

Contract No.: 100-98-0009
MPR Reference No.: 8550-121

**Program Structure
and Service Delivery
in Eleven Welfare-to-Work
Grant Programs**

January 2001

*Demetra Smith Nightingale
(The Urban Institute)*

Submitted to:

Department of Health and Human Services
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and
Evaluation
Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Room 404E
200 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20201

Project Officer: Alana Landey

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
(609) 799-3535

Urban Institute (subcontractor)

Project Director: Alan Hershey
Co-Principal Investigators:
Thomas Fraker (Mathematica)
Demetra Nightingale (Urban Institute)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is part of a congressionally-mandated evaluation of the Welfare-to-Work (WtW) Grants program, being conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR), and its subcontractors the Urban Institute and Support Services International (SSI). This is an interim report from the process analysis component of the evaluation, and several individuals from all three research organizations contributed substantially.

Much of the information in this report is based on structured site visits to each of the eleven WtW grantee programs included in the evaluation. The process analysis site visit teams consisted of: Demetra Nightingale, Terri Thompson, Nancy Pindus, Carolyn O'Brien, Pamela Holcomb, and Lynne Fender of the Urban Institute; Alan Hershey, Irma Perez-Johnson, Jaqueline Kauff, Debra Strong, and Charles Nagatoshi of MPR; Mack Rhoades of SSI; John Trutko of Capital Research Associates; and Burt Barnow of the Institute for Policy Studies at Johns Hopkins University. Each contributed to portions of this report.

We owe particular gratitude to the over 300 individuals in the eleven local programs who generously shared their time and experiences with us during the in-depth site visits. Their knowledge and insights are essential to understanding the potential of various program interventions.

Very helpful comments were provided by federal reviewers, particularly Alana Landey and Canta Pian at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Cheryl Turner at the U.S. Department of Labor.

Opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent official positions of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., or the Urban Institute, its trustees or sponsors.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ix
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. WELFARE REFORM CONTEXT	2
B. CHANGES IN THE WELFARE-TO-WORK GRANTS PROGRAM LEGISLATION.....	5
C. OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION.....	6
D. THE PROCESS ANALYSIS	8
E. STUDY SITES	10
II. PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND PARTICIPATION	13
A. PROGRAM START-UP	13
B. TARGETING	30
III. PROGRAM SERVICES	33
A. PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT	33
B. SUPPORTIVE SOCIAL SERVICES.....	37
C. EMPLOYMENT AND WORK ACTIVITIES.....	39
IV. PROGRAM STRUCTURE.....	43
A. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE	43
B. SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE	48
V. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS	57

CONTENTS (*continued*)

	Page
APPENDIX A: WTW PROGRAMS IN THE STUDY SITES— GENERAL INFORMATION	61
APPENDIX B: PROFILES OF WTW GRANT PROGRAMS IN ELEVEN STUDY SITES	69

TABLES

Table	Page
TABLE I.1 SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES AND TOPICS	9
TABLE I.2 WTW EVALUATION IN-DEPTH STUDY SITES	11
TABLE II.1 ENROLLMENT LEVELS, BY STUDY SITE.....	15
TABLE II.2 EXTENT OF OPERATIONAL INTERACTION BETWEEN WtW AND TANF WORK PROGRAMS, BY STUDY SITE.....	24
TABLE II.3 PARTICIPANT STUDY GROUPS, BY STUDY SITE.....	31
TABLE III.1 EMPLOYMENT-RELATED SERVICES PROVIDED, BY STUDY SITE	41
TABLE IV.1 TYPE OF ORGANIZATION ADMINISTERING THE WtW GRANT, BY STUDY SITE.....	45
TABLE IV.2 ROLE OF WtW GRANTEE AGENCY IN TANF PROGRAM, BY STUDY SITE.....	47
TABLE IV.3 WtW GRANTEE'S STRUCTURE FOR PROVIDING SERVICES, BY STUDY SITE.....	50
TABLE IV.4 MAJOR COMMUNITY-BASED NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN WtW SERVICE DELIVERY, BY STUDY SITE	52
TABLE IV.5 NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OPERATING UNDER THE WtW GRANT, BY STUDY SITE.....	55

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Welfare-to-Work (WtW) Grants program was created by Congress in 1997 to provide additional resources to help achieve the employment and self-sufficiency objectives of welfare reform. The additional \$3 billion Congress authorized supplement the federal funds under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant authorized by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. Congress intended the additional WtW funds to support programs, especially in high-poverty communities, that help the least employable, most disadvantaged welfare recipients and noncustodial parents make the transition from welfare to work. At the national level, the WtW grants program is administered by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), and funds are allocated to state and local grantees.

