

CITY OF NEW YORK, HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION, FAMILY INDEPENDENCE ADMINISTRATION JOBSTAT REPORT, VERSION 19.0

DEKALB(64) Job Center - February 2020

Director: Dawn Moses Since: 7/1/2019

Deputies: Dwayne Holloway, Sharon Harris-McGeachy, Vacant
Executive Regional Manager: Marlene D. Campbell
Regional Manager: Vacant
Deputy Regional Manager: Veronica Lux
Zip Codes Covered: 11203, 11205, 11211, 11213, 11216, 11217,11222, 11231, 11233,11249,11251

Caseload all (cases): Caseload recurring (cases):
Caseload non-recurring (cases): Cases with an individual in sanction status:

Average case size:

Caseload all (persons): 6,519 6,323 196 Caseload recurring (persons): Caseload non-recurring (persons): Adults: Children:

14,061

13,666 395

7,230

6,831

Applications all: Applications recurring: 1,455 925 530 Applications non-recurring:
Applications acceptance rate:

Recertifications scheduled:

| Cen | Center Performance Monthly Score: 57.4 Rank: 11 YTD Score: 51.5 Rank: 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Monthly | Score: 57.4 | Rank: 11 | YTD | Score: 51.5 | Rank: 13 | | | | | | |
| | | ACCESS to | PARTICIPANT SUPPORTS ARE | PARTICIPANT TOWARD ECONOMIC | EFFICIENCY and QUALITY in | CUSTOMER SERVICE | All | | | | | | |
| Center | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Exceeds performance expectations | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 8 | | | | | | |
| Meets performance expectations | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 | | | | | | |
| Approaching performance expectations | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Fails to meet performance expectations | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Citywide Totals (19 total centers) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Exceeds performance expectations | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | | | | | | |
| Meets performance expectations | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | | | | | | |
| Approaching performance expectations | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | | | | |
| Fails to meet performance expectations | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | | | | | | |

| Informational Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | City | | | | | | | | | |
| | Current Month | Variance from Previous Month | 3 Month Average | YTD | Current Month | YTD | | | | | | | |
| Fair Hearing Upheld Rate | 11.9% | 3.5% | | 10.1% | 8.1% | 9.2% | | | | | | | |
| Fair Hearing Withdrawal Rate | 21.6% | 10.2% | | 16.5% | 13.3% | 11.3% | | | | | | | |
| Fair Hearing Request Rate | 4.4% | -1.3% | | 5.0% | 4.0% | 4.6% | | | | | | | |
| SNAP PC Bank Applications | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| SAN Expanse Determination Rate | | | | | | | Report Month | | | | | | | 3 month | | | Year to date | | Prior Y | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|-------|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|--------|--------------|------|---------|------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | | Per | formance E | xpectations | | Center Performance | | | | Citywide | Citywid | wide Performance to Threshold | | | Center | | City | Center | | Center | City | |
| Land Assistance Application Timelinees | | | Low | Excellent | Center Pts | Available Pts | Score | Denominator | Monthly Rank | Performance | from Previous | Score | above | with-in | approaching | below | | Rank | Score | Rank | | Score | |
| Second Control Process Second Control Proc | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Same Day NAP Issanaes resocky avgs | | Jan | | | | 6 | | | 12 | | | | 2 | 10 | 2 | 5 | | | | | | | |
| 4 SNAP Segrate Determination Rate PSNAINING PERTITIONANT SUPPRINT SAFE IN PLACE 5 Missing to Qualitated Chaptogramen Plant 6 Missing to Qualitated Chaptogramen Plant 7 Missing to Qualitated Chaptogramen Plant 8 Missing to Qualitated Chaptogramen Plant 8 Missing to Qualitated Chaptogramen Plant 9 Missing to Qualitated Chaptogramen Plant 10 Missing to Qualit | | Jan | | | | 6 | | | 11 | | | | 9 | 5 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Shirt Shir | | | | | | 5 | · | 344 | 11 | | | | | 6 | 3 | 0 | | | | 14 | | | |
| Shishing on Outdated Employment Plan | 4 SNAP Separate Determination Rate | | 94% | 99% | 5.0 | 5 | 100.0% | 0 | 1 | | 0.0% | 100.0% | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 98.4% | 99.4% |
| 6 Rate of Child Care in Child Care System 9.9% 98% 19% 0.0 6 91.3% 23 12 1.6% 88.9% 4 1 5 9 92.2% 8 8.0% 93.3% 93.3% 93.5% 93. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Table Tabl | 5 Missing or Outdated Employment Plan | | 97% | 99% | 3.8 | 4 | 98.9% | 985 | 4 | | 0.8% | 96.4% | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | | | 98.6% | 6 | 96.3% | 98.8% | 96.4% |
| 8 Re-Dragged utiler Good Classe | | | 95% | 98% | 0.0 | 6 | 91.3% | 23 | 12 | | -1.6% | 88.9% | 4 | 1 | 5 | 9 | | | 92.2% | 8 | 89.7% | 95.3% | 94.1% |
| 8 Re-Flagged after Good Clause 99% 99% 0.7 3 9.75% 19 14 -1.7% 97.5% 6 8 3 2 98.4% 9 97.5% 9 75.5% 9 MOVING PARTICIPARN TOWARD ECONOMIC SECURITY 9 Reported Placements 201.7 252.1 0.0 3 1.20 10 51 51 97.5% 19 136 15 1 | 7 Eligible & Referred to Appropriate Activities | | 95% | 98% | 1.1 | 4 | 95.8% | | 11 | | -0.4% | 95.5% | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | | | 96.0% | 7 | 95.6% | 93.8% | 95.2% |
| Separate Discontents 201.7 252.1 0.0 3 120 16 3.1 97 2 4 0 13 136 15 109 136 10 10 136 15 109 136 10 10 136 15 109 136 10 10 136 15 109 136 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 | | | 97% | 99% | 0.7 | 3 | 97.5% | 119 | 14 | | -1.7% | 97.5% | 6 | 8 | 3 | 2 | | | 98.4% | 9 | 97.9% | 97.5% | 97.3% |
| 10 Cases Budgeted Timely (35 days) | MOVING PARTICIPANT TOWARD ECONOMIC SECU | RITY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 Employed Cases with Current Decumentation 90% 95% 5.5 10 92.7% 5.5 11 -7.3% 92.8% 9 4 4 2 9.5% 5.5 90.1% 84.9% 84.9% 84.0 | 9 Reported Placements | | 201.7 | 252.1 | 0.0 | 3 | 120 | | 16 | | -31 | 97 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 13 | | | 136 | 15 | 109 | 136 | 109 |
| 11 Employed Clases with Current Documentation 99% 95% 95.5 10 92.7% 55 11 7.3% 92.8% 9 4 4 2 95.6% 5 90.1% \$44.9% 89.8% 3.5 4 97.5% 80 3 7.7% 91.2% 2 6 2 9 93.1% 4 90.2% 94.7% | 10 Cases Budgeted Timely (35 days) | Jan | 90% | 95% | 5.0 | 5 | 96.9% | 65 | 8 | | 2.8% | 93.2% | 9 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | 96.0% | 8 | 91.0% | 87.0% | 91.4% |
| 12 (w) Placements weF1A3As (Employment Form) 94% 98% 3.5 4 97.5% 80 3 7.7% 91.2% 2 6 2 9 93.1% 4 90.2% 94.7% 94. | 11 Employed Cases with Current Documentation | | 90% | 95% | 5.5 | 10 | 92.7% | 55 | 11 | | -7.3% | 92.8% | 9 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | | 95.6% | 5 | 90.1% | 84.9% | 89.9% |
| ENSURING EFFICIENCY and QUALITY in CENTER ADMINISTRATION | 12 % Placements w/FIA3As (Employment Form) | | 94% | 98% | 3.5 | 4 | 97.5% | 80 | 3 | | 7.7% | 91.2% | 2 | 6 | 2 | 9 | | | 93.1% | 4 | 90.2% | 94.7% | 93.7% |
