

was in use only in Alabama and West Virginia. By the end of 1966, California, Colorado and Maine had initiated experiments. In the first five years only five States initiated the program, in the next 18 months another seven started or announced their decision to do so. In addition, at least four other states are actively examining the use of Declaration for their program.

#### C. EXTENT OF INNOVATION

The extent of innovation introduced varies greatly. Major variables along which States differ are: (1) requiring an interview with each applicant; (2) extent of organizational change introduced; (3) breadth of geographic coverage achieved; (4) inclusion of eligibility determination and redetermination; and (5) number of categories included. Other inter-state differences which were sometimes reported include; response of clients and staff members; extent of policy change introduced or developed; and degree of community involvement.

#### THE APPLICATION INTERVIEW

All States which use declaration have reduced their investigatory process; only four States however, Maine, Colorado, West Virginia and Louisiana, allow eligibility to be established without an interview. California re-established the interview when it discovered a 6-7 percent ineligibility rate, and despite the conviction that this was largely due to complex eligibility criteria.

The interview is maintained in order to assist the applicant in completing the complex form, to allow the staff member to note possible inconsistencies and areas for additional investigation and to offer and assess the need for social services. Home visits and routine investigation of assets and incomes are not ordinarily required. New York City for example, requires that full investigations of eligibility be carried out only on applicants with prior records of fraud or "other unusual circumstances." Louisiana, which uses declaration for redetermination only, has a staff member fill out the form from the case-record and mail it to the recipient requesting that they indicate any changes.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Organizational changes introduced are directed toward the separation of service from assistance. Surprisingly, organizational changes are not closely associated with establishing eligibility by mail. Maine is the only State to both establish eligibility by mail and to separate the service and assistance functions. Pennsylvania (in four experimental counties) retains the application interview but provides maximum separation. The total assistance function; eligibility determination, redetermination and interim changes in the grant are the responsibility of the eligibility unit. All other States require the service unit to process grant changes, and many involve this unit in eligibility determination in specified circumstances. The trend, however, seems to be toward a separation.

Structural changes tend to follow a three part organizational model; (1) eligibility unit, (2) service unit and (3) validation unit.

The *eligibility unit* prepares or receives the application and determines eligibility and grant status. There was an initial attempt to have the eligibility unit diagnose or assess service needs. The tendency now is to define eligibility determination as a separate task. Educational requirements for this position are reduced and lower pay offered. Service needs may be discovered by requiring service unit visits within 10-30 days of application, mailing a list of services to the client (Maine), or adding a diagnostic and referral interview at the gateway to the process.

*Service unit* innovations found in one or more States include: subdivision into short-term and long-term units; use of a pooled or agency caseload status; group orientation meetings to inform clients about policy and program; use of sub-professionals and volunteers; and a case-conference system which includes the client as participant.

*Validation units* may be staffed at the sub-caseworker level. They carry out a full investigation of a carefully drawn 10 percent caseload sample. Variations range from the use of the caseworker to determine eligibility in a sample of his own cases, to the reliance on Quality Control, rather than separate validation units, with a smaller, one-two percent sample.