Congress mandated that the WtW Grants program be evaluated, and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., along with its subcontractors the Urban Institute and Support Services International, is conducting the evaluation under contract from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). This interim report from the evaluation documents the implementation, structure, and operations of WtW grant-funded programs in eleven study sites included in the evaluation, as they existed in mid-2000.

General Observation: *WtW start-up and implementation involved many challenges, but the grants have nonetheless encouraged the development of some innovative programs and strategies at the community level.*

- The first two years of WtW implementation were dominated by problems that programs have had enrolling eligible participants. There are many reasons for the enrollment problems, especially difficulty finding persons who meet the strict eligibility criteria originally defined by the law. This has resulted in a slower pace of implementation than originally planned and led most programs to devote considerable time and effort to addressing their enrollment problems.
- There is a strong feeling at the local level that *the presence of the WtW grants has contributed to program development for hard-to-serve groups*. Some innovative programs have been created and some population groups that have not typically been served in the past, including noncustodial parents, persons with disabilities, and individuals who are homeless or have substance abuse problems, are being targeted.
- WtW services are delivered through a *highly decentralized service delivery system* that relies heavily on contracted service providers, primarily community-based organizations. Most of the grantees in the study sites have used their funds to support several, often distinct, service programs, rather than one single program or model.
- The WtW grant-funded programs exist within a *complex organizational structure at the local level*, involving TANF and workforce development agencies and their associated programs, as well as other service providers in the community. Community-based nonprofit organizations play a major role in WtW service delivery and, in many sites, businesses and firms have helped design programs as well as hire participants from the programs.

ENROLLMENT AND PARTICIPATION

In all the study sites, WtW grant-funded programs were fully operational at the time of the visits in late 1999 and early 2000, but enrollment has proceeded more slowly than originally expected. For many reasons, programs have faced challenges locating, recruiting, and enrolling eligible participants:

- The original WtW eligibility criteria and spending requirements were quite strictly defined in the legislation, and both posed major operational challenges that hindered enrollment.
- Individuals with relatively serious personal and employment problems are particularly difficult to recruit and retain in work programs.
- The proliferation of programs and funding sources to serve TANF recipients, while generally welcome, in some places has had unintended consequences, such as increasing competition among programs seeking to serve a decreasing number of recipients.
- TANF line staff often lack information about the entire range of work programs available in their community and tend to refer clients primarily to established programs and agencies with which they are familiar, rather than to newer and smaller programs.
- The strong economy and high demand for workers suppress demand for programs that offer intensive work-related services, even if individuals might benefit greatly from them.

The WtW legislation was based on the assumption that some individuals with particularly serious employment and personal problems would, in fact, benefit in the long run from more

Finding 1: A number of strategies are being used in WtW grant programs to increase enrollment and participation.

Among the strategies being used in the study sites to increase WtW enrollment and participation levels are:

- *Direct and proactive outreach approaches*, such as marketing and media campaigns, public service announcements, neighborhood canvassing and mailings, and information sessions with other agencies, community organizations, and groups that are in contact with low-income families (e.g., churches, housing authorities, health care facilities, homeless shelters).
- *Scheduling activities and components more closely together* to reduce the amount of time that elapses and, therefore, minimize the number of “no-shows.”
- *Incorporating special financial provisions into service providers’ contracts* to provide incentives to increase the number of persons recruited or participating.

intensive services. Even though the economy in most places is very strong—meaning most who want to work can find a job—those with the most problems are less likely to be able to retain steady employment or earn enough to allow them to become permanently self-sufficient. Thus, programs have strong reasons to reach out to those who are eligible for WtW services to encourage them to participate in activities that could improve their long-term economic stability.

TARGET GROUPS AND PROGRAM SERVICES

The federal legislation specified that WtW grants are to support programs and services for those welfare recipients and noncustodial parents who have the most difficulty making the transition to the workforce. To emphasize this, the legislation specified particular groups, including those with low reading and math skills, limited work experience, long-term welfare dependency, substance abuse problems, and high school dropouts. Within the parameters set by Congress, grantees have latitude in determining which of the target population to serve.

Programs in the study sites are generally available to any individual who meets the federal WtW eligibility criteria. However, some programs emphasize a particular subgroup, usually because the service provider agency has special expertise with that group or is located in a neighborhood where particular groups reside.

Finding 2: In general, WtW grants are being used to serve all persons who meet the federal eligibility criteria, but some programs focus on particular groups.

Some programs are targeting special subgroups of the eligible population. Among the more frequent target groups in the study sites are:

- *Noncustodial parents,*
- *Limited English speakers, and*
- *Persons with special problems and barriers to employment, including disabilities, homelessness, and substance abuse.*

PROGRAM SERVICES

Programs operating with WtW grant funds have considerable leeway in deciding what types of employment-related services they will offer. The original legislation included only one major restriction: grants could not be used for stand-alone training or education. The 1999 amendments maintained the clear focus on work but also allowed some short-term training to prepare individuals with the most serious difficulties for employment. Programs in the study sites routinely test participants' reading and math skills and provide case management services, job search assistance, and job placement and retention services. A few of the programs in the study sites also emphasize post-employment skills development or provide more intensive individualized intervention and support services.

Finding 3: *The WtW programs are primarily work focused, and offer a variety of services and activities.*

Among the work-specific activities in programs in the study sites are:

- job search assistance and job placement
- internships with partnering employers
- paid work experience
- wage supplements
- post-employment skills development

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The legislation established a structure for the WtW grants program that places administrative responsibility with DOL at the national level and primarily with workforce development agencies at the local level. To deliver services at the community level, there is often close interaction between the WtW programs and the TANF agency and program.

Finding 4: *Most WtW administrative agencies are workforce development agencies, but this does not mean they are necessarily distinct from TANF.*

In the study sites, most of the workforce development agencies (i.e., workforce investment agencies or boards under the new Workforce Investment Act, replacing former private industry councils) that are responsible for the WtW grant-funded programs also have a formal role in the TANF work program, either administering the program totally or operating as a main contractor to provide services.

The extensive diversity of programs and the high degree of decentralization means there are many different structures for administering and operating WtW programs. The diversity of structures is a defining characteristic of the grants program.

Finding 5: *No one particular administrative structure or program model is necessarily preferable to another in terms of ease of administrative or operational implementation.*

Among the study sites, there are various examples of programs administered by workforce development agencies, nonprofit organizations, for-profit companies, educational institutions, and other agencies. There is no evidence that any one particular model is necessarily preferable. The experiences of this diverse group of programs can offer much insight to agencies in other localities.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Welfare-to-Work (WtW) grants program is a \$3 billion program established by Congress as part of the Balanced Budget Act (BBA) of 1997. Its purpose is to provide additional resources to supplement the welfare reform funds included in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, which was authorized under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. There was some concern among policymakers that it would be relatively more difficult in high-poverty communities than in other communities to achieve the employment objectives of welfare reform, and that the same communities might eventually bear additional financial burdens when individuals reach their lifetime limits on welfare. Congress intended that these additional funds would support programs, especially in high-poverty communities, that assist the least employable, most disadvantaged welfare recipients make the transition from welfare to work, and help noncustodial parents increase their earnings and support their children. The funds are allocated by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) to state and local grantees.

Congress mandated that the WtW grants program be evaluated. Under contract from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., along with its subcontractors the Urban Institute and Support Services International, is conducting the national evaluation to document implementation of WtW programs and employment and welfare outcomes for program participants.

This is an interim report based on preliminary examination of program operations. The remainder of this chapter provides an overview of the WtW grants program, the general evaluation study design, and the issues being addressed in this component of the evaluation.

Subsequent chapters describe the programs being implemented in eleven study sites with regard to enrollment and participation, services, and program structure.

A. WELFARE REFORM CONTEXT

The WtW grants program was enacted to complement the broader welfare reform agenda defined by TANF. TANF solidified a trend among states to replace the former welfare system under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, which was based primarily on income transfers and benefit entitlements, with a work-based system of temporary public assistance. Welfare reform has resulted in rather dramatic changes to the nation's social assistance system.¹

Welfare Is Provided for Only a Temporary Period and Is Intended to Be a Short-Term Step toward Employment. Unlike the former AFDC program, TANF is explicitly defined as short-term assistance; recipients can receive cash assistance for only 60 months during their lifetime, and states can impose a shorter time limit. The intent is to emphasize employment rather than welfare. Congress underscored the emphasis on work as the goal for TANF recipients by requiring states to meet steadily increasing requirements for the percentage of their TANF cases that must be engaged in unsubsidized employment or other work activities. In fiscal year 2000, states must have 40 percent of their caseload in work activities; this requirement increases to 45 percent in fiscal year 2001 and 50 percent in 2002. Most state TANF policies, therefore, stress job search activities and encourage or require recipients to find employment rapidly, rather than promote education or training. At the same time, most states have chosen to reinforce work requirements by disregarding a larger fraction of recipients' earnings in benefit calculations as a

¹ This section is adapted from Chapter I of the report also prepared as part of this evaluation: "Further Progress, Persistent Constraints: Findings From a Second Survey of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Program," Irma Perez-Johnson, Alan Hershey, and Jeanne Bellotti (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc) April 2000.

way of making work pay, and by dedicating increased resources to child care and transportation assistance to help offset the cost of working.

