

Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP

Title	Author(s)	Year	Publication Source	Sample Size (N)	Sample Composition	Data Source	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Variable(s)	Summary of Findings	Limitations to Causal Inference	Exclusion Criteria
The downs and ups of the SNAP caseload: What matters?	Dickert-Conlin, S., Fitzpatrick, K., Tiehen, L.	2019 - Updated version of 2016 published paper, see below	United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service	16,524	SNAP administrative data from Jan. 1990 to Dec. 2016	Monthly SNAP administrative data from Jan. 1990 to Dec. 2016	• Policies related to transaction costs, stigma, and eligibility	• SNAP individual caseload at the state, monthly level from January 1990 through December 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With a 10 percentage point increase in the share of working households with recertification periods of 3 months or less, the SNAP caseload declines. The authors estimated that if all states had implemented the most accommodative policies, the SNAP caseload would have been higher in 2016 than it was. • When the authors examined transaction costs and stigma separately from eligibility policies, they found that such policies helped increase SNAP participation when they were more accommodative (less burdensome) 		
The downs and ups of the SNAP caseload: What matters?	Dickert-Conlin, S., Fitzpatrick, K., Tiehen, L.	2016	United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service	12,852	SNAP administrative data Jan. 1990 to Dec. 2011	Monthly SNAP administrative data from Jan. 1990 to Dec. 2011	• State-level SNAP policies	• Log per capita SNAP caseload (household & individual)	• More accommodative policies, implemented together, led to an increase in the SNAP participation rate		
The decline, rebound, and further rise in SNAP enrollment: Disentangling business cycle fluctuations and policy changes	Ganong, P., and Liebman, J.	2018	<i>American Economic Journal</i>	58,879	County-year / state-year enrollment rates	County-level SNAP enrollment data from USDA 1992-2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary index ranging from 0-1: fraction of 8 state policies adopted • Unemployment rate 	• Log change in SNAP enrollment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When all 8 policies were implemented jointly, there was an increase in the SNAP caseload • The index of all policies had twice the effect size of any individual policy measure 		
Has the food stamp program become more accessible? Impacts of recent changes in reporting requirements and asset eligibility limits	Hanratty, M.	2006	<i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>	12,600	Families with children who have a household head between ages 18 and 60 who is a legal US resident	Survey of Income and Program Participation from 1996-2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food stamp policies • Welfare policies • Economic factors 	• Food stamp participation rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 10 percentage point increase in the proportion of households with 3-month certification periods led to a decrease in SNAP participation rates • Simplified reporting and vehicle exemptions were not significant 		
Short recertification periods in the US Food Stamp Program	Kabbani, N., Wilde, P.	2003	<i>Journal of Human Resources</i>	561	State participation rates in 51 states over 11 years	Food and Nutrition Service Quality Control data 1990-2000	• Prevalence of short recertification intervals (1-3 months)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SNAP error rates • SNAP participation rates 	• A 10 percentage point increase in the proportion of households with short recertification intervals was associated with a reduction in participation rates		
The transformation of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program	Klerman, J., Danielson, C.	2011	<i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>	12,852	Participation rates in 51 states over 252 observation months	SNAP/Food Stamp Program Quality Control data 1989-2009	• Changes in state SNAP policy	• Log aggregate per capita SNAP participation at state-month level	• Broad-based categorical eligibility was associated with an increase in participation, lengthening the recertification period was associated with an increase as well		

Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP

Title	Author(s)	Year	Publication Source	Sample Size (N)	Sample Composition	Data Source	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Variable(s)	Summary of Findings	Limitations to Causal Inference	Exclusion Criteria
Effects of food stamp and TANF policies on food stamp receipt	Ratcliffe, C., McKernan, S., Finegold, K.	2008	<i>Social Service Review</i>	309,065	Households with heads ages 18-55 with income <175% poverty, assets less than or equal to \$4,000	Survey of Income and Program Participation data from Jan. 1996 to Dec. 2003 (monthly)	• 15 food stamp program policies in 5 categories	• Food stamp program participation	• Recertification period was significant when greater than or equal to 13 months, led to an increase in SNAP caseload • Simplified reporting was not significant		
Watching the clocks: The role of food stamp recertification and TANF time limits in caseload dynamics	Ribar, D., Edelhoch, M., Liu, Q	2008	<i>The Journal of Human Resources</i>	22,759 spells in 14,056 households	Households with unmarried heads between 18 and 85 with children <18	South Carolina's case management administrative data from Oct. 1996 to Dec. 2003	• Recertification intervals • Welfare time limits	• Transitions from and between food stamps and welfare	• Recertification policy changes (shorter intervals) and welfare time limits were significantly associated with transitions off of food stamps		
Using a policy index to capture trends and differences in state administration of USDA's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program	Stacy, N., Tiehen, L., Marquardt, D.	2018	United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service	7,156,656	All individuals over age 25 in the Survey of Income and Program Participation	Survey of Income and Program Participation data 1996-2013	• Weighted state policy index	• Monthly SNAP participation	• For a one unit change in the index, the authors estimated an increase in the probability of SNAP participation • The authors found a significant effect of short recertification periods on reducing participation; null effects were found for simplified reporting and for online applications	Correlational analysis; not meant to be causal (confirmed in email from L. Tiehen)	
Why are so many Americans on food stamps? The role of the economy, policy and demographics	Ziliak, T.	2016	Book chapter from <i>SNAP Matters: How Food Stamps Affect Health and Well-Being</i>	2,053,018	Households in the Current Population Survey from 1980-2011	Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement 1980-2011	• Economic factors • Policy (food/non-food) • Demographic factors	• SNAP caseloads • SNAP participation	• The authors found that a \$100 increase in program generosity led to an increase in participation, broad based categorical eligibility led to an increase, fingerprinting led to a decrease, simplified reporting led to an increase, call centers and online applications had null effects		
Leaving benefits on the table: Evidence from SNAP	Gray, C.	2019	<i>Journal of Public Economics</i>	166,747	SNAP program participants in Michigan from January 2005 through November 2011	Linked SNAP and Unemployment Insurance administrative data from the state of Michigan	• Implementation of an online case management simplification tool (in MI)	• Rate of program exit at key verification dates	• Found that retention in SNAP is quite low - in particular, about one half of new SNAP cases are not receiving benefits one year later. And approximately half of those who exit in the first year remain eligible. Also found that using an online case management tool reduced the rate of long term exit at recertification dates.		
Just a phone call away: The association between state SNAP caseloads and the waiver of the face-to-face interview	Pomerleau, K.	2013	Georgetown University	750 state-year observations	Households recorded in the following datasets: SNAP Quality Control, Current Population Survey, SNAP Administrative Data, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census Bureau, Bureau of Economic Analysis	Data from SNAP Quality Control, Current Population Survey, SNAP Administrative Data, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census Bureau, Bureau of Economic Analysis from 1996-2010	• Use of a waiver to remove the SNAP face-to-face interview requirement	• Participation in SNAP as a percentage of total state population	• The author found that states that waived the requirement of a face-to-face interview had participation rates that were higher than states that did not; simplified reporting led to an increase in participation; null effects found for online applications and call centers		

Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP

Title	Author(s)	Year	Publication Source	Sample Size (N)	Sample Composition	Data Source	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Variable(s)	Summary of Findings	Limitations to Causal Inference	Exclusion Criteria
Program recertification costs: Evidence from SNAP	Homonoff, T., Somerville, J.	2019	New York University Wagner School of Public Service and the National Bureau of Economic Research	45,952 recertification events for 34,360 households	SNAP cases in San Francisco County scheduled for recertification between November 2014 and November 2016	SNAP administrative data and data from the Employment Development Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program recertification date Program interview date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention in SNAP/successful recertifications versus attrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were less likely to recertify when assigned an interview at the end rather than the beginning of the month. This is because if the interview is assigned at the beginning of the month, there is more time to reschedule if the interview is missed, and the applicant has more time after the interview to gather the necessary paperwork. 		
Take-up and targeting: Experimental evidence from SNAP	Finkelstein, A., Notowidigdo, M.	2019	<i>The Quarterly Journal of Economics</i>	30,000	Elderly individuals (60+) not enrolled in, but likely eligible for, SNAP based on their enrollment in Medicaid	Calls from study participants to the Benefits Data Trust and the Pennsylvania Dept. of Human Services, administrative data from DHS on SNAP, additional demographic and health data from Medicaid records	Assignment to one of three groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No treatment A letter with information A letter with assistance for applying via phone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollment in SNAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The authors found that fewer participants in the control group enrolled in SNAP over the 9 months after the intervention period, compared to the "information only" group and the "information plus assistance group" 		Ages 60+ only
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload trends and changes in measures of unemployment, labor underutilization, and program policy from 2000 to 2008	Mabli, J., Ferrerrosa, C.	2010	Mathematic Policy Research Report	5,508 (51 states x 12 months x 9 years)	SNAP participation rates in 51 states over 9 years	SNAP Quality Control Data (SNAP QC), available from the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS)	SNAP policy changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recertification length Broad-based categorical eligibility Outreach expenditures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SNAP participation SNAP caseload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study found that a 1 percentage point increase in the share of participants with short recertification periods (1 to 3 months) decreases participants per capita 		