

Table of Tables

Table 1 History of Actions Related to Establishment of PA, Unionization and Wage Increases	42
Table 2 Number of Providers by Ethnicity and Family Relationship to Recipient, Nov 1997	43
Table 3 Provider and Recipient Ethnicity by Match, Nov 97	44
Table 4 Ave Hours Worked per Month in Nov 97	45
Table 5 Worker and Match Turnover	46
Table 6 Percent of total matches that end with...in Nov 97-Feb 98.....	47
Table 7 Consumers and providers in 2002 and percent increase between Nov 1997 & Feb 2002	48
Table 8 Average Hours Worked Per Month by Non-Family Providers	49
Table 9 Match Turnover	50
Table 10 Workforce Turnover:	51
Table 11 Ethnic match:	53
Table 12 Total Annualized Direct Cost of Program	54

Table 1 History of Actions Related to Establishment of PA, Unionization and Wage Increases

<i>Date</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>State Minimum Wage</i>	<i>IHSS Wage/Benefit</i>
The control period			
Jul 1995	Public Authority Established	\$4.25	\$4.25
Jan 1996	First wage increase pass-through –		\$4.83
May 1996	IP workers vote for union representation by SEIU Local 250		
Oct 1996	Min wage inc	\$4.75	\$5.11
Mar 1997	Min wage inc	\$5.00	\$5.29
Jul 1997	First labor agreement ratified	\$5.15	\$5.36
Oct 1997	Wage inc		\$5.69
Mar? 1998	Min wage inc	\$5.75	\$6.40
Wage rises to \$1 or more above State Minimum Wage			
Jul 1998	Wage increase to MW + \$1.25; CalWorks program begins		\$7.00
Jan 1999	CalWorks enrollment complete		
Mar 1999	Healthy Workers added		\$7.00 + HW
Jul 1999	CalWorks req. 32 hrs work/wk		
Wage rises to \$3 or more above State Minimum Wage			
Oct 1999	Wage inc to MW + \$3.25		\$9.00 + HW
Jan 2000	Dental added		\$9.00 + HW +Dental
Apr 2000	CalWorks recipients begin to reach 24 mo. limit		
Jul 2000	Wage inc to MW + \$3.95		\$9.70 + HW + Dental
Aug 2000	Living Wage Ordinance passed		
Jan 2001	Min Wage increase	\$6.25	
July 2001	Wage inc to MW + \$3.75		\$10.00 + HW + Dental
Jan 2002	Min wage increase	\$6.75	

Source: compiled by author

Table 2 Number of Providers by Ethnicity and Family Relationship to Recipient, Nov 1997

	<i>Total</i>	<i>percent</i>
Latino	588	10%
Chinese	1,198	21%
Russian	1,434	25%
Black	820	14%
White	925	16%
Filipino	269	5%
OtherAsian	280	5%
Other	175	3%
Total	5,689	100%

	<i>Family</i>	<i>Non-family</i>	<i>Both</i>	<i>Total</i>
Latino	60%	33%	7%	100%
Chinese	43%	47%	10%	100%
Russian	39%	52%	9%	100%
Black	63%	32%	5%	100%
White	41%	58%	2%	100%
Filipino	76%	22%	2%	100%
OtherAsian	73%	25%	2%	100%
Other	53%	44%	3%	100%
Total	50%	44%	6%	100%

Source: compiled by author from SF CMIPS data

Table 3 Provider and Recipient Ethnicity by Match, Nov 97

...of Provider	Latino	Chinese	Russian	Black	White	Filipino	Oth Asian	Other	Total
Latino	649	9	7	14	33	5	5	2	724
Chinese		1,525	1	1	10	1	33	3	1,574
Russian	2		1,959	3	34	3	3	6	2,010
Black	5		1	852	45	2	5	1	911
White	40	17	196	141	573	19	29	14	1,029
Filipino		1		4	11	278	6	2	302
Other Asian		73	4	4	6		218	2	307
Other	3	2	55	50	39	7	6	37	199
Total	699	1,627	2,223	1,069	751	315	305	67	7,056

Source: calculated by author from SF CMIPS data

Table 4 Ave Hours Worked per Month in Nov 97
(Mean, 25th, 50th, and 75th Percentiles)

<i>Provider Ethnicity</i>	<i>Total</i>				<i>Family</i>			
	mean	25th	50 th	75th	mean	25th	50th	75th
Latino	103.6	58.2	84.8	141.7	95.5	52.7	73.1	126.5
Chinese	85.9	50.7	73.6	106.6	65.9	38.1	57.3	82.8
Russian	83.7	50.6	75.0	104.9	72.7	42.8	65.5	92.6
Black	87.4	48.4	72.3	108.9	86.7	46.1	68.8	106.9
White	88.4	51.5	74.2	105.6	90.3	47.8	68.9	111.5
Filipino	86.3	49.2	71.3	102.1	83.2	47.8	67.0	99.6
Other Asian	80.3	44.4	71.5	101.0	80.1	40.0	65.3	101.9
Other	118.8	71.0	91.5	154.6	127.4	66.8	105.5	170.2
Total	88.6	51.5	75.3	110.1	82.2	45.6	66.6	100.9

<i>Provider Ethnicity</i>	<i>Non-Family</i>				<i>Both Family & Non-Family</i>			
	mean	25th	50th	75th	mean	25th	50th	75th
Latino	107.1	64	93.3	146.6	155.5	123	152.3	191
Chinese	92.0	62.3	81.3	110.0	143.7	99.2	133.5	186.7
Russian	87.6	53.9	77.4	107.8	110.3	77.5	102.3	135.9
Black	81.3	49.5	71.9	96.9	136.8	89.4	128.3	163.5
White	86.0	53.8	75.6	102.8	122.6	66.3	86.1	134.2
Filipino	91.0	57.8	78.2	103.3	157.5	148.9	163.2	170.1
Other Asian	80.9	58.0	75.8	98.3	81.8	78.7	81.8	97.5
Other	106.2	73.1	86.1	139.1	148.3	104.9	135.7	174.8
Total	89.5	57.0	77.7	108.9	131.0	86.1	120.7	167.4

Source: compiled by author from SF CMIPS data

Table 5 Worker and Match Turnover
(Nov 97-Feb 98)

	<i>Latino</i>	<i>Chinese</i>	<i>Russian</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Total</i>
Match Turnover	0.39	0.41	0.29	0.37	0.28	0.33
Adj Match Turnover	0.25	0.26	0.21	0.22	0.14	0.22
Workforce Turnover	0.30	0.34	0.26	0.33	0.26	0.29
Adj Workforce Turnover	0.19	0.22	0.19	0.19	0.14	0.17

NB: Ave Share of workforce that remained one year or less; ave share of matches that lasted one year or less.

Source: calculated by author from SF CMIPS data

Table 6 Percent of total matches that end with...in Nov 97-Feb 98

		Consumers	
		Stay	Leave
Providers	Stay	17%	10%
	Leave	51%	22%

Percent of Non Family Matches that end with...

		Consumers	
		Stay	Leave
Providers	Stay	12%	8%
	Leave	47%	32%

Percent of Family Matches that end with..

		Consumers	
		Stay	Leave
Providers	Stay	7%	5%
	Leave	43%	43%

Table 7 Consumers and providers in 2002 and percent increase between Nov 1997 & Feb 2002

	Number of Consumers (2.2002)	Percent of population (2/2002)	Percent increase in consumers (Nov 1997 – Feb 2002)		
			Total	Family	Non-Family
Latino	886	9%	30%	14%	52%
Chinese	3,363	33%	109%	151%	70%
Russian	3,000	29%	38%	33%	39%
Black	1,274	13%	22%	17%	22%
White, English- speaking	767	8%	5%	-12%	25%
Filipino	391	4%	26%	25%	28%
Other Asian	406	4%	38%	50%	10%
Other	94	1%	47%	60%	0%
Total	10,181	100%	47%	48%	43%

	Number of Providers (2/2002)	Percent of workforce (2/2002)	Percent increase in providers (Nov 1997 – Feb 2002)		
			Total	Family	Non-Family
Latino	826	9%	40%	24%	76%
Chinese	2,828	32%	136%	196%	96%
Russian	2,250	26%	57%	39%	71%
Black	1,111	13%	35%	22%	69%
White, English- speaking	900	10%	-3%	-2%	-2%
Filipino	353	4%	31%	28%	33%
Other Asian	324	4%	16%	20%	4%
Other	156	2%	-4%	-1%	-18%
Total	8,748	100%	54%	54%	56%

Source: compiled by author from SF CMIPS

Table 8 Average Hours Worked Per Month by Non-Family Providers

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Family providers</i>		<i>Non-family providers</i>	
	<i>Nov97 – Apr98</i>	<i>Oct01- Feb02</i>	<i>Nov97 – Apr98</i>	<i>Oct01- Feb02</i>	<i>Nov97 – Apr98</i>	<i>Oct01- Feb02</i>
Latino	101.4	102.3	95.0	94.1	102.3	106.0
Chinese	86.0	80.0	66.2	67.7	91.9	87.7
Russian	83.9	86.6	73.1	78.0	87.6	85.9
Black	87.0	94.7	86.4	90.7	80.5	97.0
White	88.3	95.4	90.6	92.3	85.3	96.7
Filipino	86.1	89.2	82.7	86.5	92.4	92.0
OtherAsian	80.8	83.3	79.6	79.8	82.2	92.2
Other	117.9	121.2	125.8	124.6	106.1	116.4
Total	88.3	88.5	82.2	80.8	89.0	91.6

Source: Compiled by author from SF CMIPS Data

Table 9 Match Turnover
Percent of matches that have lasted less than a year...
(four month average)

	Latino	Chinese	Russian	Black	White	Total
Match turnover						
Nov 97-Feb 98	0.39	0.41	0.29	0.37	0.28	0.33
Nov 01-Feb 02	0.33	0.36	0.25	0.37	0.24	0.31
Adjusted Match Turnover						
Nov 97-Feb 98	0.25	0.26	0.21	0.22	0.14	0.20
Nov 01-Feb 02	0.16	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.11	0.16

NB: Match turnover is the percent of matches that end each year, either because the consumer leaves, the provider leaves or they both find other matches. Adjusted match turnover is the percentage of matches that end each year for “bad” reasons because either the provider leaves or both provider and consumer find another match.

Source: calculated by author from SF CMIPS data

*Table 10 Workforce Turnover:
percent of providers who have been in workforce one year or less
(four month average)*

	Latino	Chinese	Russian	Black	White	Total
Workforce turnover						
Nov 97-Feb 98	0.30	0.34	0.26	0.33	0.26	0.29
Oct 01-Jan 02	0.24	0.30	0.17	0.30	0.20	0.24
Adj Workforce Turnover						
Nov 97-Feb 98	0.19	0.22	0.19	0.19	0.14	0.17
Oct 01-Jan 02	0.11	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.09	0.12

NB: Workforce turnover measures the percent of the workforce that leaves within a year, either because they find another job, leaving their recipient behind, or because both recipient and provider leave simultaneously. Adjusted workforce turnover measures the percent of providers that leave the workforce, leaving the recipient behind.

Source: calculated by author from SF CMIPS data

*Table 11 Ethnic match:
Percent recipients matched to provider of same ethnicity*

	Nov-97	Oct-99	Feb-02
Latino	92.8%	91.2%	95.2%
Chinese	93.7%	95.8%	97.9%
Russian	88.1%	88.9%	93.6%
Black	79.7%	72.3%	84.8%
White	76.3%	70.3%	69.1%
Filipino	88.3%	80.4%	89.9%
OtherAsian	71.5%	64.6%	70.9%
Other	55.2%	41.7%	50.0%
Total	86.3%	85.4%	90.7%

Source: calculated by author from SF CMIPS Data

Table 12 Total Annualized Direct Cost of Program
(millions)

	<i>March 1997</i>	<i>March 1999</i>	<i>March 2001</i>
Fed Cost	\$ 15.5	\$ 27.0	\$ 54.3
State GF Cost	\$ 14.6	\$ 18.1	\$ 26.95
State Realign Cost	\$ 7.9	\$ 9.75	\$ 14.5
County Cost	\$ 1.3	\$ 8.7	\$ 18.4
Total Direct	\$ 39.3	\$ 63.5	\$114.2

Note: Direct costs include the hourly wage, hourly cost of benefits and employment taxes.

Source: calculated by author based on data from CMIPS Management Report