
Appendix C—Source Tables

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 1a.
Verification of QC Rent Components, Third-Party Verbal or In Writing, or Documentation

	NOT VERIFIED		PARTIALLY VERIFIED		FULLY VERIFIED	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
Earned Income	107	(7.6%)	38	(2.7%)	1,264	(89.8%)
Pension, Etc.	5	(.2%)	22	(.9%)	2,404	(98.9%)
Public Assistance	43	(7.0%)	2	(.3%)	574	(92.7%)
Other Income	91	(10.9%)	11	(1.3%)	732	(87.7%)
Asset Income	22	(3.1%)	50	(7.0%)	641	(89.9%)
Child Care Expense	60	(22.5%)	3	(1.2%)	203	(76.3%)
Disability Expense	11	(76.6%)			3	(23.4%)
Medical Expense	98	(7.9%)	163	(13.2%)	976	(78.9%)

Table 1b.
Verification of QC Rent Components, Third-Party In Writing

	NOT VERIFIED		PARTIALLY VERIFIED		FULLY VERIFIED	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
Earned Income	297	(20.7%)	49	(3.4%)	1,091	(75.9%)
Pension, Etc.	62	(2.6%)	63	(2.6%)	2,325	(94.9%)
Public Assistance	170	(25.4%)	3	(.4%)	497	(74.2%)
Other Income	262	(28.5%)	23	(2.5%)	633	(69.0%)
Asset Income	109	(15.1%)	125	(17.4%)	485	(67.5%)
Child Care Expense	83	(31.3%)	3	(1.2%)	180	(67.5%)
Disability Expense	11	(76.6%)			3	(23.4%)
Medical Expense	155	(12.5%)	329	(26.6%)	752	(60.8%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 1c.
Verification of QC Rent Components, Third Party - Verbal

	NOT VERIFIED		PARTIALLY VERIFIED		FULLY VERIFIED	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
Earned Income	1,424	(99.0%)	3	(.2%)	11	(.8%)
Pension, Etc.	2,448	(99.9%)			2	(.1%)
Public Assistance	668	(99.6%)			3	(.4%)
Other Income	910	(99.2%)	3	(.3%)	4	(.5%)
Asset Income	707	(98.5%)	11	(1.5%)		
Child Care Expense	267	(100.0%)				
Disability Expense	14	(100.0%)				
Medical Expense	1,226	(99.1%)	11	(.9%)		

Table 1d.
Verification of QC Rent Components, Documentation

	NOT VERIFIED		PARTIALLY VERIFIED		FULLY VERIFIED	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
Earned Income	1,273	(88.5%)	21	(1.4%)	144	(10.0%)
Pension, Etc.	2,369	(96.7%)	46	(1.9%)	35	(1.4%)
Public Assistance	597	(89.1%)	1	(.2%)	72	(10.8%)
Other Income	820	(89.4%)	17	(1.9%)	80	(8.7%)
Asset Income	557	(77.5%)	84	(11.6%)	78	(10.9%)
Child Care Expense	243	(91.2%)			23	(8.8%)
Disability Expense	14	(100.0%)				
Medical Expense	963	(77.9%)	225	(18.2%)	49	(3.9%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 2.
Percentage of Households by Payment Type and Program Type

		UNDERPAYMENT			PROPER PAYMENT			OVERPAYMENT			TOTAL		
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	179	(17.0%)	(22.6%)	729	(69.5%)	(25.2%)	142	(13.5%)	(20.7%)	1,050	(100.0%)	(24.0%)
	Section 8	412	(20.6%)	(52.1%)	1,279	(64.0%)	(44.2%)	309	(15.4%)	(45.0%)	2,000	(100.0%)	(45.8%)
	Total	591	(19.4%)	(74.7%)	2,009	(65.9%)	(69.4%)	451	(14.8%)	(65.7%)	3,050	(100.0%)	(69.8%)
OWNER ADMINISTERED		200	(15.2%)	(25.3%)	884	(67.0%)	(30.6%)	235	(17.8%)	(34.3%)	1,320	(100.0%)	(30.2%)
TOTAL		791	(18.1%)	(100.0%)	2,893	(66.2%)	(100.0%)	686	(15.7%)	(100.0%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Table 2(S).
Percentage of Households by Payment Type and Program Type
(Proper payment based on exact match of Actual and QC Rent)

		UNDERPAYMENT			PROPER PAYMENT			OVERPAYMENT			TOTAL		
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	255	(24.3%)	(23.8%)	575	(54.8%)	(25.0%)	219	(20.9%)	(22.1%)	1,050	(100.0%)	(24.0%)
	Section 8	525	(26.3%)	(48.9%)	1,026	(51.3%)	(44.6%)	448	(22.4%)	(45.1%)	2,000	(100.0%)	(45.8%)
	Total	781	(25.6%)	(72.7%)	1,602	(52.5%)	(69.6%)	668	(21.9%)	(67.2%)	3,050	(100.0%)	(69.8%)
OWNER ADMINISTERED		294	(22.3%)	(27.3%)	700	(53.0%)	(30.4%)	326	(24.7%)	(32.8%)	1,320	(100.0%)	(30.2%)
TOTAL		1,075	(24.6%)	(100.0%)	2,302	(52.7%)	(100.0%)	994	(22.7%)	(100.0%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 3.
Dollar Rent Error by Program Type

		ACTUAL RENT (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)				GROSS RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA	Public												
ADMINISTERED	Housing	1,050	(24.0%)	194,354	185.10	1,050	(24.0%)	210,418	200.40	1,050	(24.0%)	20,173	19.21
	Section 8	2,000	(45.8%)	343,424	171.71	2,000	(45.8%)	361,146	180.57	2,000	(45.8%)	43,435	21.72
	Total	3,050	(69.8%)	537,778	176.32	3,050	(69.8%)	571,563	187.40	3,050	(69.8%)	63,608	20.86
OWNER ADMINISTERED		1,320	(30.2%)	239,095	181.13	1,320	(30.2%)	244,082	184.91	1,320	(30.2%)	18,705	14.17
TOTAL		4,370	(100.0%)	776,872	177.77	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65	4,370	(100.0%)	82,312	18.84

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 4.
Dollar Error Amount by Payment Type and Program Type

		UNDERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				OVERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum	
		(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing Section 8	179	(22.6%)	14,431	80.80	142	(20.7%)	5,742	40.46	1,050	(24.0%)	210,418	200.40
	Total	412	(52.1%)	30,541	74.13	309	(45.0%)	12,894	41.77	2,000	(45.8%)	361,146	180.57
		591	(74.7%)	44,972	76.14	451	(65.7%)	18,636	41.36	3,050	(69.8%)	571,563	187.40
OWNER ADMINISTERED		200	(25.3%)	11,809	58.93	235	(34.3%)	6,895	29.29	1,320	(30.2%)	244,082	184.91
TOTAL		791	(100.0%)	56,781	71.78	686	(100.0%)	25,531	37.21	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65

Table 4(S).
Dollar Error Amount by Payment Type and Program Type
(Proper payment based on exact match of Actual and QC Rent)

		UNDERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				OVERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum	
		(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing Section 8	255	(23.8%)	14,661	57.40	219	(22.1%)	5,908	26.94	1,050	(24.0%)	210,418	200.40
	Total	525	(48.9%)	30,824	58.66	448	(45.1%)	13,102	29.23	2,000	(45.8%)	361,146	180.57
		781	(72.7%)	45,485	58.25	668	(67.2%)	19,011	28.48	3,050	(69.8%)	571,563	187.40
OWNER ADMINISTERED		294	(27.3%)	12,064	41.06	326	(32.8%)	7,077	21.71	1,320	(30.2%)	244,082	184.91
TOTAL		1,075	(100.0%)	57,549	53.55	994	(100.0%)	26,088	26.26	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 5.
Gross and Net Rent Error by Program Type

		GROSS RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				NET RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum	
		(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing Section 8	1,050	(24.0%)	20,173	19.21	1,050	(24.0%)	-8,689	-8.28	1,050	(24.0%)	210,418	200.40
		2,000	(45.8%)	43,435	21.72	2,000	(45.8%)	-17,647	-8.82	2,000	(45.8%)	361,146	180.57
	Total	3,050	(69.8%)	63,608	20.86	3,050	(69.8%)	-26,336	-8.63	3,050	(69.8%)	571,563	187.40
OWNER ADMINISTERED		1,320	(30.2%)	18,705	14.17	1,320	(30.2%)	-4,914	-3.72	1,320	(30.2%)	244,082	184.91
TOTAL		4,370	(100.0%)	82,312	18.84	4,370	(100.0%)	-31,250	-7.15	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65

Table 5(S).
Gross and Net Rent Error by Program Type
(Proper payment based on exact match of Actual and QC Rent)

		GROSS RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				NET RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum		# of Cases		Sum	
		(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	(in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing Section 8 Group	1,050	(24.0%)	20,570	19.59	1,050	(24.0%)	-8,753	-8.34	1,050	(24.0%)	210,418	200.40
		2,000	(45.8%)	43,926	21.96	2,000	(45.8%)	-17,721	-8.86	2,000	(45.8%)	361,146	180.57
	Total	3,050	(69.8%)	64,496	21.15	3,050	(69.8%)	-26,474	-8.68	3,050	(69.8%)	571,563	187.40
OWNER ADMINISTERED		1,320	(30.2%)	19,141	14.50	1,320	(30.2%)	-4,987	-3.78	1,320	(30.2%)	244,082	184.91
TOTAL		4,370	(100.0%)	83,636	19.14	4,370	(100.0%)	-31,461	-7.20	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

**Table 6.
Case Type by Program Type**

		CERTIFICATIONS			RECERTIFICATIONS/ NON-OVERDUE			RECERTIFICATIONS/ OVERDUE			TOTAL		
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases
PHA	Public												
ADMINISTERED	Housing	127	(12.0%)	(23.5%)	832	(79.3%)	(23.6%)	91	(8.7%)	(29.3%)	1,050	(100.0%)	(24.0%)
	Section 8	206	(10.3%)	(38.4%)	1,646	(82.3%)	(46.9%)	147	(7.4%)	(46.0%)	2,000	(100.0%)	(45.8%)
	Total	333	(10.9%)	(61.9%)	2,479	(81.3%)	(70.4%)	239	(7.8%)	(76.6%)	3,050	(100.0%)	(69.8%)
OWNER ADMINISTERED		205	(15.5%)	(38.1%)	1,042	(78.9%)	(29.6%)	73	(5.5%)	(23.4%)	1,320	(100.0%)	(30.2%)
TOTAL		538	(12.3%)	(100.0%)	3,521	(80.6%)	(100.0%)	311	(7.1%)	(100.0%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 7.
Percentage of Newly Certified Households Meeting Certification Criteria

	MET CRITERION		DID NOT MEET CRITERION	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases
Citizenship	505	(93.8%)	33	(6.2%)
Social Security Number	500	(92.9%)	38	(7.1%)
Consent Form	479	(89.1%)	59	(10.9%)
Low and Very Low Income	538	(100.0%)		
Meets All Eligibility Criteria	436	(81.0%)	102	(19.0%)

Table 7b.
Percentage of Newly Certified Households Meeting Certification Criteria by Program Type

		MET CRITERION		DID NOT MEET CRITERION	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases
PUBLIC HOUSING	Citizenship	121	(95.4%)	6	(4.6%)
	Social Security Number	117	(92.9%)	9	(7.1%)
	Consent Form	108	(85.0%)	19	(15.0%)
	Low and Very Low Income	127	(100.0%)		
	Meets All Eligibility Criteria	98	(77.8%)	28	(22.2%)
PHA-ADMINISTERED SECTION 8	Citizenship	198	(96.2%)	8	(3.8%)
	Social Security Number	189	(91.7%)	17	(8.3%)
	Consent Form	183	(88.7%)	23	(11.3%)
	Low and Very Low Income	206	(100.0%)		
	Meets All Eligibility Criteria	169	(82.0%)	37	(18.0%)
OWNER-ADMINISTERED	Citizenship	186	(90.6%)	19	(9.4%)
	Social Security Number	193	(94.0%)	12	(6.0%)
	Consent Form	189	(91.9%)	17	(8.1%)
	Low and Very Low Income	205	(100.0%)		
	Meets All Eligibility Criteria	168	(81.9%)	37	(18.1%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 8.
Dollar Error Amount by Payment Type and Case Type

	UNDERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				OVERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)			
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum	
			Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount			Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount			Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
CERTIFICATION	91	(11.5%)	5,270	57.71	80	(11.6%)	2,745	34.39	538	(12.3%)	89,601	166.55
RECERTIFICATION												
Non-Overdue	603	(76.2%)	43,913	72.83	555	(81.0%)	19,712	35.49	3,512	(80.6%)	664,955	188.88
Overdue	97	(12.2%)	7,598	78.56	51	(7.4%)	3,074	60.48	311	(7.1%)	61,089	196.14
Total	700	(88.5%)	51,511	73.62	606	(88.4%)	22,786	37.59	3,832	(87.7%)	726,044	189.47
TOTAL	791	(100.0%)	56,781	71.78	686	(100.0%)	25,531	37.21	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65

Table 8(S).
Dollar Error Amount by Payment Type and Case Type
(Proper payment based on exact match of Actual and QC Rent)

	UNDERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				OVERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				QC RENT (MONTHLY)			
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum	
			Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount			Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount			Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
CERTIFICATION	119	(11.1%)	5,340	44.94	125	(12.5%)	2,830	22.70	538	(12.3%)	89,601	166.55
RECERTIFICATION												
Non-Overdue	820	(76.4%)	44,500	54.23	806	(81.1%)	20,172	25.03	3,512	(80.6%)	664,955	188.88
Overdue	135	(12.6%)	7,709	56.97	63	(6.4%)	3,086	48.90	311	(7.1%)	61,089	196.14
Total	956	(88.9%)	52,209	54.62	869	(87.5%)	23,258	26.77	3,832	(87.7%)	726,044	189.47
TOTAL	1,075	(100.0%)	57,549	53.55	994	(100.0%)	26,088	26.26	4,370	(100.0%)	815,645	186.65

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

TABLE 9.
Largest Component Error for Households with Rent Error (Annual Dollars)

	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
Earned Income	372	(25.2%)	1,600,638	4,302
Pension, Etc.	302	(20.4%)	1,084,576	3,592
Public Assistance	112	(7.6%)	338,180	3,029
Other Income	183	(12.4%)	614,857	3,368
Asset Income	36	(2.5%)	42,993	1,181
Dependent Allowance	55	(3.7%)	27,710	505
Elderly HH Allowance	38	(2.6%)	15,268	400
Child Care Allowance	69	(4.7%)	124,763	1,813
Medical Allowance	292	(19.7%)	314,026	1,077
No Error	19	(1.3%)	0	0
TOTAL	1,477	(100.0%)	4,163,012	2,818

Table 10.
Total and Largest Dollar Error by Program Type for Households with Rent Errors

		TOTAL DOLLAR IN ERROR				LARGEST DOLLAR ERROR			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public								
	Housing	321	(21.7%)	1,469,046	4,583.11	321	(21.7%)	1,128,531	3,520.78
	Section 8	721	(48.8%)	2,514,973	3,489.61	721	(48.8%)	2,151,739	2,985.61
	Total	1,041	(70.5%)	3,984,019	3,826.23	1,041	(70.5%)	3,280,270	3,150.35
OWNER ADMINISTERED		436	(29.5%)	1,143,418	2,623.37	436	(29.5%)	882,742	2,025.29
TOTAL		1,477	(100.0%)	5,127,436	3,471.29	1,477	(100.0%)	4,163,012	2,818.37

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 11.
QC Rent Components by Payment Type and Administration Type

		PHA ADMINISTERED			OWNER ADMINISTERED			TOTAL		
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases
UNDER- PAYMENT	Earned Income	228	(7.5%)	(83.3%)	46	(3.5%)	(16.7%)	273	(6.2%)	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	240	(7.9%)	(74.2%)	84	(6.3%)	(25.8%)	324	(7.4%)	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	73	(2.4%)	(74.5%)	25	(1.9%)	(25.5%)	97	(2.2%)	(100.0%)
	Other Income	123	(4.0%)	(75.9%)	39	(2.9%)	(24.1%)	161	(3.7%)	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	33	(1.1%)	(46.5%)	38	(2.9%)	(53.5%)	71	(1.6%)	(100.0%)
	Dependent Allowance	76	(2.5%)	(87.4%)	11	(.8%)	(12.6%)	87	(2.0%)	(100.0%)
	Elderly HH Allowance	19	(.6%)	(70.8%)	8	(.6%)	(29.2%)	26	(.6%)	(100.0%)
	Child Care Allowance	28	(.9%)	(76.4%)	9	(.7%)	(23.6%)	37	(.8%)	(100.0%)
	Disability Allowance									
	Medical Allowance	94	(3.1%)	(54.5%)	79	(6.0%)	(45.5%)	173	(4.0%)	(100.0%)
NO ERROR	12	(.4%)	(91.3%)	1	(.1%)	(8.7%)	13	(.3%)	(100.0%)	
PROPER PAYMENT	Earned Income	129	(4.2%)	(78.2%)	36	(2.7%)	(21.8%)	165	(3.8%)	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	282	(9.3%)	(57.7%)	207	(15.7%)	(42.3%)	489	(11.2%)	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	63	(2.1%)	(79.7%)	16	(1.2%)	(20.3%)	79	(1.8%)	(100.0%)
	Other Income	106	(3.5%)	(69.0%)	48	(3.6%)	(31.0%)	154	(3.5%)	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	125	(4.1%)	(57.3%)	93	(7.0%)	(42.7%)	217	(5.0%)	(100.0%)
	Dependent Allowance	54	(1.8%)	(94.0%)	3	(.3%)	(6.0%)	58	(1.3%)	(100.0%)
	Elderly HH Allowance	42	(1.4%)	(94.2%)	3	(.2%)	(5.8%)	45	(1.0%)	(100.0%)
	Child Care Allowance	21	(.7%)	(78.9%)	6	(.4%)	(21.1%)	27	(.6%)	(100.0%)
	Disability Allowance									
	Medical Allowance	141	(4.6%)	(46.5%)	162	(12.3%)	(53.5%)	303	(6.9%)	(100.0%)
NO ERROR	1,323	(43.4%)	(72.0%)	516	(39.1%)	(28.0%)	1,839	(42.1%)	(100.0%)	
OVER- PAYMENT	Earned Income	131	(4.3%)	(76.9%)	39	(3.0%)	(23.1%)	170	(3.9%)	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	117	(3.9%)	(59.0%)	82	(6.2%)	(41.0%)	199	(4.6%)	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	61	(2.0%)	(78.2%)	17	(1.3%)	(21.8%)	78	(1.8%)	(100.0%)
	Other Income	75	(2.4%)	(69.1%)	33	(2.5%)	(30.9%)	108	(2.5%)	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	39	(1.3%)	(50.4%)	38	(2.9%)	(49.6%)	77	(1.8%)	(100.0%)
	Dependent Allowance	59	(1.9%)	(93.7%)	4	(.3%)	(6.3%)	63	(1.4%)	(100.0%)
	Elderly HH Allowance	27	(.9%)	(53.3%)	24	(1.8%)	(46.7%)	51	(1.2%)	(100.0%)
	Child Care Allowance	65	(2.1%)	(73.6%)	23	(1.8%)	(26.4%)	88	(2.0%)	(100.0%)
	Disability Allowance									
	Medical Allowance	146	(4.8%)	(51.2%)	139	(10.5%)	(48.8%)	285	(6.5%)	(100.0%)
NO ERROR	4	(.1%)	(73.7%)	2	(.1%)	(26.3%)	6	(.1%)	(100.0%)	
TOTAL w/Rent Error Calc	3,050	(100.0%)	(69.8%)	1,320	(100.0%)	(30.2%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 12a.
Elderly/Disabled Allowances

	NON-ELDERLY/DISABLED HH			ELDERLY/DISABLED HH			TOTAL		
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases
No Allowance	2,119	(99.5%)	(99.6%)	8	(.4%)	(.4%)	2,128	(48.7%)	(100.0%)
Incorrect Allowance	10	(.5%)	(8.2%)	112	(5.0%)	(91.8%)	122	(2.8%)	(100.0%)
Correct Allowance				2,121	(94.6%)	(100.0%)	2,121	(48.5%)	(100.0%)
TOTAL	2,129	(100.0%)	(48.7%)	2,241	(100.0%)	(51.3%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Table 12b.
Dependent Allowances

	HH W/OUT DEPENDENT			HH W/DEPENDENT			TOTAL		
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Row % of Cases
No Allowance	2,217	(99.8%)	(99.8%)	4	(.2%)	(.2%)	2,221	(50.8%)	(100.0%)
Incorrect Allowance	4	(.2%)	(1.5%)	289	(13.4%)	(98.5%)	293	(6.7%)	(100.0%)
Correct Allowance				1,856	(86.4%)	(100.0%)	1,856	(42.5%)	(100.0%)
TOTAL	2,222	(100.0%)	(50.8%)	2,148	(100.0%)	(49.2%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 13.
Calculation Errors on Form 50058/59

	50058		50059		TOTAL	
	# of Errors (in 1,000)	# of Cases (in 1,000)	# of Errors (in 1,000)	# of Cases (in 1,000)	# of Errors (in 1,000)	# of Cases (in 1,000)
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	385	364	81	78	466	442
NET FAMILY ASSETS AND INCOME	350	229	96	52	446	281
ALLOWANCES AND ADJUSTED INCOME	2,050	1,535	182	73	2,232	1,608
FAMILY RENT AND SUBSIDY INFORMATION	637	406	126	80	763	486

Table 14.
Consistency Errors on Form 50058/59

	50058		50059		TOTAL	
	# of Errors (in 1,000)	# of Cases (in 1,000)	# of Errors (in 1,000)	# of Cases (in 1,000)	# of Errors (in 1,000)	# of Cases (in 1,000)
GENERAL INFORMATION	55	55	17	14	72	69
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	1,404	462	68	52	1,472	513
NET FAMILY ASSETS AND INCOME	93	82	145	113	238	196
ALLOWANCES AND ADJUSTED INCOME	335	334	23	18	358	352
FAMILY RENT AND SUBSIDY INFORMATION	259	253	11	11	270	264

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 15a.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components, Third Party Verbal or In Writing, or Documentation

	NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
			# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
Earned Income	141	(10.5%)	263	(19.5%)	942	(70.0%)	1,345	(100.0%)
Pension, Etc.	103	(4.3%)	280	(11.8%)	1,996	(83.9%)	2,380	(100.0%)
Public Assistance	77	(12.4%)	100	(16.0%)	445	(71.5%)	622	(100.0%)
Other Income	143	(17.4%)	124	(15.1%)	555	(67.5%)	822	(100.0%)
Asset Income	59	(9.1%)	48	(7.4%)	543	(83.5%)	650	(100.0%)
Child Care Expense	33	(16.8%)	30	(15.3%)	135	(67.9%)	199	(100.0%)
Disability Expense	6	(100.0%)					6	(100.0%)
Medical Expense	123	(12.1%)	159	(15.7%)	732	(72.2%)	1,014	(100.0%)

Table 15b.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components, Third Party in Writing

	NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
			# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
Earned Income	393	(29.2%)	193	(14.4%)	759	(56.4%)	1,345	(100.0%)
Pension, Etc.	521	(21.9%)	214	(9.0%)	1,645	(69.1%)	2,380	(100.0%)
Public Assistance	172	(27.7%)	71	(11.4%)	379	(61.0%)	622	(100.0%)
Other Income	285	(34.6%)	94	(11.4%)	443	(53.9%)	822	(100.0%)
Asset Income	235	(36.2%)	32	(4.9%)	383	(58.9%)	650	(100.0%)
Child Care Expense	60	(30.2%)	21	(10.6%)	118	(59.2%)	199	(100.0%)
Disability Expense	6	(100.0%)					6	(100.0%)
Medical Expense	444	(43.8%)	89	(8.7%)	481	(47.4%)	1,014	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 15c.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components, Third Party—Verbal

	NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
			# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
Earned Income	1,331	(98.9%)	3	(.2%)	12	(.9%)	1,345	(100.0%)
Pension, Etc.	2,370	(99.6%)	2	(.1%)	9	(.4%)	2,380	(100.0%)
Public Assistance	616	(99.0%)			6	(1.0%)	622	(100.0%)
Other Income	817	(99.5%)			4	(.5%)	822	(100.0%)
Asset Income	650	(100.0%)					650	(100.0%)
Child Care Expense	199	(100.0%)					199	(100.0%)
Disability Expense	6	(100.0%)					6	(100.0%)
Medical Expense	1,014	(100.0%)					1,014	(100.0%)

Table 15d.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components, Documentation

	NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
			# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
Earned Income	1,121	(83.3%)	63	(4.7%)	162	(12.0%)	1,345	(100.0%)
Pension, Etc.	2,053	(86.3%)	51	(2.1%)	276	(11.6%)	2,380	(100.0%)
Public Assistance	533	(85.7%)	29	(4.7%)	60	(9.6%)	622	(100.0%)
Other Income	693	(84.4%)	30	(3.7%)	98	(12.0%)	822	(100.0%)
Asset Income	531	(81.7%)	7	(1.1%)	112	(17.2%)	650	(100.0%)
Child Care Expense	172	(86.6%)	9	(4.7%)	17	(8.7%)	199	(100.0%)
Disability Expense	6	(100.0%)					6	(100.0%)
Medical Expense	893	(88.1%)	30	(2.9%)	90	(8.9%)	1,014	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 15e.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components,
Third Party Verbal or In Writing, or Documentation by Program Type

		NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
				# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
PUBLIC HOUSING	Earned Income	41	(11.9%)	84	(24.6%)	217	(63.5%)	342	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	31	(5.9%)	86	(16.7%)	401	(77.4%)	518	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	16	(9.1%)	32	(18.5%)	126	(72.5%)	174	(100.0%)
	Other Income	43	(23.5%)	31	(17.1%)	108	(59.4%)	182	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	7	(5.6%)	6	(5.2%)	104	(89.2%)	117	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	3	(8.4%)	13	(31.8%)	25	(59.8%)	41	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	1	(100.0%)					1	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	25	(12.2%)	36	(17.6%)	142	(70.2%)	202	(100.0%)
PHA-ADMINISTERED SECTION 8	Earned Income	69	(9.3%)	125	(16.8%)	551	(73.9%)	746	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	40	(4.2%)	93	(9.8%)	819	(86.0%)	951	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	34	(10.0%)	52	(15.3%)	253	(74.7%)	339	(100.0%)
	Other Income	45	(10.3%)	64	(14.7%)	327	(74.9%)	436	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	34	(20.2%)	6	(3.7%)	127	(76.1%)	167	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	25	(23.4%)	14	(12.8%)	69	(63.9%)	108	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	5	(100.0%)					5	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	38	(14.8%)	31	(12.3%)	187	(72.9%)	256	(100.0%)
OWNER- ADMINISTERED	Earned Income	31	(11.9%)	53	(20.7%)	174	(67.4%)	258	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	33	(3.6%)	101	(11.1%)	777	(85.3%)	911	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	28	(25.3%)	16	(14.6%)	65	(60.1%)	109	(100.0%)
	Other Income	55	(26.9%)	29	(14.1%)	120	(58.9%)	204	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	19	(5.2%)	36	(9.7%)	312	(85.1%)	366	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	5	(9.5%)	3	(7.1%)	41	(83.4%)	49	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	61	(10.9%)	92	(16.5%)	403	(72.6%)	556	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 15f.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components,
Third Party in Writing by Program Type

		NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
				# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
PUBLIC HOUSING	Earned Income	92	(26.9%)	62	(18.2%)	188	(55.0%)	342	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	142	(27.4%)	63	(12.1%)	314	(60.6%)	518	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	42	(24.2%)	20	(11.3%)	112	(64.4%)	174	(100.0%)
	Other Income	64	(35.2%)	24	(13.1%)	94	(51.7%)	182	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	45	(38.1%)	6	(5.2%)	66	(56.7%)	117	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	10	(24.6%)	12	(28.5%)	19	(46.9%)	41	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	1	(100.0%)					1	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	97	(48.0%)	19	(9.4%)	86	(42.5%)	202	(100.0%)
PHA-ADMINISTERED SECTION 8	Earned Income	226	(30.3%)	95	(12.8%)	424	(56.9%)	746	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	175	(18.4%)	76	(8.0%)	701	(73.6%)	951	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	87	(25.8%)	40	(11.8%)	212	(62.4%)	339	(100.0%)
	Other Income	120	(27.5%)	51	(11.7%)	265	(60.8%)	436	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	72	(43.3%)	2	(1.2%)	92	(55.4%)	167	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	37	(33.8%)	6	(5.4%)	66	(60.7%)	108	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	5	(100.0%)					5	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	103	(40.1%)	26	(10.1%)	127	(49.8%)	256	(100.0%)
OWNER- ADMINISTERED	Earned Income	75	(29.2%)	36	(13.8%)	147	(57.0%)	258	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	205	(22.5%)	76	(8.3%)	631	(69.2%)	911	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	42	(38.9%)	11	(10.3%)	55	(50.8%)	109	(100.0%)
	Other Income	101	(49.5%)	19	(9.2%)	84	(41.3%)	204	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	118	(32.3%)	24	(6.5%)	224	(61.2%)	366	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	13	(26.8%)	3	(7.1%)	32	(66.1%)	49	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	245	(44.0%)	44	(7.9%)	268	(48.1%)	556	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 15g.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components,
Third Party - Verbal by Program Type

		NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
				# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
PUBLIC HOUSING	Earned Income	342	(100.0%)					342	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	515	(99.5%)	2	(.3%)	1	(.2%)	518	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	173	(99.2%)			1	(.8%)	174	(100.0%)
	Other Income	182	(100.0%)					182	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	117	(100.0%)					117	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	41	(100.0%)					41	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	1	(100.0%)					1	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	202	(100.0%)					202	(100.0%)
PHA-ADMINISTERED SECTION 8	Earned Income	733	(98.3%)	3	(.4%)	10	(1.3%)	746	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	944	(99.2%)			8	(.8%)	951	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	336	(99.2%)			3	(.8%)	339	(100.0%)
	Other Income	433	(99.4%)			2	(.6%)	436	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	167	(100.0%)					167	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	108	(100.0%)					108	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	5	(100.0%)					5	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	256	(100.0%)					256	(100.0%)
OWNER- ADMINISTERED	Earned Income	256	(99.3%)			2	(.7%)	258	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	911	(100.0%)					911	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	107	(98.4%)			2	(1.6%)	109	(100.0%)
	Other Income	202	(99.2%)			2	(.8%)	204	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	366	(100.0%)					366	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	49	(100.0%)					49	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	556	(100.0%)					556	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 15h.
Verification of Form 50058/59 Rent Components,
Documentation by Program Type

		NO VERIFICATION		VERIFICATION				TOTAL	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Dollar Amount Not Matched		Dollar Amount Matched		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases
				# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases		
PUBLIC HOUSING	Earned Income	297	(86.7%)	19	(5.5%)	26	(7.7%)	342	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	423	(81.6%)	17	(3.2%)	79	(15.2%)	518	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	149	(85.6%)	12	(7.1%)	13	(7.2%)	174	(100.0%)
	Other Income	161	(88.3%)	7	(4.0%)	14	(7.7%)	182	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	93	(80.0%)			23	(20.0%)	117	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	35	(83.8%)	1	(3.3%)	5	(12.9%)	41	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	1	(100.0%)					1	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	175	(86.7%)	6	(2.8%)	21	(10.5%)	202	(100.0%)
PHA-ADMINISTERED SECTION 8	Earned Income	607	(81.4%)	26	(3.5%)	112	(15.0%)	746	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	849	(89.2%)	16	(1.7%)	86	(9.1%)	951	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	288	(85.0%)	12	(3.5%)	39	(11.5%)	339	(100.0%)
	Other Income	369	(84.7%)	13	(3.0%)	53	(12.3%)	436	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	133	(80.0%)	4	(2.5%)	29	(17.5%)	167	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	97	(89.5%)	8	(7.3%)	3	(3.1%)	108	(100.0%)
	Disability Expense	5	(100.0%)					5	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	225	(88.0%)	3	(1.0%)	28	(11.0%)	256	(100.0%)
OWNER- ADMINISTERED	Earned Income	217	(84.1%)	18	(6.9%)	23	(9.0%)	258	(100.0%)
	Pension, Etc.	782	(85.8%)	18	(2.0%)	111	(12.2%)	911	(100.0%)
	Public Assistance	96	(88.0%)	5	(4.3%)	8	(7.7%)	109	(100.0%)
	Other Income	163	(80.0%)	10	(4.9%)	31	(15.1%)	204	(100.0%)
	Asset Income	304	(83.0%)	3	(.9%)	59	(16.1%)	366	(100.0%)
	Child Care Expense	41	(82.7%)			9	(17.3%)	49	(100.0%)
	Medical Expense	493	(88.7%)	22	(3.9%)	41	(7.4%)	556	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 16a.
QC Rent Component for Household with QC Rent Error (>\$5)

		50058		50059		TOTAL	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases
Earned Income	No Error	2,692	(88.3%)	1,235	(93.6%)	3,927	(89.9%)
	w/Error	358	(11.7%)	85	(6.4%)	443	(10.1%)
Pensions, Etc.	No Error	2,692	(88.3%)	1,155	(87.5%)	3,847	(88.0%)
	w/Error	358	(11.7%)	165	(12.5%)	523	(12.0%)
Public Assistance	No Error	2,916	(95.6%)	1,278	(96.8%)	4,194	(96.0%)
	w/Error	134	(4.4%)	42	(3.2%)	176	(4.0%)
Other Income	No Error	2,853	(93.5%)	1,248	(94.5%)	4,100	(93.8%)
	w/Error	197	(6.5%)	72	(5.5%)	270	(6.2%)
Asset Income	No Error	2,978	(97.6%)	1,244	(94.2%)	4,222	(96.6%)
	w/Error	72	(2.4%)	76	(5.8%)	148	(3.4%)
Child Care Expense	No Error	2,964	(97.2%)	1,290	(97.7%)	4,254	(97.3%)
	w/Error	86	(2.8%)	30	(2.3%)	116	(2.7%)
Disability Expense	No Error	3,044	(99.8%)	1,319	(99.9%)	4,363	(99.8%)
	w/Error	6	(.2%)	1	(.1%)	7	(.2%)
Medical Expense	No Error	2,810	(92.1%)	1,114	(84.4%)	3,924	(89.8%)
	w/Error	240	(7.9%)	206	(15.6%)	446	(10.2%)
All Components	No Error	2,076	(68.1%)	904	(68.5%)	2,980	(68.2%)
	w/Error	974	(31.9%)	416	(31.5%)	1,390	(31.8%)
TOTAL		3,050	(100.0%)	1,320	(100.0%)	4,370	(100.0%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 16b.
QC Error Cases with Missing Verification in Tenant File

		50058		50059		Total	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases
Earned Income	Verified	111	(30.9%)	29	(33.6%)	139	(31.4%)
	Not Verified	247	(69.1%)	56	(66.4%)	304	(68.6%)
Pension, Etc.	Verified	38	(10.5%)	17	(10.4%)	55	(10.5%)
	Not Verified	320	(89.5%)	148	(89.6%)	468	(89.5%)
Public Assistance	Verified	46	(34.0%)	10	(22.9%)	55	(31.4%)
	Not Verified	88	(66.0%)	32	(77.1%)	120	(68.6%)
Other Income	Verified	51	(25.8%)	5	(7.0%)	56	(20.8%)
	Not Verified	146	(74.2%)	67	(93.0%)	214	(79.2%)
Asset Income	Verified	20	(27.4%)	27	(35.8%)	47	(31.7%)
	Not Verified	52	(72.6%)	49	(64.2%)	101	(68.3%)
Child Care Expense	Verified	18	(21.3%)	7	(22.5%)	25	(21.6%)
	Not Verified	67	(78.7%)	24	(77.5%)	91	(78.4%)
Disability Expense	Not Verified	6	(100.0%)	1	(100.0%)	7	(100.0%)
Medical Expense	Verified	22	(9.2%)	21	(10.3%)	43	(9.7%)
	Not Verified	218	(90.8%)	185	(89.7%)	402	(90.3%)

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 17.
50058/59 Procedural Error: Number and Percentage of Households, Average Dollars in Error

	HOUSEHOLDS WITH RECALCULATED 50058/59 ERROR			HOUSEHOLDS WITH QC RENT ERROR		
	# of Households in Error (in 1,000)	% of Households in Error	Average Gross Dollar Error	# of Households in Error (in 1,000)	% of Households in Error	Average Gross Dollar Error
Consistency Error	162	(42.2%)	118.64	438	(29.6%)	58.60
No Consistency Error	222	(57.8%)	16.32	1,039	(70.4%)	54.52
Allowances Calculation Error	45	(11.7%)	209.79	112	(7.6%)	56.36
No Allowances Calculation Error	339	(88.3%)	39.45	1,365	(92.4%)	55.67
Income Calculation Error	26	(6.8%)	128.95	57	(3.9%)	39.54
No Income Calculation Error	357	(93.2%)	54.36	1,420	(96.1%)	56.38
Other Calculation Error	64	(16.7%)	73.57	225	(15.2%)	76.58
No Other Calculation Error	319	(83.3%)	56.62	1,252	(84.8%)	51.98
Overdue Recertification	51	(13.4%)	48.18	148	(10.0%)	72.33
On-time Recertification	287	(74.8%)	67.60	1,158	(78.4%)	54.92
Certification	45	(11.8%)	20.58	171	(11.6%)	46.84
Any Form 50058/59 Error	204	(53.2%)	100.57	629	(42.6%)	61.10
No Form 50058/59 Error	179	(46.8%)	12.66	848	(57.4%)	51.74
Total Households	384	(100.0%)	59.46	1,477	(100.0%)	55.73

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 18.
Administrative Error: Number and Percentage of Households, Average Dollars in Error
For All Households with 50058/59 Recalculated Rent

	GROSS RENT ERROR			NET RENT ERROR		
	# of Households (in 1,000)	% of Households	Average Dollar Error	# of Households (in 1,000)	% of Households	Average Dollar Error
Transcription Error	1,606	(36.8%)	10.19	1,606	(36.8%)	-7.89
No Transcription Error	2,759	(63.2%)	2.34	2,759	(63.2%)	-1.66
Allowances Calculation Error	200	(4.6%)	47.27	200	(4.6%)	-36.16
No Allowances Calculation Error	4,165	(95.4%)	3.21	4,165	(95.4%)	-2.41
Income Calculation Error	155	(3.5%)	21.83	155	(3.5%)	-17.78
No Income Calculation Error	4,210	(96.5%)	4.61	4,210	(96.5%)	-3.45
Other Calculation Error	436	(10.0%)	10.83	436	(10.0%)	-8.08
No Other Calculation Error	3,928	(90.0%)	4.60	3,928	(90.0%)	-3.50
Overdue Recertification	306	(7.0%)	8.09	306	(7.0%)	-3.97
On-time Recertification	3,512	(80.7%)	5.51	3,512	(80.7%)	-4.37
Certification	538	(12.3%)	1.73	538	(12.3%)	-1.22
Any Administration Error	1,930	(44.2%)	9.65	1,930	(44.2%)	-7.17
No Administration Error	2,434	(55.8%)	1.72	2,434	(55.8%)	-1.41
TOTAL	4,365	(100.0%)	5.23	4,365	(100.0%)	-3.95

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Quality Control Data

Table 19.
Occupancy Standards on Form 50058/59

		PUBLIC HOUSING		PHA-ADMINISTERED SECTION 8		OWNER-ADMINISTERED		Total	
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	% of Cases
UNDER- HOUSED	0			4	(10.1%)	2	(1.6%)	6	(2.5%)
	1	1	(.4%)	10	(2.1%)	8	(1.1%)	20	(1.3%)
	2	4	(1.1%)	14	(1.9%)	7	(2.2%)	25	(1.7%)
	3	4	(1.7%)			2	(1.1%)	6	(.6%)
	4	1	(3.3%)	2	(1.2%)	4	(16.5%)	7	(3.5%)
	All Units	11	(1.0%)	30	(1.5%)	22	(1.7%)	63	(1.4%)
CORRECT	0	76	(100.0%)	35	(89.9%)	101	(98.4%)	213	(97.5%)
	1	341	(99.6%)	477	(97.9%)	723	(98.9%)	1,541	(98.7%)
	2	289	(82.5%)	611	(78.1%)	245	(78.4%)	1,145	(79.2%)
	3	201	(86.4%)	459	(85.3%)	139	(93.5%)	799	(86.9%)
	4	26	(61.9%)	75	(54.9%)	15	(59.7%)	116	(56.9%)
	5	1	(19.7%)	13	(78.0%)			14	(60.9%)
	All Units	934	(89.0%)	1,670	(83.5%)	1,223	(92.7%)	3,828	(87.6%)
OVER- HOUSED	2	58	(16.5%)	157	(20.0%)	60	(19.3%)	275	(19.0%)
	3	28	(11.9%)	79	(14.7%)	8	(5.4%)	115	(12.5%)
	4	15	(34.8%)	60	(43.9%)	6	(23.8%)	81	(39.6%)
	5	6	(80.3%)	4	(22.0%)			9	(39.1%)
		All Units	105	(10.0%)	300	(15.0%)	74	(5.6%)	479

Table 19a.
Frequency and Percentage of All Households by Number of Bedrooms and Number of Household Members

	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS (IN 1,000)																			
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	213	97.5%	6	2.5%																
1	1398	89.6%	143	9.1%	14	.9%	4	.3%	1	.1%										
2	275	19.0%	670	46.4%	374	25.9%	101	7.0%	17	1.2%	1	.1%	7	.5%						
3	21	2.3%	94	10.2%	298	32.4%	307	33.4%	147	16.0%	47	5.1%	4	.4%	2	.2%				
4			13	6.6%	15	7.5%	52	25.5%	60	29.2%	32	15.7%	23	11.3%	2	.7%	7	3.5%		
5					3	12.3%	4	16.6%			2	10.2%			10	42.6%	2	6.9%	3	11.4%

SOURCE TABLES BASED ON TENANT FILE INFORMATION

Appendix C—Source Tables Based on Tenant File Information

Table 2.
Percentage of Households by Payment Type and Program Type (Tenant File)

		UNDERPAYMENT			PROPER PAYMENT			OVERPAYMENT			TOTAL		
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	89	(8.5%)	(26.0%)	836	(79.6%)	(23.8%)	126	(12.0%)	(24.5%)	1,050	(100.0%)	(24.0%)
	Section 8	145	(7.2%)	(42.5%)	1,605	(80.2%)	(45.7%)	250	(12.5%)	(48.7%)	2,000	(100.0%)	(45.8%)
	Total	234	(7.7%)	(68.5%)	2,441	(80.0%)	(69.4%)	376	(12.3%)	(73.2%)	3,050	(100.0%)	(69.8%)
OWNER ADMINISTERED		107	(8.1%)	(31.5%)	1,075	(81.4%)	(30.6%)	138	(10.4%)	(26.8%)	1,320	(100.0%)	(30.2%)
TOTAL		341	(7.8%)	(100.0%)	3,515	(80.4%)	(100.0%)	514	(11.8%)	(100.0%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Table 2(S).
Percent of Households by Payment Type and Program Type
(Proper Payment based on exact match of Actual and DC Rent)

		UNDERPAYMENT			PROPER PAYMENT			OVERPAYMENT			TOTAL		
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Row % of Cases	Col % of Cases
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	129	(12.2%)	(27.5%)	728	(69.4%)	(23.5%)	193	(18.4%)	(24.2%)	1,050	(100.0%)	(24.0%)
	Section 8	192	(9.6%)	(41.2%)	1,405	(70.3%)	(45.3%)	402	(20.1%)	(50.4%)	2,000	(100.0%)	(45.8%)
	Total	321	(10.5%)	(68.6%)	2,134	(70.0%)	(68.7%)	595	(19.5%)	(74.6%)	3,050	(100.0%)	(69.8%)
OWNER ADMINISTERED		147	(11.1%)	(31.4%)	971	(73.5%)	(31.3%)	202	(15.3%)	(25.4%)	1,320	(100.0%)	(30.2%)
TOTAL		468	(10.7%)	(100.0%)	3,104	(71.0%)	(100.0%)	798	(18.3%)	(100.0%)	4,370	(100.0%)	(100.0%)

Appendix C — Source Tables Based on Tenant File Information

Table 3.
Dollar Rent Error by Program Type (Tenant File)

		ACTUAL RENT (MONTHLY)				DC RENT (MONTHLY)				GROSS RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	1,050	(24.0%)	194,354	185.10	1,050	(24.0%)	198,774	189.31	1,050	(24.0%)	14,360	13.68
	Section 8	2,000	(45.8%)	343,424	171.71	2,000	(45.8%)	324,827	162.41	2,000	(45.8%)	31,882	15.94
	Total	3,050	(69.8%)	537,778	176.32	3,050	(69.8%)	523,600	171.67	3,050	(69.8%)	46,243	15.16
OWNER ADMINISTERED		1,320	(30.2%)	239,095	181.13	1,320	(30.2%)	231,537	175.41	1,320	(30.2%)	14,783	11.20
TOTAL		4,370	(100.0%)	776,872	177.77	4,370	(100.0%)	755,138	172.80	4,370	(100.0%)	61,026	13.96

Appendix C — Source Tables Based on Tenant File Information

Table 4.
Dollar Error Amount by Payment Type and Program Type (Tenant File)

		UNDERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				OVERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				DC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	89	(26.0%)	5,758	64.88	126	(24.5%)	8,603	68.42	1,050	(24.0%)	198,774	189.31
	Section 8	145	(42.5%)	6,699	46.21	250	(48.7%)	25,183	100.72	2,000	(45.8%)	324,827	162.41
	Total	234	(68.5%)	12,457	53.30	376	(73.2%)	33,786	89.91	3,050	(69.8%)	523,600	171.67
OWNER ADMINISTERED		107	(31.5%)	3,630	33.84	138	(26.8%)	11,153	80.98	1,320	(30.2%)	231,537	175.41
TOTAL		341	(100.0%)	16,087	47.18	514	(100.0%)	44,939	87.51	4,370	(100.0%)	755,138	172.80

Table 4(S).
Dollar Error Amount by Payment Type and Program Type
(Proper Payment based on exact match of Actual and DC Rent)

		UNDERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				OVERPAYMENT (MONTHLY)				DC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	129	(27.5%)	5,823	45.30	193	(24.2%)	8,714	45.11	1,050	(24.0%)	198,774	189.31
	Section 8	192	(41.2%)	6,814	35.40	402	(50.4%)	25,412	63.19	2,000	(45.8%)	324,827	162.41
	Total	321	(68.6%)	12,637	39.36	595	(74.6%)	34,126	57.32	3,050	(69.8%)	523,600	171.67
OWNER ADMINISTERED		147	(31.4%)	3,722	25.37	202	(25.4%)	11,280	55.70	1,320	(30.2%)	231,537	175.41
TOTAL		468	(100.0%)	16,360	34.98	798	(100.0%)	45,406	56.91	4,370	(100.0%)	755,138	172.80

Appendix C — Source Tables Based on Tenant File Information

Table 5.
Gross and Net Rent Error by Program Type (Tenant File)

		GROSS RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				NET RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				DC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	1,050	(24.0%)	14,360	13.68	1,050	(24.0%)	2,845	2.71	1,050	(24.0%)	198,774	189.31
	Section 8	2,000	(45.8%)	31,882	15.94	2,000	(45.8%)	18,484	9.24	2,000	(45.8%)	324,827	162.41
	Total	3,050	(69.8%)	46,243	15.16	3,050	(69.8%)	21,329	6.99	3,050	(69.8%)	523,600	171.67
OWNER ADMINISTERED		1,320	(30.2%)	14,783	11.20	1,320	(30.2%)	7,523	5.70	1,320	(30.2%)	231,537	175.41
TOTAL		4,370	(100.0%)	61,026	13.96	4,370	(100.0%)	28,852	6.60	4,370	(100.0%)	755,138	172.80

Table 5(S).
Gross and Net Rent Error by Program Type
(Proper Payment based on exact match of Actual and DC Rent)

		GROSS RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				NET RENT ERROR (MONTHLY)				DC RENT (MONTHLY)			
		# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount	# of Cases (in 1,000)	Col % of Cases	Sum Dollar Amount (in 1,000)	Average Dollar Amount
PHA ADMINISTERED	Public Housing	1,050	(24.0%)	14,537	13.84	1,050	(24.0%)	2,891	2.75	1,050	(24.0%)	198,774	189.31
	Section 8	2,000	(45.8%)	32,226	16.11	2,000	(45.8%)	18,598	9.30	2,000	(45.8%)	324,827	162.41
	Total	3,050	(69.8%)	46,763	15.33	3,050	(69.8%)	21,488	7.05	3,050	(69.8%)	523,600	171.67
OWNER ADMINISTERED		1,320	(30.2%)	15,002	11.37	1,320	(30.2%)	7,558	5.73	1,320	(30.2%)	231,537	175.41
TOTAL		4,370	(100.0%)	61,765	14.13	4,370	(100.0%)	29,046	6.65	4,370	(100.0%)	755,138	172.80

Appendix C — Source Tables Based on Tenant File Information

Appendix D—Consistency and Calculation Errors

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50058—Consistency Errors

50058 ITEM	ERROR
General Information:	
1c. Program	Must equal P, V, VO, or MR
2a. Type of Action	Must equal 1 through 15
2b. Effective Date of Action	Cannot be earlier than Date of Admission to the Program (2h)
Household Composition:	
3g. Sex	Must equal M or F
3h. Relationship	Must equal H, S, K, F, Y, E, L, or A
3i. Citizenship	Must equal EC, EN, IN, PV, or XX
3k. Race	Must equal 1 through 5
3m. Ethnicity	Must equal 1 or 2
3u. Family Subsidy Status	Must equal C, E, F, N, P, or blank
3v. Effective Date	Should not be blank if 3u equals C or T
Net Family Assets and Income	
6a. Family Member No.	Must equal a number used in Section 3. Household.
7a. Family Member No.	Must equal a number used in Section 3. Household.
7b. Income Code	Must equal B, F, HA, M, W, G, IW, T, P, S, SS, C, E, I, N, or U
8i. Earnings Made Possible by Disability Assistance Expense	Must be <= the sum of Dollars per Year (7d) for Income Codes (7b) HA, F, W, B, or M
Allowances and Adjusted Income	
8h. Maximum Disability Allowance	Should only be completed if any member is disabled
8j. Allowable Disability Assistance Expense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be <= Maximum Disability Allowance (8h) • Should be 0 if Medical/Disability Threshold (8f) is > Maximum Disability Allowance (8h) • Should be 0 or blank if Maximum Disability Allowance (8h) is 0 or blank
8k. Total Medical Expenses	Should only be completed if the head or spouse is 62 or over, or disabled; otherwise it should be blank
8n. Medical/Disability Assistance Allowance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should equal Total Annual Disability Assistance and Medical Expense (8m) minus Medical/disability Threshold (8f) if Allowable Disability Expense (8j) is blank or Total Annual Unreimbursed Disability Assistance Expense (8g) is less than Medical /disability Threshold (8f)

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50058 ITEM	ERROR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should equal Total Annual Disability Assistance and Medical Expense (8m) if 8 Total Annual Unreimbursed Disability Assistance Expense (8g) and Allowable Disability Expense (8j) is \geq Medical/disability Threshold (8f)
8p. Elderly/Disability Allowance	Should be \$400 if head or spouse is 62 or over, or disabled; otherwise it should be 0 or blank
8s. Dependent Allowance	Must be completed if the household contains a member under age 18, disabled, or a full-time student (excluding the head, spouse, foster child or adult, or live-in attendant)
8t. Yearly Child Care Cost That Is Not Reimbursed (Child Care Allowance)	Should only be completed if any member is less than 13 years old
Family Rent and Subsidy Information	
10a. 11q, 12r, 13j, 14s TTP	Must equal TTP (9j) or blank
10a. through 14ag. Rent Calculations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Program (1c) = P: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTP (10a), must be completed; Flat Rent (10b), or Tenant Rent (10f), or Mixed Family Tenant Rent (10s) must be completed; Section 11 through 14 must be blank. If Program (1c) = VO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 10, 11, and 13 must be blank. If Program (1c) = MR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Rent to Owner (13h) must be completed; Tenant Rent (13k), or Mixed Family Tenant Rent (13x) must be completed; Sections 10, 11, 12, and 14 must be blank.

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50059 - Consistency Errors

50059 ITEM	ERROR
General Information:	
1. Effective Date	Cannot be earlier than Date Tenant Moved into Project (2.)
6a. Action Processed	Must equal 1 through 5
6b. Action Processed	Must equal 1 through 4, or blank
7. Type of Subsidy	Must equal 1 through 9
9a. Race of Head of Household	Must equal 1 through 4
9b. Ethnicity of Head of Household	Must equal 1 or 2
Household Composition	
16. Sex	Must equal M or F
19. Special Status Code	Must equal E, S, H, F, J, or blank; should be E if Age > 61
21. Eligibility Code (Citizenship)	Must equal EC, EN, IC, IN, IP, PV, or XX
Net Family Assets and Income	
26b. C or I	Must equal C or I
28. Family Member No.	Should not be greater than the total number of members listed in item 13 (Family Member Number)
Allowances and Adjusted Income	
36. Dependent Allowance	Must be completed if the household contains a member under age 18, disabled, or a full-time student (excluding the head, spouse, foster child or adult, or live-in attendant)
37. Child Care Allowance	Should only be completed if any member is less than 13 years old
39a. Total Handicapped Expenses	Should be 0 or blank if Care Code (28a) is not equal to H, or CH
39b. Handicapped Allowance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be <= Handicap Expenses (39a) • Should be 0 if 3% of Annual Income (38) is > Total Handicapped Assistance Expenses (39a) • Should be 0 or blank if Total Handicapped Assistance Expenses (39a) is 0 or blank
40a. Total Medical Expenses	Should only be completed if the head or spouse = H or E, or age 62 years old or older
41. Elderly Household Allowance	Should be \$400 if the Special Status Code for the head or spouse = H or E; otherwise it should be 0 or blank
Family Rent and Subsidy Information:	
51. Tenant Rent	Should equal the maximum of TTP (50) minus Utility Allowance (45) or 0
52. Utility Reimbursement	Should be blank if Item 45 < Item 50

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50058 - Calculation Errors

50058 ITEM	ERROR CALCULATION
Household Composition:	
3f. Age	Must equal the age calculated based on Date of Birth (3e) and Effective Date of Action (2b)
8q. Number of Dependents	Must equal the number of household members under 18, with a disability, or a full-time student (other than head, spouse co-head, foster child/adult, or live-in aide)
Net Family Assets and Income	
6f. Total Asset Value	Must equal the sum of all values in Cash Value of Asset (6d)
6i. Imputed Asset Income	Must equal Total Cash Value of Asset (6f) * Passbook Rate (6h) if Total Value of Assets (6f) is > \$5,000. If Total Value of Assets (6f) is <= \$5,000 Imputed Asset Income (6i) = 0
6j. Income from Asset	Must equal the larger of Total Anticipated Income (6g) or Imputed Asset Income (6i)
7g. Total Non Asset Income	Must equal the sum of all values in Income After Exclusions (7f)
7i. Total Annual Income	Must equal (Final Asset Income (6j) + Total Income Other Than Assets (7g))
Allowances and Adjusted Income	
8e. Total Permissible Deductions	Must equal the sum of all values in Amount of Permissible deduction (8d)
8f. 3% of Annual Income	Must equal 3% * Total Annual Income (8a)
8h. Disability Allowance	Must equal Total Annual Unreimbursed Disability Assistance Expense (8g) minus Medical/Disability Threshold (8f) if there is a disabled household member, and if there is earned income greater than or equal to the disability expense
8n. Medical Allowance	Must equal: Total Annual Disability Assistance and Medical Expense (8m) minus Medical/disability Threshold (8f) if Allowable Disability Assistance Expense (8j) is blank or Total Annual Unreimbursed Disability Assistance Expense (8g) is less than Medical/disability Threshold (8f); or equal Total Annual Disability Assistance and Medical Expense (8m) if Total Annual Unreimbursed Disability Assistance Expense (8g) and Allowable Disability Assistance Expense (8j) is >= Medical/Disability Threshold (8f); if the head, spouse, or co-head is elderly or disabled
8p. Elderly Allowance	Must equal \$400 if head, spouse, or co-head is elderly or disabled
8s. Dependent Allowance	Must equal Number of Dependents (8q) * \$480

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50058 ITEM	ERROR CALCULATION
8x. Total Allowance	Must equal Total Permissible Deductions (8e) + Medical /Disability Assistance Allowance (8n) + Elderly/Disability Allowance (8p) + Dependent Allowance (8s) + Total Annual Unreimbursed Childcare Costs (8t) + Total Annual Travel Cost to Work/School (8u)
8y. Adjusted Annual Income	Must equal Total Annual Income (8a) minus Total Allowances (8x)
Family Rent and Subsidy Information	
9j. Total Tenant Payment	Must equal the highest of TTP if Based on Annual Income (9c), TTP if Based on Adjusted Annual Income (9f), Welfare Rent (9g), Minimum Rent (9h), or Enhanced Voucher Minimum Rent (9i).
12p. Gross Rent	Must equal Rent to Owner (12k) + Utility Allowance (12m)
Tenant Rent	Tenant Rent must equal the recalculated tenant rent based on the Rent Calculation rules provided in Appendix A

* With the exception of tenant rent, negative numbers are always converted to 0.

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50059 - Calculation Errors

50059 ITEM	ERROR
Household Composition:	
18. Age	Must equal age calculated based on Date of Birth (17) and Effective Date of Action (1)
24a. Number of Family Members	Must equal the number of family members listed
24b. Number of Foster Children and Live in Aides	Must equal the number of family members listed with a relationship code of "L" or "F"
25. Number of Dependents	Must equal the number of household members under 18, with a disability, or a full-time student (other than head, spouse co-head, foster child/adult, or live-in aide)
Net Family Assets and Income	
26c. Total Asset Value	Must equal the sum of the asset values in Cash Value of Assets (26c)
26d. Asset Income Sum	Must equal the sum of the income values in Actual Yearly Income From Assets (26d)
27. Imputed Asset Income	Must equal Total Asset Value (26c) * 2%, if Total Value of Assets is > \$5,000
28b. Earned Income Sum	Must equal the sum of income values in Employment or Business (28b)
28c. Pension Income Sum	Must equal the sum of the income values in Social Security/Pension (28c)
28d. Public Assistance Income Sum	Must equal the sum of the income values in Public Assistance (28d)
28e. Other Income Sum	Must equal the sum of the income values in Other Income (28e)
29. Total Non Asset Income	Must equal Earned Income Sum (28b) + Pension Income Sum (28c) + Public Assistance Income Sum (28d) + Other Income Sum (28e)
30. Income from Asset	Must equal the greater of Imputed Asset Income (27) or Total Asset Income (26d)
31. Total Annual Income	Must equal Total Non Asset Income (29) + Income from Asset (30)
Allowances and Adjusted Income	
36. Dependent Allowance	Must equal Number of Dependents (25) * \$480
38. 3% of Annual Income	Must equal Total Annual Income (31) * .03
39b. Disability Allowance	Must equal Total Disability Expenses (39a) minus 3% of Annual Income (38) if there is a disabled household member, and if there is earned income greater than or equal to the disability expense

Appendix D—Consistency/Calculations

50059 ITEM	ERROR
40b. Medical Allowance	Must equal Total Medical Expenses (40a) minus 3% of Annual Income (38) if Total Handicapped Assistance Expense (39a) = 0; or if (Disability Allowance (39b) = 0, then Medical Allowance (40b) = Total Medical Expenses (40a) + Total Handicapped Assistance Expenses (39a) – 3% of Annual Income (38), if the head, spouse, or co-head is elderly or disabled
41. Elderly Allowance	Must equal \$400 if head, spouse, or co-head is elderly or disabled
42. Total Allowance	Must equal Allowance for Dependents (36) + Child Care Allowance (37) + Allowance for Disability Expenses (39b) + Allowance for Medical Expenses (40b) + Elderly Household Allowance (41)
43. Adjusted Annual Income	Must equal Total Annual Income (31) minus Total Allowances (42)
Family Rent and Subsidy Information	
46. Gross Income	Must equal Contract Rent (44) + Utility Allowance (45)
50. Total Tenant Payment	Must equal the higher of 30% of Adjusted Income (43), 10% of Total Annual Income (31), Welfare Rent (47), or \$50 (Minimum Rent).
Tenant Rent	Tenant Rent must equal the recalculated tenant rent based on the Rent Calculation rules provided in Appendix A

-
- With the exception of tenant rent, negative numbers are always converted to 0.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Project managers and executive directors completed a self-administered paper questionnaire that examined in detail their number and type of staff, training received by staff on how to conduct (re)certifications, transfer of information about changes in Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) policies to the staff, quality control monitoring procedures, the use of interview guides and worksheets, automation of (re)certifications, difficulties in administering tenant interviews, and various verification procedures employed in the process of (re)certifications. This information is vital in determining PHA/projects' procedures that promote accurate (re)certifications, as well as identifying areas of potential improvement.

A. Methodology

A paper version of the Project Staff Questionnaire (PSQ) was mailed to the executive director or manager of each PHA/project. The vast majority of respondents promptly mailed back their PSQs. ORC Macro conducted numerous followup mailings and telephone calls to nonresponding PHA/projects. Of the 514 PSQs initially mailed to the PHA/projects, 513 (99.8%) were received. ORC Macro staff developed and implemented editing instructions to verify and correct all items in the PSQ with respect to the validity of responses and accuracy of the skip patterns. In some cases, PHA/projects were contacted by telephone to verify or clarify their responses or provide additional information for the missing items. ORC Macro staff developed and used CPro software for the data entry of the PSQs. CPro software provided a viable tool for the data entry by incorporating some editing instructions into the programming of skip patterns, missing items, and range of valid responses. Thus, the software provided additional assurance of the accuracy of the responses by restricting the data-entry to only valid responses and skip patterns. After the data entry was completed, SPSS version 12 was used to further check the accuracy of the responses before analyzing the data. Project Staff Questionnaires with questionable responses or skip patterns were individually investigated, and all of the data issues were resolved. The detailed source tables for the PSQs are presented at the end of this appendix.

B. Results

Number and Type of Staff. (Re)certification staff are those who interview the tenant, gather information from the tenant, calculate rent, track verification, and supervise other staff in performing move-in certifications and annual recertifications. Exhibit E-1 presents the number and type of (re)certification staff by program type.

Overall, an average of 18 staff members were working in the PHA/projects, with about 5 full-time equivalence staff working on the (re)certifications and supporting more than 830 units. However, standard deviations for these averages were high, suggesting a widely diverse distribution of responses (see Table E-1 at the end of this appendix).¹ Furthermore, the number of staff and units varied greatly between different types of PHA/projects. PHA Section 8 had the largest number of staff (45), full-time equivalence (re)certification staff (14), and number of units supported by the (re)certification staff (2,975). Owner-administered projects had the smallest number of staff (5), full-time equivalence (re)certification staff (2), and number of units supported by the (re)certification staff (137).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

The results for the staff/unit ratio should be interpreted with caution because PHA/project managers had difficulty specifying the precise number of (re)certification staff. PHA/projects vary in their practices for assigning staff to perform certain tasks. As a result, PHA/project managers sometimes were inconsistent in reporting the total number of (re)certification staff, compared with the sum of all staff working on (re)certifications less than full-time. Overall, on the average, each staff member supported 163 units. Owner-administered projects reported the smallest ratio of units per staff (118), followed by Public Housing (180) and Section 8 PHA (212).

Exhibit E-1 also provides the average number of new staff assigned to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months. Overall, 28 percent of PHA/projects had new staff. These PHA/projects reported an average of three new staff members assigned to conduct (re)certifications. Furthermore, the distribution of responses for the number of new staff assigned to conduct (re)certifications did not vary much—for all PHA/projects, responses ranged from 1 to 36 staff members; however, about 50 percent reported only one new (re)certification staff.

Exhibit E-1
Average Number of Staff and Units, by Program Type

Number and Type of Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
All Staff				
Average Number of All Staff	15.8	45.1	5.4	18.3
(Re)Certification Staff				
Average Number of Staff Working on (Re)Certifications	2.8	14.4	1.6	4.9
Average Number of Units Supported by (Re)Certification Staff	304.4	2974.6	137.0	832.5
Ratio of Units per Full-time (Re)Certification Staff	180.1	211.7	117.7	163.0
New (Re)Certification Staff				
Average Number of New (Re)Certification Staff	2.5	5.0	1.4	3.0
Number of PHA/Projects with New (Re)Certification Staff	62	46	33	141
Total Number of PHA/Projects	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-1

Training of New (Re)Certification Staff. The training of the (re)certification staff was assessed for the new staff (assigned to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months), as well as the experienced staff. Information on the training of *new staff* was collected about the type of training provided, the topics covered, the provider of the training, the location of the training, the format used to provide the training, and variability in terms of the staff trained. The findings related to each of these items are discussed briefly below.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

With respect to the most frequent training modalities, most PHA/projects reported using experienced staff to conduct one-on-one training (88% of total PHA/projects, 92% of Public Housing, 87% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 82% of owner-administered; see Exhibit E-2a), followed by training led by the supervisor (79% of total PHA/projects, 74% of Public Housing, 89% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 76% of owner-administered) and self-training (74% of total PHA/projects, 68% of Public Housing, 83% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 73% of owner-administered). The largest average number of training hours was performed by working one-on-one with more experienced staff (126 hours), followed by the training provided by the supervisor (61 hours), and the self-administered training (43 hours). The relatively large standard deviations for the average hours of training indicate dispersed distributions of training hours. For instance, training hours conducted by experienced staff in one-on-one settings varied from 1 hour to 640 hours for each new staff member, with about 25 percent of respondents indicating 160 hours or more.

Among three program types, 31 percent of Public Housing projects reported having new staff members and provided the largest number of training hours for each staff (156 hours of one-on-one training, 82 hours of supervisors training, and 49 hours of self-training) for the average of about three new staff members. Owner-administered projects reported the smallest number of new staff members (17%) and provided the least amount of training hours (44 hours of one-on-one training, 28 hours of supervisors training, and 38 hours of self-training) for the average of about one new staff member. It is likely that the relatively small number of staff members and units supported by owner-administered projects have contributed to their low number of training hours.

Exhibit E-2a
Average Number of Training Hours for Each New Staff, by Program Type

Types of Training of New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Read manual, watch videos, or Web-based training	67.7%	82.6%	72.7%	73.8%
Average number of training hours	48.7	38.4	38.0	42.5
Supervisor/Senior staff held training sessions	74.2%	89.1%	75.8%	79.4%
Average number of training hours	81.7	57.4	28.4	60.9
Experienced staff worked one-on-one	91.9%	87.0%	81.8%	87.9%
Average number of training hours	155.5	140.4	43.7	126.3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF NEW STAFF	2.5	5.0	1.4	3.0

Source: Table E-2

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Training modalities for the new (re)certification staff were also explored with respect to the number of units supported by (re)certification staff. The results are presented in Exhibit E-2b. There is a clear linear trend, with smaller PHA/projects being less likely to report conducting training and acknowledging less training hours than do larger PHA/projects. Interestingly, the smallest PHA/projects (less than 150 units) and medium-sized PHA/projects (150 to 500 units) reported a comparable number of new (re)certification staff (1.1 and 1.7, respectively), while the largest PHA/projects (more than 500 units) indicated a much larger number of new staff members (4.4).

Exhibit E-2b
Average Number of Training Hours for Each New Staff, by PHA/Project Size

Types of Training of New Staff	PHA/PROJECT SIZE			TOTAL
	<150 units	150 to 500 units	>500 units	
Read manual, watch videos, or Web-based	36.8%	75.0%	82.4%	73.8%
Average number of training hours	19.0	40.8	46.2	42.5
Supervisor/Senior staff held training sessions	52.6%	75.0%	89.2%	79.4%
Average number of training hours	29.3	74.0	58.5	60.9
Experienced staff worked one-on-one	68.4%	89.6%	91.9%	87.9%
Average number of training hours	42.4	92.6	163.6	126.3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF NEW STAFF				
ASSIGNED TO CONDUCT (RE)CERTIFICATIONS	1.1	1.7	4.4	3.0
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF				
	19	48	74	141
Percent of all PHA/Projects	11.1%	26.5%	46.0%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF				
	152	133	87	372
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS				
	171	181	161	513

Note 1: Averages were calculated for PHA/Projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Averages were calculated for PHA/Projects with valid responses.

Exhibit E-3 summarizes the most frequently reported providers of training for the new (re)certification staff. Virtually all of the PHA/projects with new staff reported training conducted by other staff members (94% of total PHA/projects, 97% of Public Housing, 94% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 91% of owner-administered). Overall, the second most frequently reported source of training was Nan McKay and Associates (46% of the total PHA/projects). However, this source of training was highly endorsed only by Public Housing and Section 8 PHA/projects (55% and 67%, respectively). Training conducted by HUD was the third most frequently cited source of training (33% of total PHA/projects, 42% of Public Housing, 33% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 18% of owner-administered). For the owner-administered projects, National Center for Housing Management was also reported as a very frequently used source of training (36%); although it was hardly endorsed by Public Housing or Section 8 PHA/projects (13% and 11%, respectively).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-3
Providers of Training for New Staff, by Program Type

Providers of Training for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Staff within the PHA/Project	96.8%	93.5%	90.9%	94.3%
HUD	41.9%	32.6%	18.2%	33.3%
Nan McKay and Associates	54.8%	67.4%	.0%	46.1%
National Center for Housing Management (NCHM)	12.9%	10.9%	36.4%	17.7%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141

Source: Table E-4

PHA/project managers were also asked to indicate the topics of training being conducted for the new (re)certification staff. Virtually all of the PHA/projects with new staff provide them with training on how to conduct certifications, which tools are available in PHA/project to help conduct (re)certifications, as well as (re)certification policies and rules (percentages range from 92% to 100%); (see Table E-3).

With respect to the location of training for the new staff, almost all of the PHA/projects with the new staff reported that training is being conducted at the office (97% of total PHA/projects, 100% of Public Housing, 98% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 91% of owner-administered); (see Exhibit E-4). Similarly, a substantial percentage of PHA/projects reported conducting onsite training using tele-course or Web-based training (38% of total, 36% of Public Housing, 48% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 30% of projects). In addition, the vast majority of the PHA/projects with new staff also reported training being performed at a center located outside of the office (60% of total, 60% of Public Housing, 57% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 67% of projects). Interestingly, the results also indicated a linear trend with respect to the size of PHA/projects and the use of Web-based training. Smaller PHA/projects (<150 units) were the least likely to report using Web-based training (11%), followed by medium-sized (150–500 units) PHA/projects (40%), and the largest (>500 units) PHA/projects (45%).

Results for the format of training of new (re)certification staff revealed that owner-administered projects were the least likely to report conducting group training (55%; see Table E-6) or mixed-format training (58%), but were the most likely to indicate conducting one-on-one training (82%). Conversely, Public Housing projects were the most likely to report conducting group training (77%) and mixed-format training (68%), but were the least likely to use one-on-one training (69%). These results were corroborated by the findings that group training was clearly dependent on the size of PHA/projects, with the smallest PHA/projects being the least likely to use group training (50%), followed by the medium-sized PHA/projects (60%), and the largest PHA/projects (74%).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-4
Locations of Training for New Staff, by Program Type

Locations of Training for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
At the PHA/project office	100.0%	97.8%	90.9%	97.2%
At an outside training center	59.7%	56.5%	66.7%	60.3%
Tele-course/Internet/Web-based training	35.5%	47.8%	30.3%	38.3%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141

Source: Table E-5

Training of Experienced (Re)Certification Staff. With respect to the training of experienced (re)certification staff, results suggest that most of the PHA/projects are conducting training and moreover, they pass training information onto the staff members who could not attend the training. The overwhelming majority of PHA/projects reported conducting training for the experienced (re)certification staff (76% of total, 79% of Public Housing, 80% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 70% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-5). However, it appears that not all of the experienced staff members were able to attend training—only about 40 percent of PHA/projects reported training all of their experienced staff (38% of total, 33% of Public Housing, 42% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 41% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-12). Nevertheless, almost all PHA/projects that conducted training of the experienced staff indicated that they pass the training information on to staff members who could not attend the training—only about five percent of PHA/projects admitted to not passing the training information (5% of total, 5% of Public Housing, 3% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 6% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-12). The most frequently used methods for passing on training information are staff meetings (54% of total, 52% of Public Housing, 65% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 49% of owner-administered projects) and memos (54% of total, 52% of Public Housing, 68% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 47% of owner-administered projects).

The results for the providers and types of training of the experienced (re)certification staff are somewhat similar to the results for the training of the new staff. Almost all of the PHA/projects that conducted training of experienced (re)certification staff did so to inform these employees about changes in HUD rules or policies (94% of total, 95% of Public Housing, 88% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 96% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-5), as well as to refresh staff's skills and knowledge (83% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 89% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 73% of owner-administered projects). Another major topic of training involved discussing changes in the PHA's/project's rules or procedures (68% of total, 78% of Public Housing, 75% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 53% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-5). Interestingly, this topic of training was dependent on the size of PHA/projects—the smallest PHA/projects were the least likely to discuss changes in the PHA/project's rules or procedures (59%), followed by the medium-sized PHA/projects (62%), and the largest PHA/projects (83%).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

With respect to the number of training hours that each experienced (re)certification staff member received, the largest number of hours was spent on increasing the skills and knowledge of staff (an average of 15 hours for total PHA/projects; see Exhibit E-5), followed by discussing changes in HUD policies (an average of 14 hours for total PHA/projects) and informing staff about changes in PHA/project procedures (an average of 12 hours for total PHA/projects). Relatively small standard deviations for the average number of hours suggest that the majority of PHA/projects have training hours not far from the average. For instance, the number of training hours conducted to discuss changes in the PHA/project's rules or procedures ranged from half-an-hour to 96 hours; however, about 80 percent reported 15 hours of training or less.

Other frequently reported training topics for the experienced staff include HUD policies and rules for conducting (re)certifications (about 97% across all three program types) and tools available in the PHA/project to help conduct (re)certifications (77% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 85% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 61% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-9). There were no discernable differences between the three types of PHA/projects with respect to the number of hours spent on the training topics. In addition, similarly to the results for PHA/projects with new staff, Section 8 PHA reported the largest number of experienced (re)certification staff (19), compared with an average of seven staff members for Public Housing and two staff members in owner-administered projects (see Exhibit E-5). However, standard deviations for the number of experienced staff indicate somewhat dispersed distributions (see Table E-8). For instance, the number of new staff reported by Section 8 ranged from 1 to 276; however, only about 15 percent reported more than 19 staff members.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-5 Reasons for Training Experienced Staff and Average Number of Training Hours for Each Staff Member, by Program Type

Reasons for Training Experienced Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
As a refresher, to “brush up” on skills/knowledge	87.3%	89.0%	72.9%	82.5%
Average number of hours	13.8	17.6	13.1	14.5
To discuss changes in HUD rules or policies	94.9%	87.9%	95.7%	93.6%
Average number of hours	14.3	12.7	13.0	13.5
To discuss changes in the PHA's/project's rules or procedures	78.3%	74.7%	52.9%	68.3%
Average number of hours	10.6	12.0	12.5	11.5
AVERAGE NUMBER OF EXPERIENCED STAFF ASSIGNED TO CONDUCT (RE)CERTIFICATIONS	7.0	19.0	1.9	8.1
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388
Percent of all PHA/projects	78.9%	79.8%	70.0%	75.6%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	42	23	60	125
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-8

With respect to the sources of training for the experienced (re)certification staff, it seems that PHA/projects are equally likely to use in-house and outside training (73% and 83% of total PHA/projects respectively; see Exhibit E-6). However, Public Housing and PHA-administered Section 8 PHA/projects were more likely to use HUD (47% and 58%, respectively), Nan McKay and Associates (54% and 66%, respectively), and National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) (42% and 37%, respectively), while owner-administered projects reported that they most frequently relied on Affordable Housing Management Association/Southeastern Affordable Housing Management Association/National Affordable Housing Management Association (AHMA/SAHMA/NAHMA) (41%) and HUD (34%) for its training needs. These results were further corroborated by the findings that most of PHA/projects conducted training in-house by using supervisors (79% of total, 78% of Public Housing, 88% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 75% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-10) or self-training (75% of total, 83% of Public Housing, 77% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 64% of owner-administered projects). While a comparable percentage reported using an outside organization to perform training (81% of total, 73% of Public Housing, and 87% of PHA-administered Section 8 and owner-administered projects).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-6
External Providers of Training for Experienced Staff, by Program Type

Training Providers for Experienced Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
HUD	46.5%	58.2%	34.3%	44.8%
Nan McKay and Associates	53.5%	65.9%	2.9%	38.1%
NAHRO National	42.0%	37.4%	2.9%	26.8%
AHMA/SAHMA/NAHMA	2.5%	1.1%	40.7%	16.0%
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS WHERE STAFF CONDUCTED TRAINING	76.4%	81.3%	64.3%	73.2%
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS WHERE OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS CONDUCTED TRAINING	72.6%	91.2%	87.9%	82.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388

Source: Table E-11

Transfer of Information About Changes in HUD Policies. Exhibit E-7 summarizes three most frequently reported methods of communicating information to staff about changes in HUD policies. Most of the PHA/projects simply copied and distributed HUD announcement about changes in policies (81% of total, 84% of Public Housing, 80% of Section 8, and 79% of owner-administered projects, see Exhibit E-7). However, the majority of the PHA/projects also reported communicating new HUD policies to their staff via memos (73% of total, 71% of Public Housing, 78% of Section 8, and 71% of owner-administered projects) or using informal oral communication (67% of total, 71% of Public Housing, 74% of Section 8, and 59% of owner-administered projects).

Exhibit E-7
Methods to Communicate Changes in HUD Policies, by Program Type

Methods to Communicate Information to Staff About Changes in HUD Policies	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Staff memo is written describing the changes and providing detailed instructions for implementation	70.9%	78.1%	71.0%	72.5%
Informal oral communication by supervisors to staff	71.4%	73.7%	59.0%	67.1%
The HUD announcement is copied and distributed	84.4%	79.8%	78.5%	81.1%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-13

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

In addition to the well-established communication about changes in HUD policies, most of the PHA/projects also reported being able to answer staff's questions about HUD policies—less than a quarter of PHA/projects indicated not being able to answer staff's questions (18% of total, 19% of Public Housing, 23% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 15% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-14). The majority of PHA/projects answered staff's questions by receiving information directly from HUD (81% of total, 72% of Public Housing, 94% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 83% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-14), by talking to other PHA/owners (55% of total, 63% of Public Housing, 71% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 38% of owner-administered projects), or simply by going online to obtain information (59% of total, 56% of Public Housing, 68% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 56% of owner-administered projects).

An interesting pattern of the results emerged with respect to the size of PHA/projects and their ability to answer staff's questions about changes in HUD policies. The percentage of PHA/projects reporting not being able to answer staff's questions increased with increase in the size of the PHA/projects. The smallest PHA/projects were the least likely to report inability to answer staff's questions (12%), followed by the medium-sized (19%) and the largest PHA/projects (23%).

Quality Control via Work Monitoring. Almost all of the PHA/projects that conducted work monitoring to check the quality of work being performed by (re)certification staff did so via internal processes (90% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 97% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 87% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-15) or by involving HUD or a HUD contractor in auditing tenant files (85% of total, 84% of Public Housing, 90% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 83% of owner-administered projects). Overall, only less than three percent of PHA/projects did not specify any type of work monitoring (2% of total, 3% of Public Housing, 0% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 3% of owner-administered projects). In addition, it was found that the percentage of PHA/projects reporting work monitoring via internal processes increased with increased size of PHA/projects. The smallest PHA/projects were the least likely to use internal work monitoring (84%), followed by the medium-sized (89%) and the largest (96%) PHA/projects.

With respect to the type of work monitoring being performed, it seems that the majority of PHA/projects are conducting quality control during, as well as after (re)certification process. More than a half of PHA/projects with internal work-monitoring procedures performed them during (re)certification by either reviewing files (59% of total, 54% of Public Housing, 65% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 60% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-8) or by holding discussions with staff (55% of total, 59% of Public Housing, 55% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 51% of owner-administered projects). A comparable percentage of PHA/projects performed work monitoring after the (re)certification process by either reviewing files (88% of total, 90% of Public Housing, 89% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 85% of owner-administered projects) or by holding discussions with staff (56% of total, 61% of Public Housing, 60% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 48% of owner-administered projects). These results were further corroborated by the finding that most of the PHA/projects with internal work monitoring reported conducting work monitoring both before and after the (re)certification becomes effective (73% of total, 77% of Public Housing, 72% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 69% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-21).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

**Exhibit E-8
Types of Work Monitoring, by Program Type**

Types of Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Review of files while in process	54.0%	64.9%	59.8%	58.8%
Review of files after completion	89.7%	89.2%	84.5%	87.6%
Discussion with staff while in process	58.6%	55.0%	50.6%	54.7%
Discussion with staff after completion	60.9%	60.4%	47.7%	55.8%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459
Percent of all PHA/projects	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-16

When asked how cases are being selected for work monitoring, the majority of PHA/projects with internal work monitoring indicated that they use a mix of strategies, including monitoring all files (55% of total, 53% of Public Housing, 53% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 58% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit 9a), checking a random sample of files (66% of total, 68% of Public Housing, 71% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 62% of owner-administered projects), or focusing on files with certain characteristics such as move-in certifications (48% of total, 49% of Public Housing, 32% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 58% of owner-administered projects) or files with some anomalies (35% of total, 42% of Public Housing, 34% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 29% of owner-administered projects). Similarly, the majority of PHA/projects also mentioned monitoring a random 20 percent of cases (61% of total, 69% of Public Housing, 59% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 54% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-17) or monitoring cases when problems are suspected (54% of total, 65% of Public Housing, 56% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 43% of owner-administered projects).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-9a Types of Cases Selected for Work Monitoring, by Program Type

Types of Cases Selected for Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
All files	53.4%	53.2%	58.0%	55.1%
Move-in certifications	48.9%	32.4%	57.5%	48.1%
Random sample	67.8%	71.2%	62.1%	66.4%
Files with certain characteristics or anomalies	42.0%	34.2%	28.7%	35.1%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459

Source: Table E-18

An interesting pattern emerged with respect to the selection of cases for work monitoring by PHA/projects of different size. As the size of the PHA/projects increases, the likelihood of selecting specific cases for work monitoring also increases. For instance, the percentage of PHA/projects monitoring suspected problematic cases increased with an increase in the size of PHA/projects. The smallest PHA/projects were the least likely to report work-monitoring cases whenever a problem is suspected (43%; see Exhibit E-9b), followed by the medium-sized (53%) and the largest (67%) PHA/projects.

Exhibit E-9b Circumstances When Work Monitoring Is Conducted, by PHA/Project Size

Types of Cases or Circumstances Under Which Work Monitoring Is Conducted	PHA/PROJECT SIZE			TOTAL
	<150 units	150 to 500 units	> 500 units	
Check on certain cases within a given period	23.8%	29.8%	36.1%	30.1%
Whenever a problem is suspected	42.7%	52.8%	66.5%	54.2%
Files with certain characteristics or anomalies	27.3%	36.6%	40.6%	35.1%
Staff who have past performance problems	21.7%	29.8%	43.9%	32.0%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	143	161	155	459

Note: Percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

With respect to the tools used in conducting work monitoring of the (re)certification process, Exhibit E-10 presents the three most frequently used methods. Most of the PHA/projects with internal work monitoring used a pre-designed form (76% of total, 75% of Public Housing, 80% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 75% of owner-administered projects), and about half used case notes (52% of total, 54% of Public Housing, 48% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 52% of owner-administered projects) or computer programs (47% of total, 44% of Public Housing, 47% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 51% of owner-administered projects). The reported use of pre-designed forms when monitoring work increased with an increase in the size of PHA/projects. The smallest PHA/projects were the least likely to report using pre-designed forms for monitoring (72%), followed by the medium-sized (77%) and the largest (79%) PHA/projects.

Exhibit E-10
Tools Used to Conduct Work Monitoring, by Program Type

Tools Used to Conduct Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Pre-designed form for checking key steps	74.7%	80.2%	75.3%	76.3%
Individualized notes for each case reviewed	54.0%	47.7%	51.7%	51.6%
Computer program	43.7%	46.8%	50.6%	47.1%
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459

Source: Table E-19

When asked to indicate the person responsible for performing work monitoring, the overwhelming majority of PHA/projects with internal work monitoring reported employing the team leader or supervisor to review the quality of (re)certifications (85% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 93% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 78% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-20).

The Use of Interview Scripts, Guides, and Worksheets. Almost all of PHA/projects (more than 95%) are using interview scripts, guides, or worksheets for calculating income, allowances, or rent amounts (see Table E-22). However, there were no predominant strategies for using scripts, or guides—less than a third of PHA/projects reported using staff, tenants, or both to complete scripts/interview guides (see Table E-22). The respondents were also asked to identify questions on the interview guides that are most difficult for tenants to understand or answer. The majority of PHA/projects indicated having difficulties in getting tenants to accurately report their sporadic income (79% of total, 83% of Public Housing, 88% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 70% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-11), medical expenses (62% of total, 63% of Public Housing, 64% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 60% of owner-administered projects), or income from self-employment (55% of total, 62% of Public Housing, 70% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 39% of owner-administered projects). Interestingly, owner-administered projects were consistently less likely to report any types of problems with questions on the scripts, guides, or worksheets, than were the other two program types.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-11
Most Problematic Questions for Tenants to Understand or Answer, by Program Type

Most Problematic Questions for Tenants to Understand or Answer	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Sporadic or intermittent income	83.4%	87.7%	69.5%	78.9%
Income from self-employment	62.3%	70.2%	39.0%	55.0%
Medical expenses	63.3%	64.0%	59.5%	62.0%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-23

In addition to inquiring about difficult questions for the tenants to understand, the respondents were also asked to estimate the length of (re)certification interviews and indicate why some interviews might take longer than usual. Overall, the initial certification interview took on average approximately one hour to complete, while recertification interviews lasted slightly more than a half-hour (see Exhibit E-12). Small standard deviations indicate that the majority of responses cluster around the averages (see Table E-28). The most frequently cited reasons why some interviews take longer than others include cases with numerous sources of income/assets/expenses (84% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 82% of PHA-administered Section 8 and owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-12), changes since the last recertification (83% of total, 84% of Public Housing, 83% of PHA-administered Section 8 and owner-administered projects), and conflicting information (77% of total, 84% of Public Housing, 82% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 67% of owner-administered projects). Furthermore, the majority of PHA/projects also indicated that larger households take longer to complete (re)certification interviews than do households with fewer family members (56% of total, 68% of Public Housing, 68% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 39% of owner-administered projects).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-12
Reasons Why Some Interviews Take Longer Than Others, by Program Type

Reasons Why Some Interviews Take Longer Than Others	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
New situations in tenants case since last time (for recertification)	83.9%	82.5%	82.5%	83.0%
Conflicting information	83.9%	81.6%	67.0%	76.8%
Households with numerous family members	67.8%	67.5%	38.5%	56.3%
Tenants/Applicants with several sources of income/assets and/or expenses	87.4%	81.6%	81.5%	83.8%
AVERAGE LENGTH OF INITIAL CERTIFICATION INTERVIEW (IN HOURS)	.8	.9	.9	.9
AVERAGE LENGTH OF ANNUAL RECERTIFICATION INTERVIEW (IN HOURS)	.6	.6	.6	.6
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-28

The Use of Computers and Software Programs. It is not surprising that almost all of the PHA/projects (more than 95%) are using computers in the process of conducting (re)certifications and about all of them (more than 94%) are using the computers for all of their tenants (see Table E-24). However, there is no consensus on the type of the software used or the company providing computer support. The largest percentage of PHA/projects indicated using other/unspecified companies for computer support (36% of total, 30% of Public Housing, 41% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 40% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-13a). Furthermore, different types of PHA/projects reported using different computer software companies—owner-administered projects were most likely to use HUD Manager (45%), Public Housing PHA/projects reported most frequently relying on in-house and internal Management Information Systems (29%), while PHA-administered Section 8 projects are most likely to use Emphasis or ECS for their computer needs (25%).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Exhibit E-13a

Companies Providing Software and/or Computer Support, by Program Type

Companies Providing Software and/or Computer Support	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
HUD Manager	5.0%	1.8%	44.5%	19.7%
Rent Roll	1.0%	.0%	22.0%	9.0%
In-house and internal Management Information Systems (MIS)	29.1%	11.4%	7.5%	16.8%
Emphasis or ECS	14.6%	24.6%	.0%	11.1%
Other	29.6%	41.2%	40.0%	36.3%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-25

The results also revealed a clear linear trend with respect to the use of computer companies and the size of PHA/projects. As the size of the PHA/projects increases, so do their propensity to use in-house and MIS (9% for the smallest, 11% for the medium, and 32% for the largest PHA/projects; see Exhibit E-13b) or Emphasis or ECS (2% for the smallest, 8% for the medium, and 24% for the largest PHA/projects). Conversely, with an increase in the size of PHA/projects there is a decrease in the reported use of HUD Manager (34% for the smallest, 22% for the medium, and 3% for the largest PHA/projects) and Rent Control (14% for the smallest, 12% for the medium, and 1% for the largest PHA/projects).

Exhibit E-13b

Companies Providing Software and/or Computer Support, by PHA/Project Size

Companies Providing Software and/or Computer Support	PHA/PROJECT SIZE			TOTAL
	<150 units	150 to 500 units	> 500 units	
HUD Manager	33.9%	21.5%	2.5%	19.7%
Rent Roll	14.0%	11.6%	.6%	9.0%
In-house and internal Management Information Systems (MIS)	8.8%	11.0%	31.7%	16.8%
Emphasis or ECS	2.3%	8.3%	23.6%	11.1%
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS USING COMPUTERS	95.3%	95.0%	95.7%	95.3%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	171	181	161	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Despite the wide variety of computer companies being used for computer support, PHA/projects are likely to be using computer software for the same tasks. The most frequent uses of computers are for printing the 50058/50059 Form (96% of total, 95% of Public Housing, 98% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 96% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-14) and calculating rent (92% of total, 89% of Public Housing, 97% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 94% of owner-administered projects). These uses are followed by using computers to submit

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

tenant information to HUD (89% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 97% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 87% of owner-administered projects), input verified (re)certification information (86% of total, 81% of Public Housing, 93% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 86% of owner-administered projects), and print letters to tenants (84% of total, 87% of Public Housing, 86% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 81% of owner-administered projects).

Interestingly, as the size of PHA/projects increases so does their use of computers for interviewing tenants (24% for the smallest, 28% for the medium, and 45% for the largest PHA/projects), submitting tenant information to HUD (85% for the smallest, 90% for the medium, and 92% for the largest PHA/projects), maintenance reporting (43% for the smallest, 58% for the medium, and 62% for the largest PHA/projects), maintaining demographics on the population (47% for the smallest, 53% for the medium, and 76% for the largest PHA/projects), accounting (61% for the smallest, 65% for the medium, and 81% for the largest PHA/projects), and keeping other types of statistics (60% for the smallest, 66% for the medium, and 83% for the largest PHA/projects).

Exhibit E-14
Activities for Which Computer Software Is Used, by Program Type

Activities for Which Computer Software Is Used	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Inputting verified information	81.4%	93.0%	86.0%	85.8%
Calculating rent	88.9%	96.5%	93.5%	92.4%
Printing the 50058/50059 form	95.0%	98.2%	95.5%	95.9%
Printing letters to the tenants	86.9%	86.0%	81.0%	84.4%
Submitting tenant information to HUD	86.9%	96.5%	86.5%	88.9%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-26

The respondents were also asked how their PHA/projects are transferring 50058/50059 data to HUD. About all of the PHA/projects (more than 95%) reported using PIC/TRACS System to transfer 50058/50059 data to HUD (see Table E-27a), and the majority did so directly (76% of total, 88% of Public Housing, 92% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 59% of owner-administered projects). However, owner-administered projects were less likely to directly transfer 50058/50059 data to HUD using PIC/TRACS System (56% compared with 88% of Public Housing and 92% of PHA-administered Section 8; see Table E-27a) and were more likely to use an outside agency for the transfer of the data (32% compared with 6% of Public Housing and 4% of PHA-administered Section 8). The results also indicate that larger PHA/projects were more likely to transfer 50058/50059 data to HUD via PIC/TRACS System (64% of the smallest, 75% of the medium, and 91% of the largest PHA/projects), while smaller PHA/projects were more likely to use outside agency (26% of the smallest, 17% of the medium, and 4% of the largest PHA/projects).

Verification Procedures. The most frequently reported methods of tracking verifications, when they are received, are keeping files with outstanding verifications in a separate location (72% of

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

total, 76% of Public Housing, 67% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 70% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-15) and keeping these files for each tenant who requires verification (64% of total, 70% of Public Housing, 70% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 54% of owner-administered projects). The majority of the PHA/projects also used special tracking procedures for files with outstanding verifications, in a paper format (52% of total, 52% of Public Housing, 59% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 48% of owner-administered projects) and/or a computerized form (41% of total, 37% of Public Housing, 39% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 46% of owner-administered projects). Owner-administered projects were slightly more likely to keep track of verification files using the computer, while the other two programs were more likely to use a paper version of the tracking.

Exhibit E-15
Methods for Keeping Track of Verification, by Program Type

Methods for Keeping Track of When Verification Is Received	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Keep files with outstanding verification in a separate location	76.4%	66.7%	70.0%	71.7%
Mark on a paper list/tickler file	52.3%	58.8%	48.0%	52.0%
Record kept in tenant file	70.4%	70.2%	54.0%	63.9%
Computer tracking	36.7%	38.6%	46.0%	40.7%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-29

With respect to the staff responsible for keeping track of when verification is requested and received, virtually all of the PHA/projects reported using project staff who are actually doing (re)certifications (96% of total, 98% of Public Housing, 96% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 94% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-30). The next most frequently cited person who tracks verifications is the supervisor, although less than 45 percent of PHA/projects indicated using this source (40% of total, 45% of Public Housing, 34% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 38% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-30).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

When asked to indicate which information is being verified, almost all of the PHA/projects reported always verifying all sources of (re)certification information, including age (93% of total, 95% of Public Housing, 90% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 93% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-31), Social Security numbers (99% of total, 98% of Public Housing, 99% of PHA-administered Section 8 and owner-administered projects), U.S. citizenship (94% of total, 95% of Public Housing, 97% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 92% of owner-administered projects), non-U.S. citizenship (90% of total, 93% of Public Housing, 96% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 84% of projects), full-time student status (84% of total, 91% of Public Housing, 96% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 70% of owner-administered projects), income from employment (about 99% for all types of PHA/projects), non-employment income (about 98% for all types of PHA/projects), assets (92% of total, 89% of Public Housing, 91% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 96% of owner-administered projects), medical expenses (about 95% for all types of PHA/projects), and child care or disability expenses (92% of total, 97% of Public Housing, 94% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 86% of owner-administered projects). Owner-administered projects were slightly less likely to report verifying non-U.S. citizenship, full-time student status, and child care/disability expenses, than were the other two programs.

With respect to the methods used to verify all of these sources of (re)certification information, the most frequently employed method typically involves the most accurate method for a given source of information, with additional methods often being used when the first-choice method is unavailable. For example, age is most frequently verified by birth certificate (93% of total, 96% of Public Housing, 93% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 90% of owner-administered projects; see Table E-31), Social Security numbers by Social Security cards (more than 98% of all types of PHA/projects), U.S. citizenship via birth certificate (76% of total, 83% of Public Housing, 82% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 66% of owner-administered projects), and non-U.S. citizenship by permanent Resident Card (65% of total, 72% of Public Housing, 77% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 52% of owner-administered projects), while official third-party letters are most frequently used to verify full-time student status (82% of total, 92% of Public Housing, 94% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 67% of owner-administered projects), employment income (more than 97% of all types of PHA/projects), non-employment income (96% of total, 94% of Public Housing, 97% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 96% of owner-administered projects), assets (89% of total, 83% of Public Housing, 93% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 92% of owner-administered projects), medical expenses (85% of total, 80% of Public Housing, 89% of PHA-administered Section 8 and owner-administered projects), and child care or disability expenses (90% of total, 88% of Public Housing, 97% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 88% of projects). An additional frequently cited source of verifying (re)certification information is to use additional documentation provided by the tenant. This method was often used for verifying employment income (69% of total, 72% of Public Housing, 77% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 63% of owner-administered projects), non-employment income (72% of total, 73 of Public Housing, 80% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 66% of owner-administered projects), assets (78% of total, 79% of Public Housing, 81% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 75% of owner-administered projects), medical expenses (85% of total, 88% of Public Housing, 83% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 84% of owner-administered projects), and child care or disability expenses (72% of total, 76% of Public Housing, 79% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 64% of owner-administered projects).

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

When asked to identify sources of (re)certification information that are difficult to verify, most PHA/projects indicated sporadic/infrequent/seasonal employment (87% of total, 92% of Public Housing, 92% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 79% of owner-administered projects; see Exhibit E-16). The majority of the PHA/projects also reported difficulties in verifying assets (59% of total, 62% of Public Housing, 63% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 55% of owner-administered projects), miscellaneous income (59% of total, 64% of Public Housing, 66% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 49% of owner-administered projects), and medical expenses (52% of total, 46% of Public Housing, 59% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 53% of owner-administered projects). The difficulties in verifying various sources of (re)certification information were also contingent on the size of PHA/projects. As the size of the PHA/projects increased so did their reporting of difficulties in verifying sporadic employment (80% of the smallest, 87% of the medium, and 93% of the largest PHA/projects), child support (43% of the smallest, 50% of the medium, and 57% of the largest PHA/projects), child care expenses (25% of the smallest, 38% of the medium, and 50% of the largest PHA/projects), and many other sources of (re)certification information, although the linear trend was not very prominent.

Exhibit E-16
Difficult to Verify Items, by Program Type

Types of Income, Expenses, or Household Characteristics That Are Difficult to Verify	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Sporadic/Infrequent/Seasonal employment	92.0%	92.1%	78.5%	86.7%
Other sources of income	64.3%	65.8%	48.5%	58.5%
Value of assets	61.8%	63.2%	54.5%	59.3%
Medical expenses	46.2%	58.8%	53.0%	51.7%
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Source: Table E-32

The difficulties in verifying information were corroborated by the findings that a substantial percentage of PHA/projects reported occasional uncooperativeness with verification requests on the part of the tenant (29% of total, 36% of Public Housing, 27% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 22% of owner-administered projects) or the third party (48% of total, 51% of Public Housing, 54% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 41% of owner-administered projects). Interestingly, the ratings of occasional uncooperativeness increased concomitantly with the size of PHA/projects for uncooperativeness of the tenants (23% of the smallest, 24% of the medium, and 40% of the largest PHA/projects), as well as for uncooperativeness of the third party (38% of the smallest, 44% of the medium, and 62% of the largest PHA/projects).

It appears that most of the PHA/projects were able to resolve the verification difficulties via followup telephone calls (85% of total, 85% of Public Housing, 90% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 82% of owner-administered projects) and letters to the third party (more than 88% of all types of PHA/projects). Additionally, the majority of PHA/projects also involved tenants into resolving the verification difficulties via telephone calls (64% of total, 67% of Public Housing, 51% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 69% of owner-administered projects) and letters (62% of total, 71% of Public Housing, 59% of PHA-administered Section 8, and 56% of

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

owner-administered projects). Although, overall only 60 percent of PHA/projects reported accepting documentation other than the desired verification information, the percentage of PHA/projects reporting it increased with increase in the size of PHA/projects (52% of the smallest, 58% of the medium, and 73% of the largest PHA/projects).

Conclusions and Recommendations. Overall the PSQ analyses portrayed a complex and interesting picture of PHA and project practices. Overall, most of the PHA/projects reported conducting the training of their (re)certification staff, transferring information about changes in HUD policies to their staff, monitoring the quality of (re)certifications, using interview guides, scripts, and worksheets to aid in the (re)certification process, using computer software, and verifying all of the sources of (re)certification information. The majority of the PHA/projects also indicated having difficulties in getting tenants to report some (re)certification information, as well as in verifying some sources of (re)certification information. Most of the PHA/projects were able to resolve the difficulties via followup telephone calls and letters to the third party.

However, results differed with respect to the program type and the size of the PHA/projects. Owner-administered projects reported the smallest number of staff, (re)certification staff, and the number of units supported by the (re)certification staff. Owner-administered projects also indicated having the least amount of training being conducted for the smallest number of staff. Interestingly, owner-administered projects were less likely to report problems with questions on the scripts, guides, or worksheets, than other two types of PHA/projects. The results also differed with respect to the size of the PHA/projects. There was a clear linear trend, with smaller PHA/projects (less than 150 units) less likely to report conducting training and acknowledging less training hours than did medium-sized (150 to 500 units) or large PHA/projects (more than 500 units). Furthermore, the percentage of PHA/projects reporting not being able to answer staff's questions about HUD policies increased with increase in the size of the PHA/projects. Additionally, the percentage of PHA/projects monitoring work via internal processes increased with an increase in the size of the PHA/projects. These and other differences in responding indicate a diversity of (re)certification procedures across PHA/projects and highlight the need to examine in greater detail the context of (re)certification procedures at the PHA/project level.

It would be helpful for future studies to revise some of the PSQ items to reduce inconsistencies in responding, found, for example, in the number of (re)certification staff and units. Focus groups and cognitive interviewing might aid in revisions to the PSQ items by focusing attention on the specific circumstances and issues faced by the PHA/projects. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to develop and validate some items on the potential difficulties in conducting training, using computer software, and getting support from computer companies. Having detailed indicators of the positive as well as negative aspects of the (re)certification process at the PHA/project level would provide a more complete picture of the issues faced by the PHA/projects, as well as provide a better link between PSQ information and the estimation of payment and income errors.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

GLOSSARY OF STATISTICAL TERMS

Average. A general term applied to the various measures of central tendency, such as mean, median, and mode. When the term “average” is used without designating its type, most often it refers to the mean.

Correlation. Relationship or “going-togetherness” between two sets of scores or measures—tendency of one set of scores to vary concomitantly with the other set. Correlation coefficients range from +1.00 to –1.00, indicating the perfect positive and negative relationship, respectively. The existence of a strong relationship (high correlation) does not indicate the causal influence of one variable over the other, as their relationship can be affected by other factors.

Distribution. A tabulation of the scores to show the number of cases for each of the scores.

Mean. The type of average obtained by dividing the sum of a set of scores by their number.

Median. The middle score in a distribution that divides the distribution into two equal parts—half of the score above the median and half below it (except when the value of the median equals the obtained score for a case in the population). The 50th percentile.

Mode. The score or value that occurs most frequently in a distribution.

N. The symbol commonly used to represent the number of cases.

Normal distribution. A distribution of scores or measures that in a graphic form has a distinctive bell-shape appearance. Scores or measures in a normal distribution are distributed symmetrically about the mean, so that the same number of cases fall above or below the particular distance from the mean. Cases are clustered around the mean and decrease in frequency of occurrence as distance from the mean increases, thus creating the bell-shaped distribution where mean and median are identical.

Range. The difference between the highest and the lowest obtained score for a distribution of responses. Provides a very rough measure of a spread or variability of responses.

Random sample. A sample of the members of some population selected in such a way that every member of the population has an equal chance of being included in the sample. It is done to minimize the selection bias so that the cases selected would be representative of the total population.

Standard error. An estimate of the possible magnitude of error present for an individual score or some group measure (mean or correlation). The standard error is the estimated standard deviation of the sampling distribution of that statistic. Two out of three cases (67%) fall within one standard error above or below the statistic, 95% fall within plus or minus two standard errors, and 99% of cases fall within three standard errors. The standard error of a statistic depends on the sample size. In general, the larger the sample size, the smaller the standard error.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis

Standard deviation. A measure of variability or dispersion around the average (mean). The more scores cluster around the mean, the smaller the standard deviation. In a normal distribution, 68% of the cases fall within one standard deviation above or below the mean, 95% of the cases fall within two standard deviations above or below the mean, and 99% of cases fall within three standard deviations.

Variance. A measure of dispersion around the mean, equal to the sum of squared deviations from the mean divided by one less than the number of cases. The variance is measured in units that are the square of those of the variable itself (the square of the standard deviation).

Project Staff Questionnaire Source Tables

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

I. NUMBER AND TYPE OF STAFF

Table E-1.
Average Number of Staff and Units Supported by Staff, by Program Type

Number and Type of Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Total number of staff	15.8 (38.2) N=199	45.1 (102.2) N=114	5.4 (9.5) N=197	18.3 (56.1) N=510
Number of staff working on (re)certifications (weighted to reflect equivalence of full-time staff)	2.8 (3.4) N=199	14.4 (28.9) N=114	1.6 (2.3) N=197	4.9 (14.8) N=510
Full-time	2.7 (3.0) N=140	11.6 (16.6) N=107	1.6 (1.8) N=130	4.9 (10.0) N=377
Half- to full-time	2.6 (2.9) N=68	15.8 (42.2) N=29	1.4 (1.7) N=70	4.4 (18.3) N=167
Quarter to less than half time	1.8 (1.2) N=47	3.0 (3.3) N=18	1.1 (.4) N=35	1.8 (1.7) N=100
Less than quarter time	4.0 (7.1) N=31	22.8 (38.9) N=13	1.2 (.5) N=25	6.5 (18.8) N=69
Units supported by (re)certifications staff	304.4 (433.5) N=199	2974.6 (6584.5) N=114	137.0 (149.5) N=200	832.5 (3312.0) N=513
Ratio of units per full-time (re)certification staff	180.1 (242.5) N=199	211.7 (137.8) N=114	117.7 (130.4) N=197	163.0 (187.3) N=510
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: The averages are calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Note 4: Number of units was based on administrative data from HUD that was verified by the PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

II. TRAINING FOR THE NEW STAFF

Table E-2.
Types of Training and Average Number of Training Hours for New Staff, by Program Type

Types of Training of New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Read manual, watch videos, or Web-based	67.7% N=42	82.6% N=38	72.7% N=24	73.8% N=104
Average number of training hours	48.7 (56.6) N=42	38.4 (37.7) N=38	38.0 (70.6) N=24	42.5 (54.1) N=104
Supervisor/Senior staff held training sessions	74.2% N=46	89.1% N=41	75.8% N=25	79.4% N=112
Average number of training hours	81.7 (109.4) N=46	57.4 (81.4) N=41	28.4 (27.6) N=25	60.9 (88.5) N=112
Experienced staff worked one-on-one	91.9% N=57	87.0% N=40	81.8% N=27	87.9% N=124
Average number of training hours	155.5 (143.2) N=57	140.4 (163.0) N=40	43.7 (47.2) N=27	126.3 (142.1) N=124
Outside group conducted workshop/training	37.1% N=23	50.0% N=23	48.5% N=16	44.0% N=62
Average number of training hours	19.2 (11.5) N=23	35.6 (25.7) N=23	22.0 (11.6) N=16	26.0 (19.4) N=62
Other types of training	11.3% N=7	6.5% N=3	6.1% N=2	8.5% N=12
Average number of training hours	69.4 (155.2) N=7	190.0 (253.6) N=3	14.5 (13.4) N=2	90.4 (169.9) N=12
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	4.8% N=3	8.7% N=4	15.2% N=5	8.5% N=12
AVERAGE NUMBER OF NEW STAFF ASSIGNED TO CONDUCT (RE)CERTIFICATIONS	2.5 (2.3) N=62	5.0 (7.0) N=46	1.4 (.9) N=32	3.0 (4.5) N=140
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141
Percentage of all PHA/projects	31.2%	40.4%	16.5%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF	137	68	63	
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-3.
Types of Training Topics for New Staff and Average Ratings of
Topics' Frequency, by Program Type

Types of Training Topics for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
HUD, PHA, owner policies and rules	98.4%	97.8%	100.0%	98.6%
	N=61	N=45	N=33	N=139
Average ratings of frequency	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.2
	(.6)	(.4)	(.2)	(.5)
Tools in PHA/projects to conduct (re)certifications	96.8%	97.8%	93.9%	96.5%
	N=60	N=45	N=31	N=136
Average ratings of frequency	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.8
	(.8)	(.7)	(.7)	(.8)
How to conduct interviews	91.9%	95.7%	93.9%	93.6%
	N=57	N=44	N=31	N=132
Average ratings of frequency	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0
	(.8)	(.9)	(.9)	(.8)
Other training topics	16.1%	15.2%	12.1%	14.9%
	N=10	N=7	N=4	N=21
Average ratings of frequency	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.7
	(1.2)	(1.0)	(1.4)	(1.2)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.6%	2.2%	.0%	1.4%
	N=1	N=1	N=0	N=2
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141
Percentage of all PHA/projects	31.2%	40.4%	16.5%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF	137	68	63	372
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-4.
Sources of Training for New Staff and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Sources of Training for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Staff within the PHA/project	96.8% N=60	93.5% N=43	90.9% N=30	94.3% N=133
Average ratings of frequency	1.0 (.1)	1.0 (.2)	1.2 (.4)	1.1 (.3)
HUD	41.9% N=26	32.6% N=15	18.2% N=6	33.3% N=47
Average ratings of frequency	3.0 (1.4)	2.8 (1.3)	1.7 (.8)	2.7 (1.4)
Nan McKay and Associates	54.8% N=34	67.4% N=31	.0% N=0	46.1% N=65
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (.6)	2.1 (.7)	. (.)	2.3 (.7)
NAHRO national	37.1% N=23	34.8% N=16	.0% N=0	27.7% N=39
Average ratings of frequency	2.7 (1.1)	2.6 (1.0)	. (.)	2.6 (1.0)
NAHRO local	14.5% N=9	13.0% N=6	.0% N=0	10.6% N=15
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (.4)	2.7 (1.2)	. (.)	2.1 (.9)
NCHM	12.9% N=8	10.9% N=5	36.4% N=12	17.7% N=25
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.0)	2.8 (1.8)	1.8 (1.0)	2.0 (1.1)
AHMA/SAHMA/NAHMA	4.8% N=3	8.7% N=4	33.3% N=11	12.8% N=18
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.0)	4.3 (2.9)	2.2 (1.2)	2.6 (1.8)
Spectrum	4.8% N=3	6.5% N=3	3.0% N=1	5.0% N=7
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.0)	3.7 (2.9)	1.0 (.)	2.6 (2.0)
Other regional or national organization	21.0% N=13	10.9% N=5	21.2% N=7	17.7% N=25
Average ratings of frequency	2.2 (.6)	4.6 (3.0)	2.4 (1.0)	2.8 (1.7)
Neighboring PHA	4.8% N=3	13.0% N=6	3.0% N=1	7.1% N=10
Average ratings of frequency	2.7 (1.2)	3.8 (3.8)	3.0 (.)	3.4 (3.0)
Outside contractor	29.0% N=18	26.1% N=12	18.2% N=6	25.5% N=36
Average ratings of frequency	4.2 (1.8)	3.3 (2.6)	2.5 (1.6)	3.6 (2.1)
Other	24.2% N=15	26.1% N=12	30.3% N=10	26.2% N=37
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (.9)	2.2 (.7)	1.8 (1.2)	1.9 (.9)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	3.2% N=2	4.3% N=2	.0% N=0	2.8% N=4
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141
Percentage of all PHA/projects	31.2%	40.4%	16.5%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF	137	68	63	372
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-5.
Locations of Training for New Staff and Average Ratings of
Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Locations of Training for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
At the PHA/project office	100.0% N=62	97.8% N=45	90.9% N=30	97.2% N=137
Average ratings of frequency	1.0 (.1)	1.0 (.2)	1.2 (.6)	1.1 (.3)
At an outside training center	59.7% N=37	56.5% N=26	66.7% N=22	60.3% N=85
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (.3)	2.1 (.5)	1.7 (.6)	1.9 (.5)
Tele-course/Internet/Web-based training	35.5% N=22	47.8% N=22	30.3% N=10	38.3% N=54
Average ratings of frequency	2.4 (.6)	2.3 (.6)	2.3 (.7)	2.3 (.6)
Other	3.2% N=2	4.3% N=2	12.1% N=4	5.7% N=8
Average ratings of frequency	1.5 (.7)	1.5 (.7)	1.8 (1.5)	1.6 (1.1)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0% N=0	2.2% N=1	.0% N=0	.7% N=1
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141
Percentage of all PHA/projects	31.2%	40.4%	16.5%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF	137	68	63	372
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-6.
Format of Training for New Staff and Average Ratings of Frequency of
Use, by Program Type