| 14 SNAP (EQAS) Payment Error Rate (FFY) | ENSURING EFFICIENCY and QUALITY in CENTER AI | DMINISTR | ATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 SNAP (EQAS) Payment Error Rate (FTY) | 13 Training Attendance Rate | Jan | 97% | 100% | 2.0 | 2 | 100.0% | 74 | 1 | | 6.3% | 96.7% | 0 | 15 | 2 | 2 | | | 96.7% | 12 | 95.1% | 97.2% | 96.7% |
| 15 SNAP (EQAS) Agency Payment Error Rate Nov 4% 2% 3.0 7 0.00% 1 0.0% 1.4% 16 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | Nov | 6% | 2% | 2.0 | 2 | 0.0% | | 1 | | 0.0% | 2.1% | 16 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | | | | | 1.9% | 3.3% |
| 16 SNAP (EQAS) Case Error Rate Nov 4% 2% 3.0 3 0.00% 1 0.0% 4.2% 15 0 4 0 0.0 17 0 verdue Face-To-Face Recertifications Jan 6 0 0.0 6 8.0 19 6 2 7 9 3 0 5 5 15 2 4 18 SNS Validation 95% 98% 0.0 2 93.8% 32 15 3.6% 96.9% 10 3 4 2 2 95.7% 15 97.3% 98.3% 98.3% 99 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | | Nov | 4% | 2% | 7.0 | 7 | 0.00% | | 1 | | 0.0% | 1.4% | 16 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 17 Overdue Face-To-Face Recertifications Jan 6 0 0.0 6 8.0 19 6 2 7 9 3 0 5 15 2 4 18 SSN Validation 95% 98% 0.0 2 93.8% 32 15 -3.6% 96.9% 10 3 4 2 97.3% 98.3% 98.3% 98.3% 99 | | Nov | 4% | 2% | 3.0 | 3 | 0.00% | | 1 | | 0.0% | 4.2% | 15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 19 % SI over 45 Days Jan 5% 3% 4.0 4 1.4% 140 13 -6.3% 2.7% 17 1 1 0 4.1% 15 3.8% 5.8% 9 2 5 14 5 0 0 0 0 0 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | Jan | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 8.0 | | 19 | | 6 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 0 | | | 5 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 20 Benefits Issued on Closed Cases Jan 40 13 2.0 2 4 7448 9 2 5 14 5 0 0 0 3 9 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | 18 SSN Validation | | 95% | 98% | 0.0 | 2 | 93.8% | 32 | 15 | | -3.6% | 96.9% | 10 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | | 95.7% | 15 | 97.3% | 98.3% | 98.5% |
| 21 RMS State Audit Hit Rate 60% 75% 0.0 3 43.0% 0 18 -3.0% 65.0% 9 6 0 4 44.5% 18 65.5% 22 Non-POS/Non-PAM Transactions Jan 0 0 0.0 0 12 7448 1 0 12 1 0 18 0 12 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 9 1 9 1 9 9 1 9 1 9 9 1 9 9 1 9 9 1 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 < | 19 % SI over 45 Days | Jan | 5% | 3% | 4.0 | 4 | 1.4% | 140 | 13 | | -6.3% | 2.7% | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | 4.1% | 15 | 3.8% | 5.8% | 9.0% |
| 22 Non-POS/Non-PAM Transactions Jan 0 0 0.0 0 12 7448 1 0 12 1 0 12 1 9 9 DELIVERY of CUSTOMER SERVICE Image: Customer Service< | 20 Benefits Issued on Closed Cases | | 40 | 13 | 2.0 | 2 | 4 | 7448 | 9 | | 2 | 5 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | 3 | 9 | 5 | | |
| DELIVERY of CUSTOMER SERVICE Image: Customer service of the cu | 21 RMS State Audit Hit Rate | | 60% | 75% | 0.0 | 3 | 43.0% | 0 | 18 | | -3.0% | 65.0% | 9 | 6 | 0 | 4 | | | 44.5% | 18 | 65.5% | | |
| 23 Spot Violation 1 0 2.0 2 0 1 0 0 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 24 Average Wait Time 60 50 0.0 6 65.0 15 9 51.0 6 4 9 0 60.5 9 53.0 25 CA PC Bank Applications Jan 70.0% 80.0% 0.0 0 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Jan</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0</td><td>12</td><td>7448</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>0</td><td>12</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>18</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td>12</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | Jan | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 12 | 7448 | 1 | | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | | | 12 | 1 | 9 | | |
| 24 Average Wait Time 60 50 0.0 6 65.0 15 9 51.0 6 4 9 0 60.5 9 53.0 25 CA PC Bank Applications Jan 70.0% 80.0% 0.0 0< | DELIVERY of CUSTOMER SERVICE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 Average Wait Time 60 50 0.0 6 65.0 15 9 51.0 6 4 9 0 60.5 9 53.0 25 CA PC Bank Applications Jan 70.0% 80.0% 0.0 0< | 23 Spot Violation | | 1 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 CA PC Bank Applications Jan 70.0% 80.0% 0.0 26 AHRA Account Creation Jan 70.0% 80.0% 0.0 0 | 24 Average Wait Time | | 60 | 50 | 0.0 | 6 | 65.0 | | 15 | | 9 | 51.0 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 0 | | | 60.5 | 9 | 53.0 | | |
| 26 AHRA Account Creation | 25 CA PC Bank Applications | Jan | 70.0% | 80.0% | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 26 AHRA Account Creation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 I IIIely Inquiry Kesponse | 27 Timely Inquiry Response | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |