improved	5	6.49
Revised policies on vendor issues	6	7.79
Local agency efforts in vendor management	3	3.90
Other	13	16.88

(CONTINUED)

Table 34

Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988

Operational Areas with Change	No.	Pct.
Paperwork, Including the Development of RFP's		
No major changes	14	18.18
Increased paperwork	29	37.66
Increase in paperwork specifically due to federal requirements	8	10.39
Used/increased use of RFP's	11	40.26
Decrease in paperwork	8	10.39
Standardize paperwork	5	6.49
Other	6	7.79
State Administrative Rules, Regulations, and Policies		
No major changes	22	28.57
Change in rules, regulations, and policies but none specified	24	31.17
Change in rules, regulations, and policies in one specific area	10	12.99
Changes in regulations mean an increased burden	14	18.18
Developed/changed Policies and Procedures Manual	3	3.90
Difficult to keep up with changes	3	3.90
Other	5	6.49

(CONTINUED)

Table 34

Number and Percentage of State Agencies Reporting Major Changes in State Operations Since 1988

Operational Areas with Change	No.	Pct.
Quality of Service		
No major changes	11	14.29
Quality increased (general)	29	37.66
Quality increased due to staff	7	9.09
Quality decreased general	6	7.79
Quality decreased due to funding issue	3	3.90
Quality decreased due to caseload increases	6	7.79
Quality decreased due to increased requirements/initiatives/regulations	8	10.39
Implemented/used standards/Quality Assurance techniques	12	15.58
Other	2	2.60
Other		
No major changes	5	6.49
Automation and computers	25	32.47
Change in issuance	6	7.79
Multi-state formula rebates	4	5.19
Other	15	19.48

NOTE: Based on 77 state agencies

Table 35

Number and Percentage of State Agencies by
Factors Ranked Most Often as Promoting High Quality WIC Services

Most Important Factors	No.	Pct.
Qualified, Well Trained Staff	32	41.56
Caring, Concerned Staff	44	57.14
Staff - General	21	27.27
Quality Nutrition Services	20	25.97
Referrals/Integration	26	33.77
Ongoing Program Improvement	39	50.65
Quality Operations of Clinic	28	36.36
Adequate Facilities	18	23.38
Support and Cooperation within the WIC Program	42	54.55
Support from the Community and Other Services	14	18.18
Vendor Monitoring/Cooperation	6	7.79
Other	10	12.99

NOTE: Based on 77 state agencies

Table 36

Number and Percentage of State Agencies by
Factors Ranked Most Often as Hindering High Quality WIC Services

Most Important Factors	No.	Pct.
Shortage of Staff	38	49.35
Staff - General	6	7.79
Staff Attitude/Turnover	18	23.38
Inadequate Facilities/Materials	24	31.17
Funding Issues	35	45.45
Inefficient Operations	23	29.87
Unresponsive Participants	3	3.90
Geographical/Transportation Issues	16	20.78
Language/Literacy Barriers	3	3.90
Too Many Requirements/Paperwork	31	40.26
Not Enough Time	16	20.78
Lack of Support/Training	24	31.17
Lack of Services for Participants	7	9.09
Vendor Issues	5	6.49
Weak Infrastructure	6	7.79
Other	14	18.18

NOTE: Based on 77 state agencies

Section 5

Sampling and Estimation

Respondent Universe

There were three components to the study:

- A survey of State agencies;
- A survey of local agencies; and
- A set of case studies of local agencies.

The respondent universe was composed of all WIC State and local agencies funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). This included agencies in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. The case studies were limited to local agencies in the continental United States.

The State Agency Mail Survey was a census survey. All 85 State agencies, including those operated by Indian Tribal Organizations, were surveyed. The case studies were purposively selected. Thus the sampling issues, including weighting and variance estimation, refer exclusively to the Local Agency Survey.

Objectives of the Local Agency Sample Design

The goal of the local agency sampling design was to provide estimates on selected current operating features of local WIC agencies, to determine the extent to which change has occurred, and to assess the impact of changes on these features. The focus of the research is on local WIC agencies' decisions to implement certain procedures or to modify practices between 1988 and 1993. Thus, as one objective, it was necessary to use the local agency, which is the main decision-making unit, as the unit of analysis. As a second objective, it was important to estimate the number of participants who have been affected by changes.

General Sampling Design

Any sample design for the present study had to take these two objectives into account and try to balance them. The difference between the two objectives requires some discussion. Since the overriding interest is to obtain national estimates at the participant level (i.e., the number of participants affected), the preferred method of sampling agencies is to sample with probabilities proportional to size (PPS). But PPS sampling would have resulted in underrepresentation of smaller agencies (in the sense that a very small proportion of such agencies might be selected). Pure PPS would have resulted in a sample with a strong predominance of larger WIC agencies. On the other hand, if a random sample had been drawn, participants from larger agencies would be underrepresented. We therefore needed to develop a method that would have allowed us to

provide national estimates of participants while maintaining adequate representation from smaller agencies. In addition, many of the research questions were directed at examining agency behavior and the impact that this behavior has on participants. Thus, it became as important to adopt a sampling strategy that will allow us to say "X percent of participants are being affected by nutrition education procedure Y," as it is to say to say "X percent of agencies use nutrition education procedure Y" with maximum precision.

In general, the probability of selection according to PPS would have reflected the relative proportion of participants served by an agency relative to all participants served. In contrast, the probability of selection with simple random sampling would have been equal for all agencies. In order to increase the opportunity of selecting larger agencies (to reflect issues concerning number of participants) and yet to obtain a fair representation among smaller agencies (to address issues related to agencies), we used a square root transformation that would attenuate the size differences between agencies. The sample was selected with probabilities proportional to the square root of the number of participants, enabling the research to address the needs for information at both the participant and agency level.

Defining Local Agencies

Upon examination of the FNS-191, it became clear that the definition of "local" agency was ambiguous. In some States (Delaware, Arkansas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico) there are no local agencies per se. Instead, there is one local agency (the State) and numerous clinics. In others (e.g., Oklahoma) there is one major agency as large as many State agencies and a few small ones. Finally, there are some large city agencies that are also larger than many State agencies.

Based on conversations with the States, it was found that all had some type of administrative units between the State and the clinics, generally in the form of a regional administrative unit. However, the role of the regional level varies, and based on discussions with each State, it was apparent that some of the local agency survey questions (e.g., staffing and budgeting) could best be answered by the "State/Local" agency with the remainder answered by various regional staff.

Using regional administrative units as the definition of local agency would be inconsistent with FNS practice and would affect the selection of local agencies in other States. This led to the decision to sample as planned (defining a local agency to be one listed as such in the FNS-191 file for 1991, with number of participants greater than 0), but then to subsample the larger agencies as needed to obtain information from the regional administrative units.

All agencies with more than 30,000 participants were sampled with certainty, and it is for this set of agencies that sampling lower level units was considered. A total of 13 such agencies were identified.

Sample Size

The determination of the exact number of agencies to be sampled was based on whether or not the agencies were affected by factors related to Federal and State legislative and regulatory initiatives and by growth patterns during the period of study. This required analysis of the participation patterns for States using FNS-191 information between 1988 and 1991, as well as identification of those States that were influenced by cost-containment and other factors that would have affected participation. For a random sample of 250 agencies, the 95 percent confidence interval of an estimate at the local agency level for population estimates would be plus or minus 5.74 percent in the case of a categorical variable where 50 percent answer each way (the worst case scenario) when one corrects for the number in the population. These figures apply to a random sample, and to the extent that stratification is effective or not, the number would vary. We therefore estimated, from partial review of one FNS file, that we would need a sample between 250 and 300 agencies.

The sample was set at 300 local agencies as listed in the FNS-191. Of these, 16 were nonrespondents; resulting in 284 local agencies went into the final sample.

Stratification

The FNS-191 files for 1987, 1989, and 1991 were merged, even though there was no unique identifier that permitted an exact merger. The State agency codes changed from year to year and the local agency IDs also did not seem to be completely well defined. A match was made on State postal code and local agency ID, and where local agency IDs were duplicated (presumably because they were associated with different State agencies), a match on city was required. On examination of the files, it was found that there were a number of false matches and presumably some failures to match. Thus an exact determination of which agencies exhibited change was not possible. Even on examining the name and address, one was not always able to tell whether one was dealing with the same agency or not.

However, an exact determination was not needed. A stratification variable was established separating slow growth agencies from the rest. Slow growth was defined as less than 10 percent growth. Being classified in this category meant a match had to have taken place (and on examination of cases, it seems that a true match was accomplished in most cases). The purpose of matching was to ensure proper representation of slow growth and fast growth agencies. A stratification with a small number of misclassifications is still useful as a means of increasing precision. The sampled units were later reclassified for analytic purposes.

A second variable was defined as to whether or not the growth from 1987 to 1989 expressed as a percentage was greater than the growth from 1989 to 1991. Thus overall growth and timing of growth formed a two-way stratification of the sample. Each of the four cells was ordered by region and the frame was ordered by size within cells.

The FNS 191 files for 1988 and 1992 were obtained after the sample was drawn and the data collected. These files did not enter into the draw of the sample but were used in adjusting the weights and for analytic purposes.

Weights

Each agency was assigned an initial sampling weight $1/p$ where p is the probability of selection. This probability is 1.0 for the certainty agencies and $(k(n-c))/K'$ where k is the agency size (the transformed measure of the number of participants), n is the number of agencies sampled, c is the number of certainty agencies, and K' is the sum of the sizes of the noncertainty agencies.

After the data were collected, the weights of the noncertainty respondents were adjusted so that the total weights would total to the number of local agencies in the 1992 FNS-191 file. After the adjustment of the local agency weights, the weighted number of participants were adjusted so that they would add up to the exact number of participants according to the same file.

Description of the Procedure Used to Draw the Sample

The 13 largest agencies (all agencies with over 30,000 participants) were first sampled with certainty. Then the agencies were sorted by overall growth (slow versus fast), timing of growth, region, and within region in descending order of size. The square root of the population was calculated for each agency and the square roots were added. The total was divided by 287 (the number of noncertainty agencies to be sampled) and this ratio became the interval size. At this point it was verified that no agency's size measure (square root of the participant total) exceeded the interval size. A random number from 0 to the interval size was selected. The cumulative sum of the size measures was obtained for each agency, thus defining a segment for each agency. The agency in whose segment the starting point fell was sampled. Then one interval was added to the starting point and the segment in which that number fell determined the next sampled number. The process was repeated until all 287 noncertainty agencies were sampled.

To represent this quantitatively let $X_1 \dots X_k$ represent the noncertainty agencies ordered by region and size (the square root of the population) within region. Let $s_1 \dots s_k$ correspond to the measure of size of each agency. Let $b = (s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_k)/287$. Now let $c_j = s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_j$ where $c_0 = 0$. A random starting value e is selected between 0 and b . The sample is the set of noncertainties X_j for which $c_{j-1} < e + ib \leq c_j$ for some integer i where $0 \leq i \leq 286$.

Standard Error

Standard error estimations were carried out using SUDAAN (Professional Software for Survey Data Analysis), software developed by Research Triangle Institute, that calculates Taylor series standard error estimates. However, SUDAAN does not calculate standard errors for the design

used in this study. Indeed, since the sample was drawn systematically, there is no unbiased estimate of the variance. However, there are a number of approximations that are commonly used. The most common of these is obtained by collapsing the noncertainty units into strata of two or three, where adjacent units in the systematic order are placed in the same stratum. Then one calculates the variance for a PPS sample without replacement.

One must take into account that the sampling intervals do not correspond to where the size of the local agencies will fall. Thus the probabilities of selection will not be exact but will be sufficiently close to make the design correspond with a fair degree of accuracy to the one used.

The design was prepared such that each sampled unit was assigned to a stratum, corresponding to the segment of the frame from which it was sampled. These were arranged so that the size measures were as equal as possible among the strata. Unit nonresponses also required special treatment. Strata yielding unit nonresponse were omitted, but population counts for those strata were added to the remaining strata. This is essentially equivalent to spreading nonresponse across strata (since adjustments were made to the totals for the entire population). Then adjacent pairs of strata were collapsed (with one collapsed cell of three sampled units). Certainty units were assigned a cell of their own. All certainty units were respondents.

The SUDAAN procedure for unequal probability sampling of PSUs without replacement was used. Joint probabilities of selection used the approximation presented by Hartley and Rao (Hartley, H.O. and Rao, J.N.K. 1962. Sampling with unequal probabilities and without replacement, *Ann. Math. Statist.* 33, pp. 350-374).

For most of the tables there was no second stage sample. The crosstabulation procedure was used, using either the adjusted weights or the adjusted weighted participant counts as weights. Because the weights had been adjusted to a fixed total, there was no variance in the total; instead of using the variance of the weights, the product of the variance of the percentage and the total count was used.

The exception was in the estimation of the variance for tables referring to principal clinics. Here the agency weights had been adjusted, but not the principal clinic weights. It was decided that the weight variances (which provide variances for the total) would present a conservative estimate, given that they do not take into account the partial adjustment. Here a second stage sample was defined, but one where 100 percent of the principal clinics were sampled.

Section 6

Survey Instrumentation

LOCAL WIC AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE WIC DYNAMICS STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The WIC program has undergone many changes in the last few years. There have been some new program requirements and the number of WIC participants has grown nationally. These changes have probably had an effect on your agency and have modified the way your agency provides services to WIC participants.

Because the experience of your agency will assist in the planning for the future of WIC, we would like to find out how the WIC program is operating in your agency and what concerns you have. At the present time there is considerable discussion about the impact of potential WIC funding and participation increases. We are particularly interested in learning about how agencies currently operate, how this differs from the past, and changes that might occur in the future.

This questionnaire has three major sections. The first section asks you to describe how you view changes that have occurred in the program since 1988. The second and third sections ask you to describe your local agency and the services that you provide.

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

[LABEL]

Is information on the above label correct? If not, change any incorrect information. Thank you.

INSTRUCTIONS

Most of these questions should be answered by the **WIC Director**. Other WIC staff members may also have information that will help in answering the questions.

In the space provided below, please enter your name, title, phone number, and the date on which you completed this questionnaire. Please write legibly in this section and throughout the questionnaire. You may be contacted by staff from Macro International if any of your answers need clarification. If you have questions about any of the items please call Ms. Cindy Morgan or Ms. JoAnn Kuchak collect at (301) 588-5484.

Your name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Date: _____

To analyze your answers, we need to know if your agency was sub-divided or consolidated at any time from 1988 to the present. If so, please list the name of each affected agency on the lines below and check whether the agency was consolidated with your agency or split off from your agency.

	Consolidated With	Separated From
_____	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐

CONFIDENTIALITY

Although we ask for identifying information for follow-up, your responses will be held confidential by Macro International and names will not, under any circumstances, be shown to USDA/FNS. All information obtained from this survey will be presented in the aggregate or contained in a computerized file of responses without identifiers.

OUR THANKS

We know how busy all WIC staff are and are grateful for your cooperation. We hope you view this as an opportunity to be heard and have input into decisions made at the national level.

PART I CHANGES IN THE WIC PROGRAM AND THEIR IMPACTS ON LOCAL AGENCIES

SECTION A GROWTH AND CAPACITY

1a. Since 1988, this agency's caseload has: *[Check one.]*

Decreased	Stayed About the Same	Increased
☐	☐	☐

1b. How would you characterize these changes in caseload? *[Check one.]*

- ☐ No changes in caseload since 1988
- ☐ Generally steady growth
- ☐ Generally steady decline
- ☐ Growth every year, with one or more years of peak growth
- ☐ Decline every year, with one or more years of sharp decline
- ☐ Constant up and down fluctuations, with no peaks
- ☐ Constant up and down fluctuations with peak growth
- ☐ Constant up and down fluctuations with sharp declines
- ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

2a. How close are you to **operating at maximum capacity** (relative to the size of your WIC caseload and your capability to deliver services effectively)? *[Check one.]*

Below Capacity	At Capacity	Above Capacity
☐	☐	☐

2b. If your agency tapped all of the resources you know to be currently available to you, up to how many more **WIC participants** could you serve while maintaining your current level of services? *[Please estimate to the nearest 100. Insert number below.]*

SECTION B PROGRAM CHANGES

3. Since 1988, there have been many changes in WIC. Infant formula rebates and additional funding have increased participation, and new program requirements have been placed on local WIC agencies (e.g., drug abuse education, breastfeeding promotion). In addition, many states and local communities have suffered economic hardships. Below is a list of events, requirements, and circumstances that *may* have affected the way local agencies provided WIC services between 1988 and 1992. Please review the following list and indicate for each item whether the item affected your local WIC agency.

[Please check the appropriate box to indicate whether these changes had an impact on the delivery of services at your agency.]

WIC PROGRAM CHANGES 1988 - 1992

Changes	Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
CASELOAD FLUCTUATIONS			
Caseload increases	☐	☐	☐
Caseload decreases	☐	☐	☐
Reprioritizing or targeting caseload	☐	☐	☐
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	☐	☐	☐
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
Federal funding	☐	☐	☐
Availability of state funds for WIC	☐	☐	☐
Availability of local funds for WIC	☐	☐	☐
Downturn in local economy	☐	☐	☐
State budget cuts	☐	☐	☐
Food cost fluctuations	☐	☐	☐
Infant formula rebates	☐	☐	☐
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	☐	☐	☐

Changes	Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
NEW PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
Breastfeeding promotion requirements	☐	☐	☐
Drug abuse education requirements	☐	☐	☐
Homeless service requirements	☐	☐	☐
Vendor management initiatives	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐
OTHER INITIATIVES			
Medicaid expansion (expanded eligibility for Medicaid)	☐	☐	☐
Coordination/integration of services (e.g., one-stop shopping, self-sufficiency programs)	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐
OTHER FACTORS			
Shortages of physicians	☐	☐	☐
Shortages of nutritionists	☐	☐	☐
Increases in non-English-speaking population	☐	☐	☐
Computerization/automation initiatives	☐	☐	☐
Agency reorganization (e.g., changes in local agency catchment areas)	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐

4. Please identify the changes that have taken place since 1988. *[Check all applicable statements.]*

Certification

Yes No

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | Stopped doing walk-in certifications |
| ☐ | ☐ | Started doing walk-in certifications |
| ☐ | ☐ | Scheduled less time per certification per person |
| ☐ | ☐ | Scheduled more time per certification per person |
| ☐ | ☐ | Replaced one-on-one interviews with self-administered forms |
| ☐ | ☐ | Conducted group certifications |
| ☐ | ☐ | Dropped group certifications |
| ☐ | ☐ | Reduced priorities served |
| ☐ | ☐ | Limited caseload to certain priorities |
| ☐ | ☐ | Added priorities served |
| ☐ | ☐ | Other <i>[specify]</i> _____ |

Nutrition Education

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | Increased group nutrition education |
| ☐ | ☐ | Canceled or postponed group nutrition education |
| ☐ | ☐ | Canceled individual sessions |
| ☐ | ☐ | Added more group nutrition education sessions and offered fewer individual sessions |
| ☐ | ☐ | Added more individual nutrition education sessions and offered fewer group sessions |
| ☐ | ☐ | Placed more emphasis on breastfeeding |
| ☐ | ☐ | Increased staff time per participant in nutrition education |
| ☐ | ☐ | Decreased staff time per participant in nutrition education |
| ☐ | ☐ | Relied more on paraprofessionals to deliver nutrition education |
| ☐ | ☐ | Used more handouts and pamphlets to supplement or minimize staff |
| ☐ | ☐ | Increased class sizes |
| ☐ | ☐ | Decreased class sizes |
| ☐ | ☐ | Other <i>[specify]</i> _____ |

Food Instruments

Yes No

- ☐ ☐ Issued multiple food instruments
- ☐ ☐ Issued single food instrument
- ☐ ☐ Issued standard packages more often
- ☐ ☐ Prepared food instruments before determining eligibility
- ☐ ☐ Implemented classes on how to use food instruments
- ☐ ☐ Wrote food instrument at local agency level
- ☐ ☐ Computer-generated food instruments at local agency
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

Scheduling

- ☐ ☐ Began appointment system or rigorously held to appointment schedule
- ☐ ☐ Over-booked WIC participant appointments
- ☐ ☐ Implemented less flexible clinic activity schedules (limiting services to a particular type at a particular time or on a particular day)
- ☐ ☐ Implemented more flexible clinic activity schedules
- ☐ ☐ Extended clinic hours beyond regular business hours, such as Saturday, early morning, or evening clinics
- ☐ ☐ Shortened clinic hours
- ☐ ☐ Extended clinic days of service (for clinics not typically open every day)
- ☐ ☐ Cut back on days of service (for any clinic)
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

Staff

- ☐ ☐ Utilized volunteer staff to a greater extent
- ☐ ☐ Utilized volunteer staff to a lesser extent
- ☐ ☐ Utilized contract/consultant staff to a greater extent
- ☐ ☐ Utilized contract/consultant staff to a lesser extent
- ☐ ☐ Used more itinerant staff (who traveled to the various sites)
- ☐ ☐ Used less itinerant staff (who traveled to the various sites)
- ☐ ☐ Used more paraprofessional staff
- ☐ ☐ Used fewer paraprofessional staff
- ☐ ☐ Used more clerical staff
- ☐ ☐ Used fewer clerical staff
- ☐ ☐ Used more professional staff

Staff (continued)

Yes No

- ☐ ☐ Used fewer professional staff
- ☐ ☐ Curtailed or canceled staff meetings
- ☐ ☐ Cutback training activities for staff
- ☐ ☐ Increased training activities for staff
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

Waiting Lists

- ☐ ☐ Initiated or increased use of waiting lists
- ☐ ☐ Dropped waiting lists
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

Administrative

- ☐ ☐ Postponed or canceled special projects
- ☐ ☐ Delayed completion of "paperwork" and reports
- ☐ ☐ Streamlined recordkeeping
- ☐ ☐ Streamlined case management
- ☐ ☐ Made greater use of computers
- ☐ ☐ Increased paperwork
- ☐ ☐ Decreased paperwork
- ☐ ☐ Expanded case management
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

Facilities

- ☐ ☐ Moved to new facilities
- ☐ ☐ Added clinic sites
- ☐ ☐ Eliminated clinic sites
- ☐ ☐ Made more efficient use of space
- ☐ ☐ Co-located with health care provider
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

Other

- ☐ ☐ Initiated special projects
- ☐ ☐ Planned, scheduled, and held regular staff meetings
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____
- ☐ ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

PART II LOCAL AGENCY OPERATIONS

SECTION A LOCAL AGENCY CHARACTERISTICS

5. How many WIC participants did your agency serve as of November 1992? *[Insert number for each type of participant.]*

	<u>Number of Participants</u>
Pregnant women	_____
Breastfeeding women	_____
Postpartum women	_____
Infants	_____
Children	_____
Total	_____

6. Which one of the following **WIC service settings** best describes your local agency? *[Check the box next to the best description -- check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ State health agency
- ☐ District health agency
- ☐ Multi-county health agency
- ☐ Single county health agency
- ☐ Municipal health agency
- ☐ Community health agency
- ☐ Community action agency
- ☐ Indian health agency
- ☐ Public hospital
- ☐ Private voluntary hospital
- ☐ Private proprietary hospital
- ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

7. What is the best description of the **geographic area** served by your local agency? *[Check the box next to the best description - check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ A single neighborhood
- ☐ A group of neighborhoods
- ☐ A city
- ☐ A portion of one county (or parish)
- ☐ One county (or parish)
- ☐ Portions of several counties
- ☐ Multiple counties or parishes
- ☐ A state-designated health district: *Enter number of counties* _____
- ☐ Special populations throughout the state *[For example, the local WIC agency serves a special population group regardless of place of residence in the state. A public hospital drawing high risk, indigent maternity patients from a wide area of the state might fit this designation.]*
- ☐ The entire state: *Enter number of counties* _____

The next series of questions are about your clinic/service sites.

8. Please enter the total number of **local agency service sites** that provide any type of WIC services.

Enter number of sites: _____

- 8a. How many of these **sites** provide all the following WIC services: certification, nutrition education, and food instrument [e.g., voucher] issuance?

Enter number of sites: _____

- 8b. How many sites have **health care services** available on site or available within the same building complex?

Enter number of sites: _____

- 8c. How many sites have **social services** available on site or available within the same building complex?

Enter number of sites: _____

- 8d. How many sites operate on a **part-time** basis? *[Part-time means the site offers WIC services only some days or some portions of each weekday.]*

Enter number of sites: _____

- 8e. How many sites operate with **extended hours**, offering weekend or evening hours?

Enter number of sites: _____

8f. How many of these sites have been established since 1988?

Enter number of sites: _____

8g. Since 1988, how many sites were eliminated or consolidated?

Enter number of sites: _____

9. Does your agency use vans, mobile units, or other motorized facilities to provide WIC services? [Check one.]

☐ Yes

☐ No

10a. Some local WIC agencies use staff funded from other sources. For the following types of staff that perform WIC services, enter the current number of FTE positions (1 FTE = 40 hrs per week) by funding source. [Enter number.]

Staff Positions	Staff Number of Positions		
	Funded by WIC	Funded by a Non-WIC Government Source	Volunteer/Charitable
Professional			
Paraprofessional			
Clerical/support			

10b. Have these staffing numbers changed since 1988? [Check the box under the appropriate column.]

	More	No Change	Less	Not Applicable
WIC funded staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
Non WIC-funded staff	☐	☐	☐	☐

10c. Do any non-WIC funded medical care providers perform certifications? [Check one.]

☐ Yes

☐ No

11a. Do you currently use any **contract or consulting staff** to provide WIC services? *[Check one.]*

☐ Yes

☐ No

11b. If yes, how many **staff** are consultants or contract staff?

Enter number of staff: _____

What positions do they hold? *[Please specify.]* _____

11c. How many **staff travel** from one site to one or more other WIC sites to provide WIC services?
[Enter the number of staff in each category.]

_____ Professional

_____ Paraprofessional

_____ Clerical/support

12. For each of the following non-labor items, check the box which best describes the **funding source**.
[Check the box under the appropriate column.]

Non-Labor Items	Exclusively Funded by WIC	Exclusively Funded by a Non-WIC Government Source	Exclusively Charitable	Funded by a Combination of WIC, non-WIC Government Sources and/or Charitable Sources
Space	☐	☐	☐	☐
Utilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
Computer equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Medical equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Educational equipment (audio/visual)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (<i>specify</i>)				
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Overall, has there been a change in the level of **funding** for items such as space utilities, equipment, or other expenses since 1988? *[Check the box under the appropriate column.]*

Funding for Non-Labor Items	More	About the Same	Less	Not Applicable
WIC FUNDED:				
Space	☐	☐	☐	☐
Utilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
Computer equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Medical equipment or supplies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Educational equipment or supplies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (such as office supplies, travel, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
(Please specify)				
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐
NON-WIC FUNDED:				
Space	☐	☐	☐	☐
Utilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
Computers	☐	☐	☐	☐
Medical equipment or supplies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Educational equipment or supplies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (such as office supplies, travel, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
(Please specify)				
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐

- 14a. We are interested in the **current suitability** of staffing — that is, the **number of staff** and the appropriateness of their skills and experience. For each type of staff, please check the box that describes the **sufficiency of your current staff** in terms of number of staff and appropriateness of skills and experience. *[For each type of staff check one box.]*

Number of Staff				
	More Than Sufficient	Sufficient	Less Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
Professional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appropriateness of Skills and Experience in Providing Nutrition Education/Nutrition Services				
	More Than Sufficient	Sufficient	Less Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
Professional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appropriateness of Skills and Experience in Performing Non-Nutritional Services (e.g. referrals to social services)				
	More Than Sufficient	Sufficient	Less Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
Professional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐	☐

- 14b. Please identify how the suitability of your staff has changed since 1988. For each type of staff, please check the box that describes the change in the sufficiency of your staff relative to 1988 in terms of size and appropriateness of skills and experience. *[For each type of staff, check one box.]*

Number of Staff				
	More Than Sufficient	No Change	Less Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
Professional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appropriateness of Skills and Experience in Providing Nutrition Education/Nutrition Services				
	More Than Sufficient	No Change	Less Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
Professional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appropriateness of Skills and Experience in Performing Non-Nutritional Services (e.g. referrals to social services)				
	More Than Sufficient	No Change	Less Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
Professional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐	☐

15. Enter the number of vacant positions that your agency currently has. *[Enter number.]*

	Number of Current Vacant Positions
Professional	_____
Paraprofessional	_____
Clerical/support	_____
Total	_____

- 16a. Please check the category that describes whether it is difficult to recruit and hire staff for vacant staff positions. *[For each type of staff, check one box.]*

Staff Positions	No Vacancies	Not Difficult	Difficult
Professional	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐	☐

- 16b. Has the degree of difficulty recruiting and filling vacant staff positions changed since 1988? *[Check one.]*

Less Difficult	About the Same	More Difficult
☐	☐	☐

17. What were the main problems filling vacant positions? *[Check all that apply.]*

- ☐ There were no problems
- ☐ Hiring freeze
- ☐ Shortage of certain types of staff
[specify] _____
- ☐ Salary and/or benefits not competitive
- ☐ Poor working conditions
- ☐ Safety of the facility and/or neighborhood
- ☐ Other [specify] _____

18. What were the main problems contributing to high staff turnover? *[Check all that apply.]*

- ☐ There were no problems
- ☐ Salary and/or benefits not competitive
- ☐ Poor working conditions
- ☐ Safety of the facility and/or neighborhood
- ☐ Work load
- ☐ Low morale
- ☐ Other [specify] _____

19a. Retaining staff once you have hired them may also be a problem. Is it difficult to **retain staff**? *[For each type of staff, check one box.]*

Staff Positions	Difficult	Not Difficult
Professional	☐	☐
Paraprofessional	☐	☐
Clerical/support	☐	☐

19b. Has the degree of **difficulty retaining staff** changed since 1988? *[Check one.]*

More Difficult	About the Same	Less Difficult
☐	☐	☐

20. Indicate the **languages** for which **staff** are available to act as interpreters for WIC participants. *[Check all that apply.]*

- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Vietnamese
- ☐ Cambodian/Khmer
- ☐ Laotian
- ☐ Thai
- ☐ Hmong
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Haitian/Creole
- ☐ French
- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Native American Language
- ☐ Sign Language
- ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

SECTION B SPACE AND FACILITIES

21. In your opinion, is your local agency's **current space** adequate for the number of staff, participants, and program responsibilities? *[Check one.]*

Adequate	Inadequate
☐	☐

22. Do you think the **adequacy** of your **space** and facilities has **changed** since 1988? *[Check one.]*

Decreased	About the Same	Increased
☐	☐	☐

PART III PARTICIPANT SERVICES

SECTION A SERVICES OVERVIEW

- 23a. What is the variation and typical number of minutes that a WIC participant spends waiting for following WIC services: If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter number of minutes.]*

	Waiting Time		
	Variation in # Minutes	Typical # Minutes	Not Applicable
Certification	From to		☐
Group nutrition education	From to		☐
Individual nutrition education	From to		☐
Issuance	From to		☐
Food pick up	From to		☐

- 23b. How has the amount of time a WIC participant spends waiting for services changed since 1988? *[Check one for each service.]*

	Waiting Time			
	Decreased	About the Same	Increased	Not Applicable
Certification	☐	☐	☐	☐
Group nutrition education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Individual nutrition education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Issuance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Food pick up	☐	☐	☐	☐

- 24a. What is the variation and typical number of minutes that a WIC participant spends **receiving** the following WIC services? (i.e. personal transaction time) If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter number of minutes].*

	Time Receiving Services		
	Variation in # Minutes	Typical # Minutes	Not Applicable
Certification	From to		☐
Group nutrition education (Not high risk)	From to		☐
Group nutrition education (High risk)	From to		☐
Individual nutrition education (Not high risk)	From to		☐
Individual nutrition education (High risk)	From to		☐
Issuance	From to		☐
Food pick up	From to		☐

- 24b. How has the amount of time a WIC participant spends **receiving services** changed since 1988? *[Check one for each service.]*

	Time Receiving Services			
	Decreased	About the Same	Increased	Not Applicable
Certification	☐	☐	☐	☐
Group nutrition education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Individual nutrition education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Issuance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Food pick up	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION B CERTIFICATION

25. Please indicate the number of clinics in your agency that use the methods listed for obtaining **hematological measurements**. If your agency has more than 6 clinics please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

Methods	Typically Used	Not Used	Don't Know
On site by WIC staff	_____	_____	_____
On site by non-WIC staff	_____	_____	_____
Off site by health care personnel; results brought in by applicant	_____	_____	_____
Off site by health care personnel; results brought in by someone other than applicant	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[describe]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____

26. In how many clinics are **hematological measurements** coordinated with local lead screening efforts? If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

	Number of Clinics
Coordinated with lead screening	_____
Not typically coordinated with lead screening	_____
Don't know	_____

SECTION C REFERRALS

27. On Site Health Care Services.

For the following health care services, please estimate the number of clinics at which service is or is not available on-site. If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

Health Care Services	Number of Clinics by Service Availability		
	Available on Site	Not Available on Site	Don't Know
Dental care	_____	_____	_____
Obstetrical/gynecological care	_____	_____	_____
Breastfeeding support program	_____	_____	_____
Pediatric care	_____	_____	_____
Family planning services	_____	_____	_____
Immunizations	_____	_____	_____
EPSDT	_____	_____	_____
Other health screening	_____	_____	_____
Medicaid screening	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____

28a. On Site Application for Other Services.

For the following non-health care referral services that may be available to a WIC participant, please estimate the number of clinics at which the service is or is not available on-site. If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

Other Services	Number of Clinics According to Service Availability		
	Available on Site	Not Available on Site	Don't Know
AFDC	_____	_____	_____
Food assistance programs	_____	_____	_____
Social services program	_____	_____	_____
Head Start	_____	_____	_____
Child care	_____	_____	_____
Transportation	_____	_____	_____
Substance abuse counseling	_____	_____	_____
Housing	_____	_____	_____
Adult education/job training	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____

- 28b. For the following non-health care referral services that may be available to a WIC participant, please estimate the number of clinics that offer WIC participants the opportunity to apply for these services. If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

Other Services	Number of WIC Clinics that Typically Offer Opportunities to Apply for Social Services		
	Typically Offered	Not Offered	Don't Know
AFDC	_____	_____	_____
Food assistance programs	_____	_____	_____
Social services program	_____	_____	_____
Head Start	_____	_____	_____
Child care	_____	_____	_____
Transportation	_____	_____	_____
Substance abuse counseling	_____	_____	_____
Housing	_____	_____	_____
Adult education/ job training	_____	_____	_____
Child Support	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	_____	_____	_____

- 29a. In how many of your clinics, have you or your staff experienced problems or difficulties obtaining needed non-WIC services (listed in Questions 27 and 28 above) for WIC participants during the past year? If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimates for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

Number of Clinics			
	Typically a Problem	Not a Problem	Don't Know
Health care service	_____	_____	_____
Non-health care service	_____	_____	_____

29b. What were the main **difficulties**? *[Check all that apply.]*

☐ We have not experienced problems obtaining needed services

☐ Services not available or available on a limited basis.

☐ Waiting list for services.

☐ WIC participants not eligible for needed services.

☐ Services not offered during convenient times.

☐ Lack of or limited transportation to access services.

☐ Other *[specify]* _____

☐ Other *[specify]* _____

30. Since 1988, in how many of your clinics has there been a change in the **amount of staff time spent on referrals** for participants? If your agency has more than 6 clinics, please provide estimate for the 6 largest clinics. *[Enter the number of clinics.]*

	Time on Referrals				
	Substantially Less	Somewhat Less	About the Same	Somewhat More	Substantially More
Number of clinics spending:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

SECTION D NUTRITION EDUCATION

31. Enter the number of **staff responsible for nutrition education** duties who are licensed, registered, or eligible for registration as a dietitian. *[Complete all categories that apply.]*

_____ Total Staff

_____ Licensed/registered/certified or eligible for registration

_____ Paraprofessionals (less than a 4-year degree)

_____ Other professionals (i.e. nurse, health educator or others with a 4-year degree)

32. In the table below, please indicate the **nutrition education topics** offered during the past year.
[Check the boxes that indicate the method used to deliver the information. Check all that apply.]

Topics Offered in Nutrition Education and Counseling Sessions, by Delivery Method	Not Offered	Verbal Presentation (Group or Individual)	Printed Materials	Audio/Visual	Computer-Assisted
Management of the individual's certified nutritional risk or medical condition (e.g., anemia)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Importance of nutrition to participant's health status	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Description of basic good diet	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Major nutrients provided by WIC food package	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other sources of particular nutrients such as iron, Vitamin A, and Vitamin C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Importance of diet for fetal growth	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Breastfeeding	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Handling of infant formula	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of whole cow's milk	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Solid and table foods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Importance of nutrition for growth in children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Nutritious snacks	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dental health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Risks of substance abuse [including drugs, smoking, coffee, alcohol]	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

33. In what **language(s)**, other than English, is **nutrition education** provided in your local agency?
[Check the box next to each language that applies.]

- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Vietnamese
- ☐ Cambodian/Khmer
- ☐ Laotian
- ☐ Thai
- ☐ Hmong
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Haitian/Creole
- ☐ French
- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Native American Language
- ☐ Sign Language
- ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

34. Are any **nutrition education services** currently **reimbursed** by Medicaid? *[Check one.]*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

35a. During a 6-month certification period, how often does a participant receive **nutrition education**?
[Please all that apply for each type of participant.]

	High Risk Participant	Non-High Risk Participant
Once per certification period	☐	☐
Twice per certification period	☐	☐
Monthly	☐	☐
Bi-monthly (every 2 months)	☐	☐
Other <i>(specify)</i> _____	☐	☐

35b. What type of session does your agency employ to provide nutrition education? *[Please check all that apply for each type of participant.]*

	High Risk Participant	Non-High Risk Participant
Individual	☐	☐
Small group (2-9)	☐	☐
Medium group (10-19)	☐	☐
Large group (20-29)	☐	☐
Very large group (30+)	☐	☐

36a. Are the following nutrition education materials and methods used in Individual nutrition education sessions? *[Check one for each medium.]*

Individual Instruction:

	Yes	No
Verbal discussion/ counseling	☐	☐
Pamphlets	☐	☐
Food models	☐	☐
Food demonstrations	☐	☐
Tests	☐	☐
Audio tapes	☐	☐
Slides	☐	☐
Films/videos	☐	☐
Flip charts	☐	☐
Computer-assisted instruction	☐	☐
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	☐	☐

- 36b. Are the following nutrition education materials and methods used in **group nutrition education** sessions?
[Check one for each medium.]

Group Instruction:	Yes	No
Lectures/oral discussions	☐	☐
Pamphlets	☐	☐
Food models	☐	☐
Food demonstrations	☐	☐
Tests	☐	☐
Audio tapes	☐	☐
Slides	☐	☐
Films/videos	☐	☐
Flip charts	☐	☐
Computer-assisted instruction	☐	☐
Other <i>[specify]</i> _____	☐	☐

37. In your opinion, what is the **quality of nutrition education** that your agency is currently able to offer compared to the quality your agency provided in 1988? *[Check one.]*

Substantially Lower	Somewhat Lower	About the Same	Somewhat Higher	Substantially Higher
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

38. What are the **barriers** to your agency providing high-quality nutrition education? *[Check all that apply.]*

- ☐ There are no barriers
- ☐ Space
- ☐ Too few staff
- ☐ Too little staff time per participant
- ☐ Participant interest
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Child care
- ☐ Participant time
- ☐ Cultural issues/language difficulties
- ☐ Difficulty recruiting qualified staff
- ☐ Other *[specify]* _____

39. This agency provides nutrition education directly to: *[Check all that apply.]*

	None	A Few	Some	Most	All
Caregiver of infants (0-12 months)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Caregiver of children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION E QUALITY

40. In your agency, what are the five most important factors that currently promote high quality WIC services to participants?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

41. In your agency, what are the five most important factors that currently hinder high quality WIC services to participants?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

When you have completed this questionnaire, please be sure you have entered your name, title, phone number, and date on page 2 of this questionnaire. A mailing envelope with postage has been provided for your use. In case the envelope was lost, please send this questionnaire to:

**WIC Dynamics
Attn: CSO
Macro International
8630 Fenton Street, Suite 300
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910**

Again, we thank you for your cooperation. Your answers will be extremely helpful to understanding what is happening in the WIC program across the nation.

STATE WIC AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE WIC DYNAMICS STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The WIC program has undergone many changes in the last few years. There have been some new program requirements and the number of WIC participants has grown nationally.

To help plan for the future of WIC, we would like to find out how the WIC program is operating at the state and local level and what concerns WIC state directors have. At the present time there is considerable discussion about whether to increase WIC funding and participation. We are particularly interested in learning about how agencies currently operate, how this differs from the past, and changes that might occur in the future.

This questionnaire has four major sections. The first section asks you to describe how you view changes that have occurred in the program since 1988. The second section asks descriptive information about your agency; the third, WIC program initiatives; and the fourth, other related program initiatives. Please review the entire questionnaire before writing your answers.

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

[LABEL]

Before completing this questionnaire, please review the information on the above label and change any incorrect information. Thank you.

INSTRUCTIONS

Most of these questions should be answered by the state WIC Director. Other staff members may also have information that will help in answering the questions.

In the space provided below, please enter your name, title, and phone number, and the date on which you completed this questionnaire. Please write legibly in this section and throughout the questionnaire. You may be contacted by staff from Macro International if any of your answers need clarification. If you have questions about any of the items please call Ms. Cindy Morgan or Ms. JoAnn Kuchak collect at (301) 588-5484.

Your name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Date: _____

CONFIDENTIALITY

Although we ask for identifying information for follow-up, your responses will be held confidential by Macro International and names will not, under any circumstances, be shown to USDA/FNS. Responses will not be attributed to you or your state. All information obtained from this survey will be presented in the aggregate or contained in a computerized file of responses without identifiers.

OUR THANKS

We know how busy all WIC staff are and are grateful for your cooperation. We hope you view this as an opportunity to be heard and have input into decisions made at the national level.

PART I CHANGES IN THE WIC PROGRAM AND THEIR IMPACTS ON STATE AGENCIES

- 1a. Since 1988, there have been many changes in WIC. Infant formula rebates and additional funding have increased participation, and new program requirements have been placed on the WIC program (e.g., drug abuse education, breastfeeding promotion). In addition, many states and local communities have suffered economic hardships. Below is a list of events, requirements, and circumstances that may have affected the way state WIC agencies operated between 1988 and 1992. Please review the following list and indicate for each item whether the item affected the WIC program in your state between 1988 and 1992.

[Please check the appropriate box to indicate whether these changes impacted the WIC program.]

WIC PROGRAM CHANGES
1988 - 1992

Changes	Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
CASELOAD			
Infant formula rebates	☐	☐	☐
Other caseload increases or decreases	☐	☐	☐
Other cost containment efforts	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
Federal funding policies	☐	☐	☐
Availability of state funds for WIC	☐	☐	☐
Downturn in local economies	☐	☐	☐
State budget cuts	☐	☐	☐
Food cost fluctuations	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐
NEW PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
Breastfeeding promotion requirements	☐	☐	☐
Drug abuse education requirements	☐	☐	☐
Homeless service requirements	☐	☐	☐
Immunization requirements	☐	☐	☐
Prenatal care initiatives	☐	☐	☐
Vendor management initiatives	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐
OTHER FEDERAL INITIATIVES			
Medicaid expansion (expanded eligibility for Medicaid)	☐	☐	☐
Coordination/integration of services (e.g., one-stop shopping, self-sufficiency programs)	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐
OTHER FACTORS			
Computerization/automation initiatives	☐	☐	☐
Other [specify] _____	☐	☐	☐

1b. Since 1988, what have the major changes in state agency operations been? *[Briefly describe below.]*

Since 1988 — Staffing: _____

Since 1988 — Funding policies: _____

Since 1988 — Nutrition education, including breastfeeding promotion and support and use of standards: _____

Since 1988 — Coordination with other agencies and programs that serve WIC participants: _____

Since 1988 — Monitoring and vendor management procedures: _____

Since 1988 — Paperwork, including the development of request for proposals (RFPs): _____

Since 1988 — State administrative rules, regulations, and policies: _____

Since 1988 — Quality of service: _____

Since 1988 — Other operational changes: _____

PART II STATE AGENCY DESCRIPTION

SECTION A BACKGROUND

2a. Does the WIC program **operate in all areas** of your state? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes

☐ No

2b. How many counties remain unserved?

Enter number of counties _____

2c. How many **individuals** do you estimate to be unserved? *[Estimate number or check "Don't know".]*

_____ # of unserved WIC eligibles

_____ Don't know

3a. What period of time is covered by the **state fiscal year** definition?

Enter month and day: From _____ *to* _____

3b. Has the **state fiscal year** changed since 1988? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes, it changed

☐ No, it remained the same

SECTION B FUNDING

4. In addition to Federal funding to support WIC program operations in your state, what **other funding sources** are currently used? *[Check all applicable boxes.]*

☐ State appropriated funds are used

☐ Private grants are used

☐ County or local funds are used in some jurisdictions

☐ Other sources are used *[please describe]* _____

☐ No other sources are available

5a. Has the availability of funding from sources other than the Federal source changed since 1988?
[Check only ONE box.]

☐ Yes, additional funding sources became available

☐ Yes, fewer funding sources were available

☐ No, funding sources remained the same

5b. Has the amount of funding from sources other than the Federal source changed since 1988?
[Check only ONE box.]

☐ Yes, more funding became available

☐ Yes, less funding became available

☐ No, the amount of funding remained the same

6. If state appropriated funds are not spent during the state fiscal year, may these funds be carried forward or must they be returned to the state? [Check only ONE box.]

☐ State funds may be carried forward

☐ State funds must be returned

☐ Other [please describe] _____

7a. Do you currently use an administrative cost per participant formula to allocate administrative funds between local agencies within your state? [Check only ONE box.]

☐ Yes

☐ No

7b. Has the method of computing administrative costs per participant changed noticeably since 1988?
[Check only ONE box.]

☐ Yes

☐ No

7c. What is the current administrative grant per participant for local agencies?

Enter average amount per participant \$ _____

8. Check the box opposite the statement that best describes this state's method of computing administrative funding formulas for its local agencies. [Check only ONE box.]

- ☐ The state considers historical conditions of the local agencies such as the number of participants they have served in the past, the local agency infrastructure, the local agency's willingness to serve more participants, etc.
- ☐ The state considers other factors about the local agency service area such as statistics about the number of people potentially eligible for WIC, the area's poverty level, birth and death statistics, high risk maternity statistics, and/or the percent of need being met by the program currently.
- ☐ The state agency considers most of the factors listed in A and B.
- ☐ The state agency considers conditions other than those listed in A or B. They are: _____
- _____

9. How long has the current method of determining local agency administrative grants been in place?

Enter approximate month and year when current method began: ____/____

10. How many times during the most recently completed Federal fiscal year (October 1, 1991 to September 30, 1992) did the state allocate or re-allocate administrative funds to local agencies?

Enter number of administrative funding allocations and re-allocations _____

11. Indicate the percentage of administrative funds used for local level expenses and the percentage of state-level expenses for the previous fiscal year. [Insert percentage.]

_____ % local level

_____ % state level

SECTION C CASELOAD ALLOCATION

12. Considering current caseload, what method is currently used to **Increase or decrease caseload limits** to the local agencies within the state? *[Check the box next to the statement that best describes your method.]*

- ☐ The state agency assigns a caseload maximum, or number of caseload slots, for each local agency on the basis of the number of pregnant women and/or infants on waiting lists.
- ☐ The state agency assigns a caseload maximum, or number of caseload slots, for each local agency on the basis of the number of eligibles meeting specific priorities.
- ☐ The state agency assigns a caseload maximum, or number of caseload slots, for each local agency on a basis other than items 1 and 2 above.
- ☐ Local agencies must require a certain caseload limit from the state which is then negotiated with the state agency based on additional factors. *[Describe factors.]*

- ☐ Other *[please specify]* _____
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

13. How long has this **method** been used? *[Please enter the number of years.]*

_____ years

14. Listed below are 11 factors that the state agency may consider when assigning caseload increases or decreases to a local agency. Please read the entire list and then rank the factors by whether they are very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not used. Please use the following scale to rate the factor: 1= very important, 2= somewhat important, 3= not very important, 4= not used.

- ☐ The state agency considers the local agency's **Affirmative Action Ranking** when allocating caseload slots to local agencies.
- ☐ The state agency considers the **percent of potentially eligible being served** by the local agency.
- ☐ The state agency considers the local agency's **historical ability to serve** the number of caseload slots allocated to it.
- ☐ The state agency considers the **WIC priority groups** currently being serviced by the local agency.
- ☐ The state agency considers **new or expanded services for high-risk maternity patients** at a local agency.
- ☐ The state agency considers **whether maternity care is co-located with WIC services**.
- ☐ The state considers **first any areas which remain unserved** in the state.
- ☐ The state considers the **average food cost per participant** in a local agency.
- ☐ The state considers the **local agency's proven ability to grow** at a certain rate.
- ☐ The state agency considers **management or staffing problems** which might hinder the local agency's ability to serve participants.
- ☐ The state considers **factors other than those listed here** which it considers important in allocating caseload limits. They are:
- ☐ Other *[please specify]* _____
- ☐ Other *[please specify]* _____

15. In the past when you have had **rapid growth** in your caseload, what was the most frequently used method the state agency used to increase caseload allocation limits to the local agencies? *[Check the box next to the statement that best describes your method.]*

- ☐ All local agency caseload limits were increased systematically by a certain percentage without taking other factors into consideration.
- ☐ Local agencies were asked how many participants they could serve and were generally increased up to the level stated or requested.
- ☐ Local agencies were only granted additional caseload slots if they met certain conditions (such as that they must serve a certain proportion of pregnant women and infants, or must increase the number of Priority 1 and/or Priority 2 groups served).
- ☐ Other *[please specify]* _____
- ☐ Not applicable; we have not had rapid participant growth.

SECTION D STAFFING

16a. Has the state agency developed WIC local agency participant-to-staff ratios *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Yes *[please specify]* _____
- ☐ No

16b. How long have participant-to-staff ratios been in effect in your state? *[Please enter the number of years.]*

_____ years

_____ not applicable

17. Are WIC-funded employees who work at the local agency level in the direct delivery of WIC service considered to be: *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ State employees (with salary and fringe benefits set by state personnel policies).
- ☐ District (multi-county) employees (with salary and fringe benefits set by statewide employment policies).
- ☐ County employees (with salary and fringe benefits set by the various county government units).
- ☐ City employees (with salary and fringe benefits determined by city government units).
- ☐ A combination of WIC employment settings exists.
- ☐ Other *[please specify]* _____

SECTION E QUALITY

18. What are the five most important factors that currently promote high-quality WIC services in your state? *[Please list those factors that relate to your state agency.]*

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

19. What are the five most important factors that currently hinder high-quality WIC services in your state? *[Please list to those factors that relate to your state agency.]*

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

SECTION F CAPACITY

- 20a. In your opinion, at what capacity are local agencies in your state currently operating? *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Far above capacity
- ☐ Somewhat above capacity
- ☐ At capacity
- ☐ Somewhat below capacity
- ☐ Far below capacity

- 20b. If your current local sponsoring agencies tapped all of the resources you know to be currently available to them, how many more WIC participants could your state serve while maintaining the current level of services? *[Please estimate to the nearest 100. Insert number below.]*

PART III WIC PROGRAM INITIATIVES

21a. Has the state developed and implemented WIC program performance standards? *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Yes, they are developed and in use
- ☐ Yes, they are under development
- ☐ No, we have not developed program standards

21b. Do these standards include nutrition education and nutrition services? *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Do not use standards
- ☐ Yes, the standards primarily focus on nutrition education
- ☐ Yes, the standards focus somewhat on nutrition education
- ☐ No, the standards do not address nutrition education

21c. Does the state agency use these standards to monitor or evaluate local agencies? *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Do not use standards
- ☐ Yes, they are used for monitoring
- ☐ Yes, they are used for evaluation
- ☐ Yes, they are used for monitoring and evaluation activities
- ☐ No, they are used for other activities *[please specify]* _____

22. Does the state WIC agency currently sponsor any of the following breastfeeding promotional activities? *[Check all applicable boxes.]*

- ☐ Providing materials—such as pamphlets, posters, etc.
- ☐ Co-sponsoring local activities
- ☐ Hot lines
- ☐ Public Service Announcements
- ☐ Coordinating with hospital maternity wards
- ☐ In-service training programs
- ☐ Peer counseling program training
- ☐ Other *[please specify]* _____

23a. What is the average frequency of issuing vouchers or food instruments to WIC participants? *[Check the box opposite the average frequency.]*

☐ Less than one time a month

☐ Once per month

☐ Once every 6 weeks

☐ Once every 2 months

☐ Once every 3 months

☐ No issue schedule

☐ Other *[please specify]* _____

23b. Does this issuance schedule vary across local agencies? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes, it varies significantly

☐ Yes, it varies somewhat

☐ No, it does not vary

24a. Have your food package issuance policies and procedures changed since 1988? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Don't know

24b. How many years have you been using current food issuance policies and procedures? *[Please enter the number of years.]*

_____ years

25a. What proportion of the local agencies in your state are using PC or mini-computer support? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ All

☐ Most

☐ Some

☐ Few

25b. What proportion of local agencies in your state are using mainframe support? [Check only ONE box.]

- ☐ All
- ☐ Most
- ☐ Some
- ☐ Few

25c. Please indicate, for each functional area, the best description of the **current state of automation** in WIC operations.

ENROLLMENT [Check only ONE box.]

- ☐ Local agencies **fill out paper forms** and send to state or contract agency for key entry into a central database.
- ☐ Local agencies **key data on terminals** linked to a central computer (state, regional or contractor data processing center).
- ☐ Local agencies **enter data on micro- or mini-computer** and later transmit all or part to central database.
- ☐ Other [please specify] _____

FOOD INSTRUMENT PRODUCTION [Check only ONE box.]

- ☐ State produces **bulk automated checks/drafts/vouchers** and sends to local agencies; locals **write manual checks/drafts/vouchers**.
- ☐ State produces **bulk automated checks/drafts/vouchers** and sends to local agencies; locals **produce "manuals"** (i.e., first visit food instrument) using on-line terminals or computers.
- ☐ Local agencies produce all **food instruments on-site** using computers or terminals.
- ☐ **Electronic Benefit Transfer card** is used.
- ☐ Other [please specify] _____

APPOINTMENT SCHEDULING [Check only ONE box.]

- ☐ There is only **manual scheduling**.
- ☐ There is **automated scheduling** on computer at local level, but it is not part of the state-wide WIC data system.
- ☐ There is **automated scheduling** at the local level that is part of WIC state-wide data system.
- ☐ There is **automated scheduling** that is part of a local WIC data system.
- ☐ Other [please specify] _____

25d. Is the level of automation described above a change in automation since 1988? *[Check all applicable boxes.]*

- ☐ No change.
- ☐ Small shift from local recordkeeping to centralized state processing.
- ☐ Large shift from local recordkeeping to centralized state processing.
- ☐ Small shift from central state processing to more locally based processing.
- ☐ Large shift from central state processing to more locally based processing.

25e. Was there a shift in the type and location of equipment since 1988?

STATE LEVEL *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Yes, there is substantially more mainframe equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there somewhat more mainframe equipment used.
- ☐ No significant change.
- ☐ Yes, there is somewhat less mainframe equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there is substantially less mainframe equipment used.

LOCAL LEVEL *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Yes, there is substantially more mainframe equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there somewhat more mainframe equipment used.
- ☐ No significant change.
- ☐ Yes, there is somewhat less mainframe equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there is substantially less mainframe equipment used.

STATE LEVEL *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Yes, there is substantially more PC/mini-computer equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there somewhat more PC/mini-computer equipment used.
- ☐ No significant change.
- ☐ Yes, there is somewhat less PC/mini-computer equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there is substantially less PC/mini-computer equipment used.

LOCAL LEVEL *[Check only ONE box.]*

- ☐ Yes, there is substantially more PC/mini-computer equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there somewhat more PC/mini-computer equipment used.
- ☐ No significant change.
- ☐ Yes, there is somewhat less PC/mini-computer equipment used.
- ☐ Yes, there is substantially less PC/mini-computer equipment used.

25f. Overall, how do you perceive that these changes in automation affected productivity and quality in the program? *[Check ONE box for productivity and ONE box for quality.]*

PRODUCTIVITY *[Check one]*

- ☐ No effect in productivity
- ☐ Substantial improvement
- ☐ Some improvement
- ☐ Some decline
- ☐ Substantial decline

QUALITY *[Check one]*

- ☐ No effect in quality
- ☐ Substantial improvement
- ☐ Some improvement
- ☐ Some decline
- ☐ Substantial decline

PART IV RELATED PROGRAM INITIATIVES

26. Have **coordination efforts** involving WIC and other programs, such as maternal and child health programs, as well as Medicaid, changed since 1988? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes, they have substantially increased

☐ Yes, they have somewhat increased

☐ Yes, they have somewhat decreased

☐ Yes, they have substantially decreased

☐ No, they stayed about the same

27. In your state, does the Medicaid program currently **reimburse for WIC services**, such as nutrition education? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Don't know

28. Does the WIC program currently participate in any **joint program efforts** with the health department, maternal and child health providers, and other agencies to provide services to women and young children? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes, to a large extent *[please specify]* _____

☐ No, not at all _____

29. Does the WIC program participate in any initiatives to improve the **immunization** status of young children? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes, to a large extent *[please specify]* _____

☐ No, not at all _____

30. In your state, do WIC applicants need to **visit a physician or other non-WIC clinic** prior to certification to obtain biochemical and anthropometric data or to verify pregnancy? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes

☐ No

31a. Are there other **new program efforts** targeting low-income women and young children currently underway in your state that relate to and impact the WIC program? *[Check only ONE box.]*

☐ Yes

☐ No

31b. If so, please briefly **describe** what these program efforts are. _____

When you have completed this questionnaire, please be sure you have entered your name and title, phone number, and date on page 2 of this questionnaire. A mailing envelope with postage has been provided for your use. In case the envelope was lost please send this questionnaire to:

**WIC Dynamics
Attn: CSO
Macro International
8630 Fenton Street, Suite 300
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910**

Again, we thank you for your cooperation. Your answers will be extremely helpful to FNS.