Format of Training for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Group	77.4% N=48	58.7% N=27	54.5% N=18	66.0% N=93
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (.5)	1.9 (.6)	1.8 (.6)	1.8 (.5)
One-on-one	69.4% N=43	76.1% N=35	81.8% N=27	74.5% N=105
Average ratings of frequency	1.2 (.4)	1.2 (.4)	1.1 (.4)	1.2 (.4)
Both group and one-on-one	67.7% N=42	65.2% N=30	57.6% N=19	64.5% N=91
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (.9)	1.9 (.9)	1.5 (.7)	1.7 (.9)
Other	9.7% N=6	.0% N=0	3.0% N=1	5.0% N=7
Average ratings of frequency	3.0 (.9)	. (.)	2.0 (.)	2.9 (.9)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0% N=0	4.3% N=2	.0% N=0	1.4% N=2
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141
Percentage of all PHA/projects	31.2%	40.4%	16.5%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF	137	68	63	372
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

**Table E-7.
Variability of Training for New Staff, by Program Type**

Variability of Training for New Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
All new staff receive the same training	58.1% N=36	37.0% N=17	42.4% N=14	47.5% N=67
Training varies based on the position or function	61.3% N=38	89.1% N=41	78.8% N=26	74.5% N=105
Staff are permitted to select different types of training	9.7% N=6	6.5% N=3	6.1% N=2	7.8% N=11
Other	1.6% N=1	.0% N=0	12.1% N=4	3.5% N=5
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.6% N=1	2.2% N=1	.0% N=0	1.4% N=2
PHA/PROJECTS WITH NEW STAFF	62	46	33	141
Percentage of all PHA/projects	31.2%	40.4%	16.5%	27.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT ANY NEW STAFF	137	68	63	372
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that assigned new staff to conduct (re)certifications in the past 12 months.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

III. TRAINING FOR THE EXPERIENCED STAFF

Table E-8.
Reasons for Training of Experienced Staff, Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, and Average Number of Hours of Training, by Program Type

Reasons for Training of Experienced Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
As a refresher, to help staff “brush up” on skills/knowledge	87.3% N=137	89.0% N=81	72.9% N=102	82.5% N=320
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (1.1)	1.7 (1.0)	1.8 (1.0)	1.8 (1.0)
Average number of hours	13.8 (14.9) N=127	17.6 (14.7) N=72	13.1 (15.5) N=84	14.5 (15.1) N=283
To discuss changes in HUD rules or policies	94.9% N=149	87.9% N=80	95.7% N=134	93.6% N=363
Average ratings of frequency	1.3 (.8)	1.5 (.8)	1.2 (.4)	1.3 (.7)
Average number of hours	14.3 (16.9) N=136	12.7 (12.4) N=71	13.0 (9.4) N=113	13.5 (13.6) N=320
To discuss changes in the PHA/project’s rules or procedures	78.3% N=123	74.7% N=68	52.9% N=74	68.3% N=265
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.9)	2.0 (.9)	1.9 (.9)	1.9 (.9)
Average number of hours	10.6 (16.3) N=108	12.0 (12.6) N=58	12.5 (18.5) N=57	11.5 (16.0) N=223
To discuss changes in computers/software	51.6% N=81	73.6% N=67	50.7% N=71	56.4% N=219
Average ratings of frequency	2.7 (1.2)	2.7 (1.2)	2.1 (1.1)	2.5 (1.2)
Average number of hours	6.8 (6.6) N=67	10.7 (13.7) N=54	9.3 (10.9) N=56	8.8 (10.6) N=177
To reward/benefit employees for outstanding work	16.6% N=26	25.3% N=23	20.0% N=28	19.8% N=77
Average ratings of frequency	3.9 (1.7)	3.7 (1.6)	3.2 (1.7)	3.6 (1.7)
Average number of hours	4.1 (6.6) N=19	5.4 (6.0) N=17	2.9 (2.7) N=16	4.2 (5.5) N=52
Other	3.8% N=6	8.8% N=8	7.1% N=10	6.2% N=24
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (1.6)	3.1 (2.4)	3.7 (2.3)	3.0 (2.2)
Average number of hours	13.0 (14.1) N=6	20.6 (25.4) N=7	12.8 (9.7) N=8	15.4 (17.0) N=21
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.7% N=1	.3% N=1
AVERAGE NUMBER OF EXPERIENCED STAFF ASSIGNED TO CONDUCT (RE)CERTIFICATIONS	7.0 (12.4) N=154	19.0 (49.9) N=91	1.9 (2.0) N=136	8.1 (26.4) N=381
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388
Percentage of all PHA/projects	78.9%	79.8%	70.0%	75.6%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	42	23	60	125
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that have experienced staff (other than the new staff) participating in training in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Note 4: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-9.
Training Topics for Experienced Staff and Average Ratings of
Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Training Topics for Experienced Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
HUD policies and rules for conducting (re)certifications	97.5% N=153	97.8% N=89	95.7% N=134	96.9% N=376
Average ratings of frequency	1.3 (.7)	1.5 (.7)	1.3 (.5)	1.3 (.6)
Tools available in the PHA/project to help conducting (re)certifications	87.3% N=137	84.6% N=77	60.7% N=85	77.1% N=299
Average ratings of frequency	2.4 (.9)	2.3 (1.1)	2.2 (1.0)	2.3 (1.0)
How to conduct interviews	75.8% N=119	69.2% N=63	64.3% N=90	70.1% N=272
Average ratings of frequency	2.9 (1.2)	2.7 (1.1)	2.4 (1.2)	2.7 (1.2)
Changes in HUD or PHA/project policies or procedures	89.8% N=141	90.1% N=82	92.9% N=130	91.0% N=353
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (.8)	1.5 (.8)	1.5 (.7)	1.6 (.8)
Other	8.9% N=14	3.3% N=3	8.6% N=12	7.5% N=29
Average ratings of frequency	2.9 (1.9)	2.3 (2.3)	3.6 (1.8)	3.1 (1.9)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0% N=0	1.1% N=1	.7% N=1	.5% N=2
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388
Percentage of all PHA/projects	78.9%	79.8%	70.0%	75.6%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	42	23	60	125
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that have experienced staff (other than the new staff) participating in training in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-10.
Types of Training for Experienced Staff and Average Ratings of
Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Types of Training for Experienced Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Staff read HUD/PHA/owner manual or other publications with informal questions/answers	83.4% N=131	76.9% N=70	63.6% N=89	74.7% N=290
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (.7)	2.0 (.7)	1.9 (.8)	1.9 (.7)
Supervisor/Senior staff conducted training sessions	77.7% N=122	87.9% N=80	75.0% N=105	79.1% N=307
Average ratings of frequency	1.5 (.6)	1.3 (.5)	1.5 (.7)	1.5 (.6)
Training/Workshops conducted by an outside organization	73.2% N=115	86.8% N=79	87.1% N=122	81.4% N=316
Average ratings of frequency	1.6 (.7)	1.8 (.8)	1.4 (.6)	1.6 (.7)
Other	6.4% N=10	4.4% N=4	7.1% N=10	6.2% N=24
Average ratings of frequency	2.3 (1.2)	2.8 (1.5)	2.9 (1.3)	2.6 (1.2)
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388
Percentage of all PHA/projects	78.9%	79.8%	70.0%	75.6%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	42	23	60	125
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that have experienced staff (other than the new staff) participating in training in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

**Table E-11.
Sources of Training for Experienced Staff and Average Ratings of
Frequency of Use, by Program Type**

Sources of Training for Experienced Staff	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
STAFF WITHIN PHA/PROJECT CONDUCTED TRAINING	76.4%	81.3%	64.3%	73.2%
	N=120	N=74	N=90	N=284
OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS CONDUCTED TRAINING	72.6%	91.2%	87.9%	82.5%
	N=114	N=83	N=123	N=320
HUD	46.5%	58.2%	34.3%	44.8%
	N=73	N=53	N=48	N=174
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (1.1)	2.1 (1.0)	1.6 (.7)	1.9 (1.0)
Nan McKay and Associates	53.5%	65.9%	2.9%	38.1%
	N=84	N=60	N=4	N=148
Average ratings of frequency	1.6 (.9)	1.5 (.7)	2.0 (.8)	1.5 (.8)
NAHRO National	42.0%	37.4%	2.9%	26.8%
	N=66	N=34	N=4	N=104
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (1.0)	1.9 (1.0)	2.5 (1.3)	2.0 (1.0)
NAHRO Local	15.3%	19.8%	5.7%	12.9%
	N=24	N=18	N=8	N=50
Average ratings of frequency	1.3 (.9)	2.3 (1.1)	2.0 (1.1)	1.8 (1.1)
NCHM	3.8%	4.4%	19.3%	9.5%
	N=6	N=4	N=27	N=37
Average ratings of frequency	2.7 (1.0)	2.8 (1.0)	1.3 (.7)	1.7 (1.0)
AHMA/SAHMA/NAHMA	2.5%	1.1%	40.7%	16.0%
	N=4	N=1	N=57	N=62
Average ratings of frequency	3.3 (1.5)	2.0 (.)	1.2 (.4)	1.3 (.7)
Spectrum	2.5%	2.2%	10.0%	5.2%
	N=4	N=2	N=14	N=20
Average ratings of frequency	2.3 (1.9)	2.5 (2.1)	2.4 (1.3)	2.3 (1.4)
Other regional or national organization	11.5%	11.0%	14.3%	12.4%
	N=18	N=10	N=20	N=48
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (1.1)	2.3 (1.6)	2.0 (1.2)	1.9 (1.3)
Other PHA	3.2%	8.8%	5.0%	5.2%
	N=5	N=8	N=7	N=20
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.7)	3.6 (1.4)	2.7 (1.8)	2.9 (1.5)
Outside contractor	13.4%	24.2%	25.7%	20.4%
	N=21	N=22	N=36	N=79
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (1.3)	1.7 (1.1)	1.5 (.8)	1.9 (1.1)
QUADEL	.0%	2.2%	12.1%	4.9%
	N=0	N=2	N=17	N=19
Average ratings of frequency	. (.)	1.0 (.0)	1.4 (.5)	1.3 (.5)
Other	15.3%	23.1%	25.7%	20.9%
	N=24	N=21	N=36	N=81
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (.5)	1.7 (.9)	1.6 (1.0)	1.6 (.8)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0%	2.2%	3.6%	1.8%
	N=0	N=2	N=5	N=7
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388
Percentage of all PHA/projects	78.9%	79.8%	70.0%	75.6%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	42	23	60	125
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that have experienced staff participating in training in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Note 4: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-12.
Methods to Disseminate Training Information to Experienced Staff Who Did Not Attend Training and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Methods to Disseminate Training Information to Experienced Staff Who Did Not Attend Training	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Staff Meetings	51.6% N=81	64.8% N=59	48.6% N=68	53.6% N=208
Average ratings of frequency	1.3 (.7)	1.5 (.8)	1.5 (.9)	1.4 (.8)
Training Sessions or workshops for appropriate Staff	37.6% N=59	48.4% N=44	28.6% N=40	36.9% N=143
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.8)	1.9 (.8)	1.8 (.9)	1.9 (.8)
Memos/Other written documents/manual updates	51.6% N=81	68.1% N=62	47.1% N=66	53.9% N=209
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.8)	2.1 (.8)	1.9 (.8)	2.0 (.8)
All staff attended the training	32.5% N=51	41.8% N=38	40.7% N=57	37.6% N=146
Average ratings of frequency	1.5 (.8)	1.5 (.9)	1.2 (.7)	1.4 (.8)
Information not passed on	4.5% N=7	3.3% N=3	5.7% N=8	4.6% N=18
Average ratings of frequency	4.0 (1.4)	2.3 (2.3)	2.6 (2.2)	3.1 (2.0)
Other	5.1% N=8	4.4% N=4	6.4% N=9	5.4% N=21
Average ratings of frequency	1.5 (.5)	1.3 (.5)	2.4 (1.7)	1.9 (1.3)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.6% N=1	2.2% N=2	7.9% N=11	3.6% N=14
PHA/PROJECTS WITH TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	157	91	140	388
Percentage of all PHA/projects	78.9%	79.8%	70.0%	75.6%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT TRAINING FOR EXPERIENCED STAFF	42	23	60	125
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that have experienced staff (other than the new staff) participating in training in the past 12 months.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

III. INFORMATION TRANSFER

Table E-13.
Methods to Communicate Information to Staff About Changes in HUD Policies
and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Methods to Communicate Information to Staff About Changes in HUD Policies	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Formal training session is held	64.3% N=128	70.2% N=80	58.5% N=117	63.4% N=325
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (1.2)	1.9 (1.1)	2.0 (1.1)	2.0 (1.2)
Staff memo is written describing the changes and providing detailed instructions for implementation	70.9% N=141	78.1% N=89	71.0% N=142	72.5% N=372
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (.9)	1.7 (.8)	1.5 (.9)	1.6 (.9)
Informal oral communication by supervisors to staff	71.4% N=142	73.7% N=84	59.0% N=118	67.1% N=344
Average ratings of frequency	2.1 (1.0)	2.4 (1.2)	2.1 (1.1)	2.1 (1.1)
Staff memo is written describing the change in regulation (with no instructions)	23.1% N=46	23.7% N=27	27.5% N=55	25.0% N=128
Average ratings of frequency	2.9 (1.5)	3.4 (1.7)	2.6 (1.3)	2.9 (1.5)
The HUD announcement is copied and distributed	84.4% N=168	79.8% N=91	78.5% N=157	81.1% N=416
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (1.1)	1.9 (1.2)	1.6 (1.0)	1.7 (1.1)
Primarily word of mouth (among workers)	27.1% N=54	23.7% N=27	20.5% N=41	23.8% N=122
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (1.6)	4.0 (1.9)	3.1 (1.8)	3.1 (1.8)
Other	11.6% N=23	8.8% N=10	9.0% N=18	9.9% N=51
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (1.6)	2.1 (1.8)	2.4 (2.2)	2.1 (1.8)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0% N=0	.9% N=1	2.5% N=5	1.2% N=6
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-14.
Sources of Information to Answer Staff's Questions About HUD Policies
and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Sources of Information to Answer Staff's Questions About HUD Policies	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
HUD field office or other HUD staff	71.9% N=143	93.9% N=107	83.0% N=166	81.1% N=416
Average ratings of frequency	1.6 (.9)	1.7 (1.0)	1.5 (1.0)	1.6 (1.0)
Meetings or talks with other PHA/owners	63.3% N=126	71.1% N=81	38.0% N=76	55.2% N=283
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (1.1)	2.0 (.9)	2.0 (1.0)	1.9 (1.0)
Usually do not get answers; staff have to figure out themselves	19.1% N=38	22.8% N=26	14.5% N=29	18.1% N=93
Average ratings of frequency	2.5 (1.5)	3.2 (1.9)	3.0 (1.6)	2.8 (1.7)
Internet/Web-based information	55.8% N=111	68.4% N=78	55.5% N=111	58.5% N=300
Average ratings of frequency	2.1 (1.0)	2.1 (1.0)	2.1 (.9)	2.1 (1.0)
Contractors/Consulting services	28.1% N=56	36.8% N=42	29.5% N=59	30.6% N=157
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (1.3)	2.7 (1.2)	2.5 (1.2)	2.6 (1.2)
Save up questions and take to a training session	33.7% N=67	24.6% N=28	22.5% N=45	27.3% N=140
Average ratings of frequency	2.9 (1.5)	4.1 (1.0)	3.2 (1.5)	3.2 (1.5)
Other	21.1% N=42	14.0% N=16	32.5% N=65	24.0% N=123
Average ratings of frequency	1.4 (1.1)	1.6 (1.5)	1.4 (.7)	1.4 (1.0)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.5% N=1	.9% N=1	2.0% N=4	1.2% N=6
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

IV. QUALITY CONTROL

**Table E-15.
PHA/Projects with Different Types of Work Monitoring, by Program Type**

Types of Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
PHA/projects have an internal process for monitoring the work of staff who conduct (re)certifications	87.4% N=174	97.4% N=111	87.0% N=174	89.5% N=459
HUD or a HUD contractor conduct an audit of tenant files in the last year	84.4% N=168	90.4% N=103	82.5% N=165	85.0% N=436
PHA/projects did not indicate any work monitoring	3.0% N=6	.0% N=0	2.5% N=5	2.1% N=11
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-16.
Types of Work Monitoring and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Types of Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Observation	42.0%	47.7%	36.8%	41.4%
	N=73	N=53	N=64	N=190
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.9	2.4	2.6
	(1.6)	(1.5)	(1.6)	(1.6)
Review of files while in process	54.0%	64.9%	59.8%	58.8%
	N=94	N=72	N=104	N=270
Average ratings of frequency	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.7
	(.9)	(1.1)	(1.2)	(1.1)
Review of files after completion	89.7%	89.2%	84.5%	87.6%
	N=156	N=99	N=147	N=402
Average ratings of frequency	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5
	(1.0)	(.7)	(.9)	(.9)
Discussion with staff while in process	58.6%	55.0%	50.6%	54.7%
	N=102	N=61	N=88	N=251
Average ratings of frequency	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.2
	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.3)	(1.2)
Discussion with staff after completion	60.9%	60.4%	47.7%	55.8%
	N=106	N=67	N=83	N=256
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.9	2.4	2.5
	(1.4)	(1.4)	(1.3)	(1.4)
Someone sits in on the actual interview with the client	20.7%	25.2%	16.1%	20.0%
	N=36	N=28	N=28	N=92
Average ratings of frequency	3.2	4.0	2.6	3.3
	(2.4)	(2.2)	(2.0)	(2.3)
Reinterview households	16.7%	19.8%	13.2%	16.1%
	N=29	N=22	N=23	N=74
Average ratings of frequency	3.2	4.5	3.0	3.5
	(2.3)	(2.6)	(1.9)	(2.4)
Use statistics or computer generated print-outs	48.9%	54.1%	39.1%	46.4%
	N=85	N=60	N=68	N=213
Average ratings of frequency	2.5	2.9	2.6	2.6
	(1.8)	(2.1)	(1.9)	(1.9)
Other	4.0%	5.4%	13.2%	7.8%
	N=7	N=6	N=23	N=36
Average ratings of frequency	2.3	2.7	1.9	2.1
	(3.0)	(3.2)	(1.2)	(2.0)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.7%	.9%	.6%	1.1%
	N=3	N=1	N=1	N=5
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459
Percentage of all PHA/projects	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-17.
Circumstances Under Which Work Monitoring Is Conducted
and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Circumstances Under Which Work Monitoring Is Conducted	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Random spot check of a certain percentage of all cases	69.0%	58.6%	54.0%	60.8%
	N=120	N=65	N=94	N=279
Average ratings of frequency	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2
	(.4)	(.5)	(.6)	(.5)
Average percentage of cases that are randomly checked	17.3	17.9	20.2	18.5
	(20.7)	(19.7)	(18.1)	(19.5)
	N=78	N=47	N=71	N=196
Check on certain dates or times of year	38.5%	28.8%	39.7%	36.6%
	N=67	N=32	N=69	N=168
Average ratings of frequency	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.8
	(1.2)	(.9)	(.8)	(1.0)
Check on certain cases within a given period	29.9%	36.0%	26.4%	30.1%
	N=52	N=40	N=46	N=138
Average ratings of frequency	2.5	2.1	1.9	2.2
	(1.3)	(.9)	(.8)	(1.1)
Whenever a problem is suspected	64.9%	55.9%	42.5%	54.2%
	N=113	N=62	N=74	N=249
Average ratings of frequency	1.9	2.5	2.0	2.0
	(.8)	(1.0)	(.9)	(.9)
Other	10.3%	11.7%	12.1%	11.3%
	N=18	N=13	N=21	N=52
Average ratings of frequency	1.9	1.2	1.4	1.5
	(1.5)	(.4)	(.7)	(1.1)
Check 100% of cases	14.4%	26.1%	20.1%	19.4%
	N=25	N=29	N=35	N=89
Average ratings of frequency	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0
	(.0)	(.0)	(.3)	(.2)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.7%	.9%	.6%	1.1%
	N=3	N=1	N=1	N=5
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459
Percentage of all PHA/projects	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Note 4: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-18.
Types of Cases Selected for Work Monitoring and Average Ratings of
Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Types of Cases Selected for Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
All files	53.4% N=93	53.2% N=59	58.0% N=101	55.1% N=253
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (1.6)	1.7 (1.5)	1.5 (.9)	1.7 (1.3)
Move-in certifications	48.9% N=85	32.4% N=36	57.5% N=100	48.1% N=221
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (1.2)	2.2 (1.4)	1.4 (.7)	1.7 (1.1)
New staff	34.5% N=60	33.3% N=37	21.8% N=38	29.4% N=135
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (1.3)	2.1 (1.2)	2.2 (1.2)	2.0 (1.2)
Random sample	67.8% N=118	71.2% N=79	62.1% N=108	66.4% N=305
Average ratings of frequency	1.4 (.8)	1.5 (.9)	1.6 (.9)	1.5 (.8)
Files with certain characteristics or anomalies	42.0% N=73	34.2% N=38	28.7% N=50	35.1% N=161
Average ratings of frequency	2.5 (1.2)	2.8 (1.4)	2.3 (1.3)	2.5 (1.3)
Staff who have past performance problems	40.2% N=70	36.9% N=41	20.7% N=36	32.0% N=147
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (1.5)	2.6 (1.3)	2.7 (1.7)	2.6 (1.5)
Other	8.6% N=15	5.4% N=6	3.4% N=6	5.9% N=27
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (2.1)	2.3 (2.4)	1.2 (.4)	1.9 (1.9)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.7% N=3	3.6% N=4	1.7% N=3	2.2% N=10
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459
Percentage of all PHA/projects	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-19.
Tools Used to Conduct Work Monitoring and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Tools Used to Conduct Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Predesigned form for checking key steps	74.7%	80.2%	75.3%	76.3%
	N=130	N=89	N=131	N=350
Average ratings of frequency	1.1 (.4)	1.1 (.3)	1.2 (.5)	1.1 (.4)
Individualized notes for each case reviewed	54.0%	47.7%	51.7%	51.6%
	N=94	N=53	N=90	N=237
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (.7)	1.7 (.6)	1.8 (.8)	1.8 (.7)
Reinterview the household	25.9%	18.0%	19.0%	21.4%
	N=45	N=20	N=33	N=98
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (1.2)	2.7 (1.1)	2.4 (1.2)	2.5 (1.2)
Computer program	43.7%	46.8%	50.6%	47.1%
	N=76	N=52	N=88	N=216
Average ratings of frequency	1.6 (.8)	2.1 (.9)	1.6 (.8)	1.7 (.8)
Other	8.6%	10.8%	6.3%	8.3%
	N=15	N=12	N=11	N=38
Average ratings of frequency	2.7 (1.8)	1.6 (1.2)	1.5 (.7)	2.0 (1.5)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	2.9%	.0%	2.9%	2.2%
	N=5	N=0	N=5	N=10
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459
Percentage of all PHA/projects	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-20.
Individuals Who Conduct Work Monitoring and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Individuals Who Conduct Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Team leader or supervisor	87.4%	92.8%	78.2%	85.2%
	N=152	N=103	N=136	N=391
Average ratings of frequency	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.4)	1.1 (.3)
Outside contractor/Consultant	30.5%	19.8%	31.0%	28.1%
	N=53	N=22	N=54	N=129
Average ratings of frequency	2.8 (1.2)	2.8 (1.3)	1.9 (.8)	2.4 (1.1)
Coworker	40.8%	39.6%	30.5%	36.6%
	N=71	N=44	N=53	N=168
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (.6)	2.1 (.8)	1.8 (.7)	1.9 (.7)
Staff auditor	42.0%	29.7%	33.9%	35.9%
	N=73	N=33	N=59	N=165
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.9)	1.7 (.8)	1.6 (.8)	1.8 (.9)
Other	5.7%	8.1%	15.5%	10.0%
	N=10	N=9	N=27	N=46
Average ratings of frequency	2.5 (1.4)	1.6 (.9)	1.5 (.6)	1.7 (1.0)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.7%	.0%	.6%	.9%
	N=3	N=0	N=1	N=4
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF				
Percentage of all PHA/projects	174	111	174	459
	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF				
	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS				
	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-21.
Timing of Work Monitoring and Average Ratings of Frequency of Use, by Program Type

Timing of Work Monitoring	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Both before and after the (re)certification becomes effective	77.0% N=134	72.1% N=80	69.0% N=120	72.8% N=334
Only before the (re)certification becomes effective	13.2% N=23	9.9% N=11	12.1% N=21	12.0% N=55
Only after the (re)certification becomes effective	6.3% N=11	16.2% N=18	14.4% N=25	11.8% N=54
Other	5.2% N=9	3.6% N=4	5.2% N=9	4.8% N=22
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	2.3% N=4	.0% N=0	2.3% N=4	1.7% N=8
PHA/PROJECTS WITH INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	174	111	174	459
Percentage of all PHA/projects	87.4%	97.4%	87.0%	89.5%
PHA/PROJECTS WITHOUT INTERNAL WORK MONITORING OF STAFF	25	3	26	54
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for PHA/projects that conduct work monitoring of staff who perform (re)certifications.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-22.
The Use of Worksheets and Interview Scripts/Guides for Calculating Income, Allowances, or Rent Amounts and Strategies for Using Worksheets, by Program Type

Strategies for Using Worksheets and Interview Scripts/Guides	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Tenant fills out script/interview guide	14.6% N=29	28.1% N=32	17.5% N=35	18.7% N=96
Staff reads questions and records answers	24.6% N=49	12.3% N=14	26.0% N=52	22.4% N=115
Both	36.2% N=72	39.5% N=45	29.0% N=58	34.1% N=175
Other	7.5% N=15	6.1% N=7	5.0% N=10	6.2% N=32
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	12.6% N=25	14.0% N=16	18.5% N=37	15.2% N=78
DO NOT USE WORKSHEETS OR INTERVIEW SCRIPT/GUIDES	4.5% N=9	.0% N=0	4.0% N=8	3.3% N=17
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS USING WORKSHEETS OR INTERVIEW SCRIPT/GUIDES	95.5% N=190	100.0% N=114	96.0% N=192	96.7% N=496
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

**Table E-23.
Most Problematic Questions for Tenants to Understand or Answer
and Average Ratings of Frequency of Occurrence, by Program Type**

Most Problematic Questions for Tenants to Understand or Answer	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Earned income	46.2%	43.9%	37.5%	42.3%
	N=92	N=50	N=75	N=217
Average ratings of frequency	2.7	3.9	2.7	3.0
	(2.6)	(3.2)	(2.7)	(2.8)
Sporadic or intermittent income	83.4%	87.7%	69.5%	78.9%
	N=166	N=100	N=139	N=405
Average ratings of frequency	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.6
	(1.4)	(1.0)	(.8)	(1.1)
Income received from absent family members	52.8%	50.9%	36.0%	45.8%
	N=105	N=58	N=72	N=235
Average ratings of frequency	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.5
	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.5)	(1.6)
Income from self-employment	62.3%	70.2%	39.0%	55.0%
	N=124	N=80	N=78	N=282
Average ratings of frequency	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.5
	(1.9)	(1.5)	(1.6)	(1.7)
Other income (Social Security, retirement, TANF, etc.)	41.2%	35.1%	33.5%	36.8%
	N=82	N=40	N=67	N=189
Average ratings of frequency	3.8	4.9	3.5	3.9
	(2.9)	(3.0)	(2.6)	(2.9)
Child support	48.2%	53.5%	34.0%	43.9%
	N=96	N=61	N=68	N=225
Average ratings of frequency	3.1	4.0	2.7	3.2
	(2.3)	(2.4)	(1.9)	(2.3)
Training programs	37.7%	36.8%	19.5%	30.4%
	N=75	N=42	N=39	N=156
Average ratings of frequency	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.3
	(2.3)	(2.8)	(2.4)	(2.4)
Household composition	33.2%	45.6%	20.5%	31.0%
	N=66	N=52	N=41	N=159
Average ratings of frequency	3.7	4.0	4.6	4.0
	(3.3)	(2.8)	(3.1)	(3.1)
Child care expenses	39.7%	40.4%	25.5%	34.3%
	N=79	N=46	N=51	N=176
Average ratings of frequency	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.3
	(2.9)	(2.5)	(2.9)	(2.8)
Medical expenses	63.3%	64.0%	59.5%	62.0%
	N=126	N=73	N=119	N=318
Average ratings of frequency	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.5
	(1.9)	(2.1)	(2.0)	(2.0)
Assets	7.0%	4.4%	5.0%	5.7%
	N=14	N=5	N=10	N=29
Average ratings of frequency	2.1	5.2	1.5	2.4
	(.9)	(2.6)	(.7)	(1.8)
Other	8.0%	5.3%	7.0%	7.0%
	N=16	N=6	N=14	N=36
Average ratings of frequency	2.1	2.8	1.4	1.9
	(2.6)	(3.5)	(.8)	(2.3)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	2.5%	3.5%	5.5%	3.9%
	N=5	N=4	N=11	N=20
DO NOT USE WORKSHEETS	4.5%	.0%	4.0%	3.3%
	N=9	N=0	N=8	N=17
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Averages and percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

VI. AUTOMATION

Table E-24.
The Use of Computers for (Re)Certifications
and Types of Tenants for Whom the Computers are Used, by Program Type

Types of Tenants for Whom the Computers Are Used	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
For all tenants	95.0% N=189	97.4% N=111	94.5% N=189	95.3% N=489
For some tenants	.5% N=1	1.8% N=2	.5% N=1	.8% N=4
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.5% N=1	.0% N=0	.5% N=1	.4% N=2
DO NOT USE COMPUTERS IN (RE)CERTIFICATIONS	4.0% N=8	.9% N=1	4.5% N=9	3.5% N=18
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS USING COMPUTERS	96.0% N=191	99.1% N=113	95.5% N=191	96.5% N=495
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

**Table E-25.
Companies Providing Software and/or Computer Support, by Program Type**

Companies Providing Software and/or Computer Support	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
HUD Manager	5.0% N=10	1.8% N=2	44.5% N=89	19.7% N=101
Rent Roll	1.0% N=2	.0% N=0	22.0% N=44	9.0% N=46
Creative Computer Solutions	10.1% N=20	5.3% N=6	.0% N=0	5.1% N=26
In-house and internal Management Information Systems (MIS)	29.1% N=58	11.4% N=13	7.5% N=15	16.8% N=86
Memory Lane Systems	6.5% N=13	3.5% N=4	.5% N=1	3.5% N=18
Happy Software	1.0% N=2	14.0% N=16	.0% N=0	3.5% N=18
Lindsey Software Systems	10.1% N=20	7.9% N=9	.0% N=0	5.7% N=29
Emphasis or ECS	14.6% N=29	24.6% N=28	.0% N=0	11.1% N=57
Scott Accounting	5.5% N=11	3.5% N=4	.0% N=0	2.9% N=15
YARDI Systems	2.5% N=5	5.3% N=6	8.0% N=16	5.3% N=27
Other	29.6% N=59	41.2% N=47	40.0% N=80	36.3% N=186
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	1.0% N=2	1.8% N=2	.5% N=1	1.0% N=5
DO NOT USE COMPUTERS IN (RE)CERTIFICATIONS	4.0% N=8	.9% N=1	4.5% N=9	3.5% N=18
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-26.
Activities for Which Computer Software Is Used, by Program Type

Activities for Which Computer Software Is Used	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Interviewing tenants and recording answers	47.2% N=94	28.9% N=33	18.5% N=37	32.0% N=164
Keeping track of pending verifications	53.3% N=106	53.5% N=61	63.5% N=127	57.3% N=294
Inputting verified information	81.4% N=162	93.0% N=106	86.0% N=172	85.8% N=440
Calculating rent	88.9% N=177	96.5% N=110	93.5% N=187	92.4% N=474
Printing the 50058/50059 form	95.0% N=189	98.2% N=112	95.5% N=191	95.9% N=492
Accounting	77.9% N=155	76.3% N=87	55.0% N=110	68.6% N=352
Maintenance reporting	77.4% N=154	43.0% N=49	37.0% N=74	54.0% N=277
Printing letters to the tenants	86.9% N=173	86.0% N=98	81.0% N=162	84.4% N=433
Assigning recertification dates/appointments	74.4% N=148	69.3% N=79	60.0% N=120	67.6% N=347
Printing checks	62.3% N=124	76.3% N=87	14.0% N=28	46.6% N=239
Submitting tenant information to HUD	86.9% N=173	96.5% N=110	86.5% N=173	88.9% N=456
Conducting rent reasonableness comparisons	33.7% N=67	50.9% N=58	13.0% N=26	29.4% N=151
Maintaining demographics on the population	62.8% N=125	64.9% N=74	49.5% N=99	58.1% N=298
Keeping other types of statistics	74.4% N=148	83.3% N=95	56.5% N=113	69.4% N=356
Do not use computers in (re)certifications	4.0% N=8	.9% N=1	4.5% N=9	3.5% N=18
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-27a.
Transfer of 50058/50059 Data to HUD via PIC/TRACS System, by Program Type

Transfer of 50058/50059 Data to HUD via PIC/TRACS System	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Directly	88.4% N=176	92.1% N=105	55.5% N=111	76.4% N=392
Through another agency	6.0% N=12	4.4% N=5	32.0% N=64	15.8% N=81
Other	2.5% N=5	.0% N=0	4.5% N=9	2.7% N=14
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	2.0% N=4	1.8% N=2	3.0% N=6	2.3% N=12
DO NOT TRANSFER 50058/50059 DATA VIA PIC/TRACS SYSTEM	1.0% N=2	1.8% N=2	5.0% N=10	2.7% N=14
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS TRANSFERRING 50058/50059 DATA TO HUD VIA PIC/TRACS	99.0% 197	98.2% 112	95.0% 190	97.3% 499
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-27b.
Reasons Why Data for Some Assisted Households Are Not Submitted
to the PIC/TRACS System, by Program Type

Reasons Why Data for Some Assisted Households Are Not Submitted to the PIC/TRACS	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Software problems/vendor problems	.5% N=1	2.6% N=3	.0% N=0	.8% N=4
Lack of resources	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0
Other system problems	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.5% N=1	.2% N=1
Higher priorities	.0% N=0	.9% N=1	.0% N=0	.2% N=1
Other	3.0% N=6	.9% N=1	.0% N=0	1.4% N=7
DON'T KNOW	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.5% N=1	.2% N=1
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS NOT SUBMITTING ALL DATA TO HUD VIA PIC/TRACS	3.5% N=7	4.4% N=5	1.0% N=2	2.7% N=14
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF CASES SUBMITTED TO HUD VIA PIC/TRACS	91.2 (4.0) N=6	91.0 (5.2) N=5	90.0 (.) N=1	91.0 (4.2) N=12
TOTAL PHA/PROJECTS TRANSFERRING 50058/50059 DATA TO HUD VIA PIC/TRACS	99.0% 197	98.2% 112	95.0% 190	97.3% 499
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

VII. TENANT INTERVIEW

Table E-28.
Reasons Why Some Interviews Take Longer Than Others
and Average Ratings of Frequency of Occurrence, by Program Type

Reasons Why Some Interviews Take Longer Than Others	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
New situations in tenants case since last time (for recertification)	83.9%	82.5%	82.5%	83.0%
Average ratings of frequency	N=167 2.0 (1.3)	N=94 1.8 (1.5)	N=165 1.7 (1.1)	N=426 1.8 (1.3)
Conflicting information	83.9%	81.6%	67.0%	76.8%
Average ratings of frequency	N=167 2.1 (1.5)	N=93 2.4 (1.5)	N=134 1.8 (1.0)	N=394 2.1 (1.4)
Households with numerous family members	67.8%	67.5%	38.5%	56.3%
Average ratings of frequency	N=135 2.8 (2.4)	N=77 3.1 (2.3)	N=77 2.6 (2.2)	N=289 2.8 (2.3)
Tenants/applicants with several sources of income/assets and/or expenses	87.4%	81.6%	81.5%	83.8%
Average ratings of frequency	N=174 2.3 (2.0)	N=93 2.3 (1.7)	N=163 1.8 (1.4)	N=430 2.1 (1.7)
Difficult tenant/applicant or unruly children	63.8%	65.8%	42.0%	55.8%
Average ratings of frequency	N=127 3.0 (2.5)	N=75 3.1 (2.1)	N=84 2.9 (2.2)	N=286 3.0 (2.3)
Computer problems	48.7%	24.6%	17.5%	31.2%
Average ratings of frequency	N=97 4.6 (3.6)	N=28 6.2 (3.7)	N=35 4.9 (3.4)	N=160 5.0 (3.6)
Staff inexperience	40.7%	26.3%	12.0%	26.3%
Average ratings of frequency	N=81 5.6 (4.2)	N=30 6.0 (3.5)	N=24 6.0 (4.2)	N=135 5.7 (4.0)
Interruptions by other staff, or tenants/applicants	54.8%	32.5%	40.5%	44.2%
Average ratings of frequency	N=109 3.9 (3.5)	N=37 5.2 (3.5)	N=81 3.1 (2.2)	N=227 3.9 (3.1)
Language barriers	54.8%	36.0%	27.5%	40.0%
Average ratings of frequency	N=109 4.2 (3.5)	N=41 4.5 (3.5)	N=55 3.4 (2.7)	N=205 4.0 (3.3)
Need for special accommodations	40.2%	32.5%	15.5%	28.8%
Average ratings of frequency	N=80 5.1 (3.7)	N=37 5.7 (3.7)	N=31 4.8 (3.6)	N=148 5.2 (3.7)
New requirements since the last review	65.3%	50.9%	38.5%	51.7%
Average ratings of frequency	N=130 3.1 (2.4)	N=58 3.7 (2.6)	N=77 3.2 (2.0)	N=265 3.3 (2.4)
Errors or omissions on the tenant's recertification	58.3%	49.1%	35.5%	47.4%
Average ratings of frequency	N=116 3.6 (3.0)	N=56 3.8 (3.0)	N=71 3.4 (2.5)	N=243 3.6 (2.8)
Other	6.5%	3.5%	6.0%	5.7%
Average ratings of frequency	N=13 3.3 (4.4)	N=4 6.0 (6.0)	N=12 1.7 (1.0)	N=29 3.0 (3.8)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.5%	7.9%	.5%	2.1%
	N=1 .8 (.5)	N=9 .9 (.6)	N=1 .9 (.5)	N=11 .9 (.5)
AVERAGE LENGTH OF INITIAL CERTIFICATION INTERVIEW (IN HOURS)	N=184 .6 (.4)	N=103 .6 (.3)	N=193 .6 (.3)	N=480 .6 (.4)
AVERAGE LENGTH OF ANNUAL RECERTIFICATION INTERVIEW (IN HOURS)	N=190	N=103	N=192	N=485
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.
 Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.
 Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.
 Note 4: Averages were calculated for PHA/projects with valid responses.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

VIII. VERIFICATION PROCEDURES

Table E-29.
Methods for Keeping Track of When Verification Is Received and Average Ratings of Frequency of Occurrence, by Program Type

Methods for Keeping Track of When Verification Is Received	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Keep files with outstanding verification in a separate location	76.4% N=152	66.7% N=76	70.0% N=140	71.7% N=368
Average ratings of frequency	1.4 (.6)	1.4 (.7)	1.4 (.7)	1.4 (.7)
Mark calendar	37.2% N=74	36.0% N=41	24.5% N=49	32.0% N=164
Average ratings of frequency	2.5 (1.0)	2.5 (1.3)	2.3 (1.3)	2.4 (1.2)
Mark on a paper list/tickler file	52.3% N=104	58.8% N=67	48.0% N=96	52.0% N=267
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (1.0)	2.0 (1.0)	1.6 (.9)	1.8 (1.0)
Record kept in tenant file	70.4% N=140	70.2% N=80	54.0% N=108	63.9% N=328
Average ratings of frequency	1.7 (1.1)	1.8 (1.0)	1.6 (.8)	1.7 (1.0)
Computer tracking	36.7% N=73	38.6% N=44	46.0% N=92	40.7% N=209
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (1.1)	1.9 (1.4)	1.7 (1.0)	1.8 (1.1)
Hit or miss	7.5% N=15	9.6% N=11	5.5% N=11	7.2% N=37
Average ratings of frequency	2.8 (1.8)	5.1 (1.7)	3.3 (1.8)	3.6 (2.0)
Other	9.0% N=18	8.8% N=10	2.5% N=5	6.4% N=33
Average ratings of frequency	2.5 (1.9)	2.3 (2.1)	1.2 (.4)	2.2 (1.9)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.5% N=1	.9% N=1	.5% N=1	.6% N=3
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-30.
Staff Responsible for Keeping Track of Requesting and Receiving Verifications
and Average Ratings of Frequency of Occurrence, by Program Type

Staff Who Keep Track of When Verification Is Requested and Received	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Project staff who are doing the (re)certifications	98.0% N=195	95.6% N=109	93.5% N=187	95.7% N=491
Average ratings of frequency	1.0 (.3)	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.2)	1.1 (.3)
Supervisor	44.7% N=89	34.2% N=39	37.5% N=75	39.6% N=203
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (.6)	2.1 (.6)	1.7 (.6)	1.9 (.6)
Clerical staff	42.7% N=85	32.5% N=37	25.0% N=50	33.5% N=172
Average ratings of frequency	1.8 (.6)	1.7 (.8)	1.7 (.5)	1.8 (.6)
Some other staff members	13.6% N=27	7.0% N=8	7.5% N=15	9.7% N=50
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.9)	2.0 (1.1)	1.7 (.6)	1.9 (.9)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.5% N=1	.9% N=1	.0% N=0	.4% N=2
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

**Table E-31a.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Age of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type**

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Age of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	94.5% N=188	89.5% N=102	92.5% N=185	92.6% N=475
Usually verified	3.0% N=6	2.6% N=3	5.0% N=10	3.7% N=19
Sometimes verified	1.0% N=2	3.5% N=4	1.0% N=2	1.6% N=8
Never verified	.5% N=1	.9% N=1	.5% N=1	.6% N=3
Not applicable	1.0% N=2	1.8% N=2	1.0% N=2	1.2% N=6
DON'T KNOW	.0% N=0	1.8% N=2	.0% N=0	.4% N=2
Method of verification:				
<i>Birth Certificate</i>	95.5% N=190	93.0% N=106	90.0% N=180	92.8% N=476
Average ratings of frequency	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.4)	1.1 (.3)
<i>Driver's License</i>	68.8% N=137	65.8% N=75	68.5% N=137	68.0% N=349
Average ratings of frequency	1.9 (.7)	2.0 (1.0)	1.7 (.7)	1.8 (.8)
<i>Letter from SSI or SSA (age 62 or older)</i>	49.2% N=98	47.4% N=54	56.5% N=113	51.7% N=265
Average ratings of frequency	2.7 (1.7)	2.7 (1.2)	1.9 (.8)	2.3 (1.4)
<i>Baptismal Certificate</i>	36.2% N=72	33.3% N=38	15.5% N=31	27.5% N=141
Average ratings of frequency	3.0 (1.3)	2.8 (1.3)	2.9 (1.5)	3.0 (1.3)
<i>Census Record</i>	19.1% N=38	9.6% N=11	4.0% N=8	11.1% N=57
Average ratings of frequency	3.4 (1.7)	5.6 (2.3)	3.5 (1.9)	3.9 (2.0)
<i>Military ID</i>	24.1% N=48	21.9% N=25	9.0% N=18	17.7% N=91
Average ratings of frequency	3.7 (1.8)	4.2 (1.6)	3.1 (2.1)	3.7 (1.9)
<i>Adoption Paper (under age of 18)</i>	23.1% N=46	16.7% N=19	10.5% N=21	16.8% N=86
Average ratings of frequency	3.3 (2.3)	3.3 (1.5)	3.0 (2.0)	3.2 (2.1)
<i>Custody Agreement (under age of 18)</i>	27.6% N=55	15.8% N=18	12.0% N=24	18.9% N=97
Average ratings of frequency	3.3 (2.3)	4.1 (1.8)	2.6 (1.9)	3.2 (2.2)
Use some other method	13.1% N=26	12.3% N=14	6.5% N=13	10.3% N=53
Average ratings of frequency	5.3 (3.5)	4.8 (2.6)	2.9 (2.4)	4.6 (3.2)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

**Table E-31b.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Social Security Numbers of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type**

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Social Security Numbers of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	98.0% N=195	99.1% N=113	99.0% N=198	98.6% N=506
Usually verified	2.0% N=4	.0% N=0	1.0% N=2	1.2% N=6
Sometimes verified	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0
Never verified	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0
Not applicable	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0
DON'T KNOW	.0% N=0	.9% N=1	.0% N=0	.2% N=1
Method of verification:				
SS Card	99.0% N=197	99.1% N=113	97.5% N=195	98.4% N=505
Average ratings of frequency	1.0 (.1)	1.0 (.0)	1.0 (.2)	1.0 (.2)
Letter/Benefit statement from SSA	74.4% N=148	76.3% N=87	63.0% N=126	70.4% N=361
Average ratings of frequency	2.1 (1.2)	2.0 (.5)	1.7 (.5)	1.9 (.9)
Letter from INS stating SSN has been assigned	37.7% N=75	39.5% N=45	33.0% N=66	36.3% N=186
Average ratings of frequency	2.5 (.9)	2.7 (1.1)	2.3 (1.0)	2.5 (1.0)
Certification that no SSN has been assigned	27.1% N=54	32.5% N=37	17.5% N=35	24.6% N=126
Average ratings of frequency	2.6 (1.1)	2.9 (1.1)	2.5 (1.1)	2.6 (1.1)
Verbal information from SSA	14.1% N=28	6.1% N=7	3.5% N=7	8.2% N=42
Average ratings of frequency	3.9 (1.3)	6.1 (2.0)	2.3 (.8)	4.0 (1.7)
Verbal information from INS	14.1% N=28	5.3% N=6	3.5% N=7	8.0% N=41
Average ratings of frequency	4.6 (1.6)	5.8 (2.1)	2.4 (1.6)	4.4 (1.9)
Tenant declaration	17.6% N=35	16.7% N=19	12.5% N=25	15.4% N=79
Average ratings of frequency	4.5 (2.9)	4.2 (1.8)	2.7 (2.0)	3.9 (2.5)
Adoption paper	15.1% N=30	8.8% N=10	6.5% N=13	10.3% N=53
Average ratings of frequency	3.7 (2.3)	5.0 (1.8)	2.9 (2.1)	3.7 (2.2)
Use some other method	11.1% N=22	13.2% N=15	6.0% N=12	9.6% N=49
Average ratings of frequency	6.1 (3.1)	3.9 (2.7)	3.4 (2.4)	4.8 (3.1)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31c.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying U.S. Citizenship of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying U.S. Citizenship of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	94.5%	97.4%	92.0%	94.2%
	N=188	N=111	N=184	N=483
Usually verified	2.0%	.0%	2.5%	1.8%
	N=4	N=0	N=5	N=9
Sometimes verified	.0%	.0%	2.0%	.8%
	N=0	N=0	N=4	N=4
Never verified	1.5%	.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	N=3	N=0	N=2	N=5
Not applicable	2.0%	1.8%	1.5%	1.8%
	N=4	N=2	N=3	N=9
DON'T KNOW	.0%	.9%	1.0%	.6%
	N=0	N=1	N=2	N=3
Method of verification:				
Birth certificate	82.9%	81.6%	65.5%	75.8%
	N=165	N=93	N=131	N=389
Average ratings of frequency	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1
	(.4)	(.4)	(.5)	(.4)
Voter's registration	28.1%	21.1%	11.0%	19.9%
	N=56	N=24	N=22	N=102
Average ratings of frequency	2.9	3.2	2.9	3.0
	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.7)
U.S. Passport	37.2%	32.5%	27.5%	32.4%
	N=74	N=37	N=55	N=166
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.9	2.0	2.4
	(1.3)	(1.4)	(1.0)	(1.3)
Official citizenship document	57.8%	56.1%	38.0%	49.7%
	N=115	N=64	N=76	N=255
Average ratings of frequency	2.1	2.4	1.8	2.1
	(.9)	(1.1)	(.9)	(1.0)
Baptismal certificate	22.6%	21.1%	7.0%	16.2%
	N=45	N=24	N=14	N=83
Average ratings of frequency	2.7	3.0	2.4	2.7
	(1.2)	(1.4)	(1.2)	(1.3)
Declaration of citizenship	68.3%	74.6%	65.0%	68.4%
	N=136	N=85	N=130	N=351
Average ratings of frequency	2.1	2.0	1.5	1.9
	(1.4)	(1.4)	(.9)	(1.3)
Use some other method	12.1%	7.9%	5.0%	8.4%
	N=24	N=9	N=10	N=43
Average ratings of frequency	4.8	4.4	2.3	4.2
	(2.4)	(2.2)	(2.1)	(2.5)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31d.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Non-U.S. Citizenship of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Non-U.S. Citizenship of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	92.5%	95.6%	83.5%	89.7%
	N=184	N=109	N=167	N=460
Usually verified	2.5%	.9%	2.0%	1.9%
	N=5	N=1	N=4	N=10
Sometimes verified	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%
	N=0	N=0	N=2	N=2
Never verified	2.0%	.0%	.5%	1.0%
	N=4	N=0	N=1	N=5
Not applicable	3.0%	2.6%	8.5%	5.1%
	N=6	N=3	N=17	N=26
DON'T KNOW	.0%	.9%	4.5%	1.9%
	N=0	N=1	N=9	N=10
Method of verification:				
Permanent Resident Card	71.9%	77.2%	52.0%	65.3%
	N=143	N=88	N=104	N=335
Average ratings of frequency	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.4
	(.7)	(.8)	(.8)	(.7)
INS card	64.3%	71.1%	41.5%	56.9%
	N=128	N=81	N=83	N=292
Average ratings of frequency	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.8
	(.8)	(.8)	(.9)	(.8)
INS system verification (SAVE)	56.3%	64.9%	58.5%	59.1%
	N=112	N=74	N=117	N=303
Average ratings of frequency	1.7	1.9	1.4	1.6
	(.9)	(1.1)	(.7)	(.9)
Declaration of Citizenship	52.3%	53.5%	48.0%	50.9%
	N=104	N=61	N=96	N=261
Average ratings of frequency	2.1	2.0	1.6	1.9
	(1.3)	(1.2)	(1.0)	(1.2)
Use some other method	12.1%	5.3%	6.0%	8.2%
	N=24	N=6	N=12	N=42
Average ratings of frequency	3.8	4.5	2.9	3.7
	(1.6)	(.8)	(1.6)	(1.6)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31e.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Full-Time Student Status of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Full-Time Student Status of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	91.0%	95.6%	69.5%	83.6%
	N=181	N=109	N=139	N=429
Usually verified	5.0%	2.6%	3.0%	3.7%
	N=10	N=3	N=6	N=19
Sometimes verified	2.5%	.0%	1.0%	1.4%
	N=5	N=0	N=2	N=7
Never verified	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
Not applicable	1.5%	.9%	23.5%	9.9%
	N=3	N=1	N=47	N=51
DON'T KNOW	.0%	.9%	3.0%	1.4%
	N=0	N=1	N=6	N=7
Method of verification:				
Letter from the registrar's office or school official	91.5%	93.9%	66.5%	82.3%
	N=182	N=107	N=133	N=422
Average ratings of frequency	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1
	(.4)	(.5)	(.3)	(.4)
School enrollment documents	77.4%	80.7%	42.5%	64.5%
	N=154	N=92	N=85	N=331
Average ratings of frequency	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.8
	(.6)	(.6)	(.6)	(.6)
Verbal information from the registrar's office or school official	33.2%	36.0%	12.5%	25.7%
	N=66	N=41	N=25	N=132
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.8	2.7	2.6
	(.8)	(.9)	(.9)	(.9)
Tenant declaration	26.1%	26.3%	20.0%	23.8%
	N=52	N=30	N=40	N=122
Average ratings of frequency	3.1	3.0	1.9	2.7
	(1.4)	(1.2)	(1.2)	(1.4)
Use some other method	17.1%	12.3%	4.0%	10.9%
	N=34	N=14	N=8	N=56
Average ratings of frequency	3.0	3.1	2.6	3.0
	(1.8)	(1.7)	(2.0)	(1.8)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31f.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Employment Income of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Employment Income of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	99.0%	98.2%	99.0%	98.8%
	N=197	N=112	N=198	N=507
Usually verified	.5%	.0%	.5%	.4%
	N=1	N=0	N=1	N=2
Sometimes verified	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
Never verified	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
Not applicable	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%
	N=0	N=0	N=1	N=1
DON'T KNOW	.5%	1.8%	.0%	.6%
	N=1	N=2	N=0	N=3
Method of verification:				
Call on the telephone	68.8%	76.3%	49.0%	62.8%
	N=137	N=87	N=98	N=322
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.7	2.2	2.5
	(.9)	(.7)	(.7)	(.8)
Send a letter or form to a third party	97.0%	97.4%	98.0%	97.5%
	N=193	N=111	N=196	N=500
Average ratings of frequency	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.1
	(.4)	(.5)	(.2)	(.4)
Have access to a computer data base	60.8%	70.2%	24.5%	48.7%
	N=121	N=80	N=49	N=250
Average ratings of frequency	2.0	1.9	2.2	2.0
	(.9)	(.8)	(.8)	(.9)
Tenant provides documentation	71.9%	77.2%	62.5%	69.4%
	N=143	N=88	N=125	N=356
Average ratings of frequency	2.6	3.0	2.1	2.5
	(1.1)	(1.1)	(.9)	(1.1)
Use some other method	16.1%	14.0%	7.0%	12.1%
	N=32	N=16	N=14	N=62
Average ratings of frequency	3.7	3.6	2.4	3.4
	(1.7)	(1.2)	(1.4)	(1.6)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31g.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Non-Employment Income of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Non-Employment Income of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	98.5%	97.4%	97.0%	97.7%
	N=196	N=111	N=194	N=501
Usually verified	.5%	.9%	1.5%	1.0%
	N=1	N=1	N=3	N=5
Sometimes verified	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%
	N=0	N=0	N=2	N=2
Never verified	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
Not applicable	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%
	N=0	N=0	N=1	N=1
DON'T KNOW	1.0%	1.8%	.0%	.8%
	N=2	N=2	N=0	N=4
Method of verification:				
Call on the telephone	64.8%	74.6%	45.5%	59.5%
	N=129	N=85	N=91	N=305
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.5
	(.8)	(.7)	(.8)	(.8)
Send a letter or form to a third party	94.0%	97.4%	96.0%	95.5%
	N=187	N=111	N=192	N=490
Average ratings of frequency	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.2
	(.4)	(.5)	(.3)	(.4)
Have access to a computer database	49.2%	64.9%	27.0%	44.1%
	N=98	N=74	N=54	N=226
Average ratings of frequency	2.0	1.8	2.2	2.0
	(1.0)	(.8)	(.8)	(.9)
Tenant provides documentation	73.4%	79.8%	66.0%	71.9%
	N=146	N=91	N=132	N=369
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.9	2.1	2.4
	(1.1)	(1.1)	(.8)	(1.1)
Use some other method	15.1%	13.2%	6.0%	11.1%
	N=30	N=15	N=12	N=57
Average ratings of frequency	3.6	3.6	2.2	3.3
	(1.6)	(1.2)	(1.2)	(1.5)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31h.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Assets' Value of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Assets Value of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	89.4%	91.2%	95.5%	92.2%
	N=178	N=104	N=191	N=473
Usually verified	5.5%	5.3%	2.5%	4.3%
	N=11	N=6	N=5	N=22
Sometimes verified	2.5%	1.8%	1.0%	1.8%
	N=5	N=2	N=2	N=9
Never verified	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
Not applicable	1.5%	.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	N=3	N=0	N=2	N=5
DON'T KNOW	1.0%	1.8%	.0%	.8%
	N=2	N=2	N=0	N=4
Method of verification:				
Call on the telephone	44.7%	58.8%	39.5%	45.8%
	N=89	N=67	N=79	N=235
Average ratings of frequency	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	(.8)	(.7)	(.7)	(.8)
Send a letter or form to a third party	82.9%	93.0%	92.0%	88.7%
	N=165	N=106	N=184	N=455
Average ratings of frequency	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1
	(.4)	(.4)	(.2)	(.3)
Have access to a computer database	22.1%	28.1%	15.0%	20.7%
	N=44	N=32	N=30	N=106
Average ratings of frequency	2.2	2.1	2.5	2.3
	(.9)	(1.2)	(.8)	(1.0)
Tenant provides documentation	78.9%	80.7%	74.5%	77.6%
	N=157	N=92	N=149	N=398
Average ratings of frequency	2.0	2.3	1.9	2.0
	(1.0)	(.9)	(.8)	(.9)
Use some other method	16.6%	11.4%	6.0%	11.3%
	N=33	N=13	N=12	N=58
Average ratings of frequency	3.5	3.7	2.3	3.3
	(1.5)	(1.0)	(1.5)	(1.5)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31i.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Medical Expenses of Household Members
and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Medical Expenses of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	94.5%	93.9%	95.5%	94.7%
	N=188	N=107	N=191	N=486
Usually verified	3.5%	1.8%	3.0%	2.9%
	N=7	N=2	N=6	N=15
Sometimes verified	1.5%	2.6%	1.0%	1.6%
	N=3	N=3	N=2	N=8
Never verified	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
Not applicable	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%
	N=0	N=0	N=1	N=1
DON'T KNOW	.5%	1.8%	.0%	.6%
	N=1	N=2	N=0	N=3
Method of verification:				
Call on the telephone	49.7%	60.5%	37.5%	47.4%
	N=99	N=69	N=75	N=243
Average ratings of frequency	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5
	(.8)	(.7)	(.7)	(.7)
Send a letter or form to a third party	79.9%	88.6%	89.0%	85.4%
	N=159	N=101	N=178	N=438
Average ratings of frequency	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2
	(.5)	(.5)	(.4)	(.5)
Have access to a computer database	18.6%	21.9%	12.5%	17.0%
	N=37	N=25	N=25	N=87
Average ratings of frequency	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.3
	(1.2)	(1.2)	(.8)	(1.1)
Tenant provides documentation	87.9%	82.5%	83.5%	85.0%
	N=175	N=94	N=167	N=436
Average ratings of frequency	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.8
	(.9)	(1.0)	(.8)	(.9)
Use some other method	15.1%	12.3%	3.5%	9.9%
	N=30	N=14	N=7	N=51
Average ratings of frequency	3.5	3.7	2.9	3.5
	(1.6)	(1.1)	(1.5)	(1.5)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-31j.
Procedures and Methods for Verifying Child Care or Disability Expenses of Household Members and Average Ratings of Frequency, by Program Type

Procedures and Methods for Verifying Child Care or Disability Expenses of Household Members	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Ratings of frequency of verification:				
Always verified	97.0% N=193	93.9% N=107	86.0% N=172	92.0% N=472
Usually verified	.5% N=1	3.5% N=4	2.0% N=4	1.8% N=9
Sometimes verified	.0% N=0	.9% N=1	1.0% N=2	.6% N=3
Never verified	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0	.0% N=0
Not applicable	2.0% N=4	.0% N=0	10.0% N=20	4.7% N=24
DON'T KNOW	.5% N=1	1.8% N=2	1.0% N=2	1.0% N=5
Method of verification:				
Call on the telephone	50.8% N=101	64.9% N=74	36.0% N=72	48.1% N=247
Average ratings of frequency	2.4 (.8)	2.3 (.6)	2.4 (.6)	2.4 (.7)
Send a letter or form to a third party	87.9% N=175	96.5% N=110	87.5% N=175	89.7% N=460
Average ratings of frequency	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.4)	1.1 (.3)	1.1 (.3)
Have access to a computer database	15.1% N=30	15.8% N=18	11.0% N=22	13.6% N=70
Average ratings of frequency	2.4 (1.1)	2.3 (1.1)	2.5 (.9)	2.4 (1.0)
Tenant provides documentation	76.4% N=152	78.9% N=90	63.5% N=127	71.9% N=369
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (1.0)	2.3 (.9)	1.9 (.8)	2.1 (.9)
Use some other method	17.1% N=34	11.4% N=13	3.0% N=6	10.3% N=53
Average ratings of frequency	3.3 (1.6)	3.8 (1.2)	2.8 (1.6)	3.4 (1.5)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-32.
Types of Income, Expenses, or Household Member Characteristics That Are Difficult to Verify and Average Ratings of Frequency of Occurrence, by Program Type

Types of Income, Expenses, or Household Characteristics That Are Difficult to Verify	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Income from employment	45.7%	36.8%	40.0%	41.5%
Average ratings of frequency	N=91 4.5 (3.7)	N=42 5.8 (3.9)	N=80 4.1 (3.5)	N=213 4.6 (3.7)
Sporadic/Infrequent/Seasonal employment	92.0%	92.1%	78.5%	86.7%
Average ratings of frequency	N=183 1.8 (1.4)	N=105 1.7 (1.3)	N=157 1.7 (1.4)	N=445 1.7 (1.4)
Welfare benefits	36.7%	28.1%	25.5%	30.4%
Average ratings of frequency	N=73 6.4 (4.7)	N=32 7.9 (4.4)	N=51 5.3 (4.3)	N=156 6.4 (4.6)
Social Security payments	40.7%	32.5%	30.5%	34.9%
Average ratings of frequency	N=81 5.8 (4.9)	N=37 7.2 (4.3)	N=61 4.7 (3.9)	N=179 5.7 (4.5)
Child support	55.8%	55.3%	40.0%	49.5%
Average ratings of frequency	N=111 3.8 (3.5)	N=63 4.0 (3.4)	N=80 2.6 (2.2)	N=254 3.4 (3.2)
Other sources of income	64.3%	65.8%	48.5%	58.5%
Average ratings of frequency	N=128 2.6 (2.0)	N=75 2.4 (2.0)	N=97 2.7 (2.2)	N=300 2.6 (2.0)
Value of assets	61.8%	63.2%	54.5%	59.3%
Average ratings of frequency	N=123 2.4 (1.7)	N=72 3.1 (1.9)	N=109 2.5 (1.8)	N=304 2.6 (1.8)
Medical expenses	46.2%	58.8%	53.0%	51.7%
Average ratings of frequency	N=92 3.3 (2.5)	N=67 3.3 (2.0)	N=106 2.7 (2.1)	N=265 3.1 (2.2)
Child care expenses	42.7%	44.7%	27.5%	37.2%
Average ratings of frequency	N=85 4.9 (3.0)	N=51 4.5 (2.8)	N=55 4.1 (2.9)	N=191 4.5 (2.9)
Disability expenses	38.7%	39.5%	29.5%	35.3%
Average ratings of frequency	N=77 3.9 (2.6)	N=45 4.5 (3.1)	N=59 4.1 (2.6)	N=181 4.1 (2.8)
Citizenship	34.7%	31.6%	26.5%	30.8%
Average ratings of frequency	N=69 5.2 (3.9)	N=36 5.6 (3.7)	N=53 5.0 (3.9)	N=158 5.2 (3.8)
Disability status	38.2%	34.2%	29.5%	33.9%
Average ratings of frequency	N=76 4.4 (3.5)	N=39 6.6 (3.6)	N=59 4.5 (3.8)	N=174 4.9 (3.7)
Full-time student status	38.2%	36.0%	21.5%	31.2%
Average ratings of frequency	N=76 5.8 (3.9)	N=41 6.3 (3.8)	N=43 5.7 (4.5)	N=160 5.9 (4.0)
Other	13.1%	8.8%	6.0%	9.4%
Average ratings of frequency	N=26 2.3 (2.6)	N=10 1.7 (1.1)	N=12 2.4 (1.6)	N=48 2.2 (2.1)
DON'T KNOW OR NONE OF THE ABOVE	.0%	.9%	2.5%	1.2%
	N=0	N=1	N=5	N=6
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-33.
Ratings of Cooperation with Verification Requests Received
from Tenants and Others, by Program Type

Ratings of Cooperation	PROGRAM TYPE			TOTAL
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	
Cooperation received from tenants:				
Usually cooperative	63.3% N=126	72.8% N=83	76.5% N=153	70.6% N=362
Sometimes cooperative/Sometimes not cooperative	36.2% N=72	27.2% N=31	22.0% N=44	28.7% N=147
Usually uncooperative	.5% N=1	.0% N=0	1.5% N=3	.8% N=4
Cooperation received from other persons:				
Usually cooperative	47.2% N=94	45.6% N=52	57.5% N=115	50.9% N=261
Sometimes cooperative/Sometimes not cooperative	51.3% N=102	54.4% N=62	40.5% N=81	47.8% N=245
Usually uncooperative	1.5% N=3	.0% N=0	2.0% N=4	1.4% N=7
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note: Percentages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Appendix E—Project Staff Questionnaire Analysis—Source Tables

Table E-34.
Procedures Used When Verification Is Not Provided as Requested and Average Ratings of Frequency of Occurrence, by Program Type

Procedures Used When Verification Is Not Provided as Requested	PROGRAM TYPE			
	Public Housing	PHA Section 8	Owner	TOTAL
Send followup letter to third party	87.9% N=175	87.7% N=100	88.5% N=177	88.1% N=452
Average ratings of frequency	1.3 (.5)	1.2 (.5)	1.3 (.7)	1.3 (.6)
Call tenant	66.8% N=133	50.9% N=58	69.0% N=138	64.1% N=329
Average ratings of frequency	2.3 (1.2)	3.0 (1.1)	2.1 (1.0)	2.3 (1.1)
Send followup letter to tenant	71.4% N=142	58.8% N=67	55.5% N=111	62.4% N=320
Average ratings of frequency	2.3 (1.2)	2.8 (1.1)	2.3 (1.2)	2.4 (1.2)
Accept other/less preferred verification	63.8% N=127	73.7% N=84	49.0% N=98	60.2% N=309
Average ratings of frequency	3.4 (1.3)	3.4 (1.2)	3.0 (1.3)	3.3 (1.3)
Call third party	85.4% N=170	90.4% N=103	81.5% N=163	85.0% N=436
Average ratings of frequency	2.0 (.9)	2.0 (.8)	1.9 (.9)	1.9 (.9)
Other	11.6% N=23	7.0% N=8	2.5% N=5	7.0% N=36
Average ratings of frequency	4.0 (2.1)	3.0 (2.5)	1.6 (.9)	3.4 (2.2)
TOTAL NUMBER OF PHA/PROJECTS	199	114	200	513

Note 1: Percentages and averages were calculated for all PHA/projects.

Note 2: Standard deviations for the averages are in parentheses.

Note 3: Frequency ratings of 1 indicate the most frequently used option.

ⁱ For instance, standard deviation for the average number of units supported by (re)certification staff was 3,312, indicating that 95 percent of responses fall within +/- two standard deviation or (833 +/- 6,624 = 7457) roughly between 1 and 7,457 units. For the description of statistical terms, see the attached glossary.