Welfare Rolls Have Declined Dramatically. The welfare rolls, which began to shrink in the mid-1990s, have continued to decline in the first few years since the passage of PRWORA and the BBA. From 1994 through 1999, the average monthly number of cases receiving AFDC (and then TANF) cash assistance decreased from 5.05 million to 2.65 million.² According to much research, the caseload reduction is due to a combination of the continuing strong national economy and the new welfare reform policies that have emphasized employment.³ As more employable recipients leave welfare for work, a greater share of those remaining on TANF tend to have employment and personal problems than was true before welfare reform.

WtW Provides Additional Resources to Help the Most Disadvantaged. Congress enacted the WtW grants program to complement state welfare reform policies by concentrating additional resources on parents who were particularly disadvantaged and likely to have the greatest difficulty finding and holding a job.

To further reinforce the general purpose of the grants, Congress established eligibility criteria and spending rules to ensure that the funds are used primarily for individuals who have specific disadvantages in the labor market. As originally enacted, the BBA required that WtW grantees spend 70 percent of their grant funds on (1) long-term TANF recipients or recipients within a year of reaching a TANF time limit, who also have two of three specific problems affecting employment prospects; or (2) noncustodial parents of children in a long-term TANF case, who

² U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, “Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, 1936-1999,” August 22, 2000, Administration on Children and Families Web site, <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news.stats/3697.htm>, accessed September 28, 2000.

³ See, for example, Geoffrey Wallace and Rebecca M. Blank, “What Goes Up Must Come Down? Explaining Recent Changes in Public Assistance Caseloads,” in *Economic Conditions and Welfare Reform*, edited by Sheldon H. Danziger (Kalamazoo, MI: Upjohn Institute), 1999.

themselves face two of the three specified problems. The three problems specified in the original language of the BBA were (1) lack of a high school diploma or GED *and* low reading or math skills, (2) a substance abuse problem, and (3) a poor work history. The remaining 30 percent could be spent on people who met less stringent criteria: TANF recipients (or noncustodial parents of TANF recipients) who have characteristics associated with long-term welfare dependence, such as being a school dropout or a teen parent, or having a poor work history.

Organizational Roles Regarding Welfare Programs Have Changed. PRWORA and the BBA have given states and localities increased control over their strategies for moving welfare recipients into employment. Allowing states about \$16.5 billion annually through fiscal year (FY) 2002 in TANF block grants from DHHS, PRWORA established a broad policy framework for TANF programs, but leaves states great discretion in defining the combination of cash assistance and employment and support services they offer families. The BBA gives authority to DOL to administer the WtW grants program, and local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) have primary operational responsibility. In effect, at the local level, the job of moving welfare recipients into employment is very much shared by human services agencies, responsible for TANF and its work programs, and the workforce development system, with its responsibility for WtW grant programs.

Jurisdictions with high poverty and high welfare caseloads were given priority in the allocation of WtW funds, because DOL recognized that in such areas individuals may have a more difficult time moving from welfare into the labor market. The U.S. Department of Labor has distributed nearly \$3 billion to state and local grantees. Seventy-five percent of the funds were distributed to states according to the legislative formula based on poverty rates and welfare caseloads. The state agency designated by the Governor to administer the formula grant funds is

required to distribute 85 percent of the formula funds to the local WIBs, and can retain the rest as discretionary funds. Twenty-five percent of the federal funds were awarded competitively based on applications from nonprofit organizations, WIBs, other public agencies, and multi-site grantees serving local areas in multiple states.

B. CHANGES IN THE WELFARE-TO-WORK GRANTS PROGRAM LEGISLATION

As WtW grant programs were being implemented beginning in 1999, it became clear that the combination of the strict eligibility criteria and the “70-30” spending requirement were contributing to slow enrollment. In response, Congress modified the WtW legislation in 1999 as part of the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations legislation for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies. While the amendments left in place the requirement that 70 percent of WtW funds be spent on a defined category of participants, they broadened the population in two ways to make it easier for TANF recipients and noncustodial parents to qualify for WtW services under the 70 percent category:

- ***TANF Participants Qualify Simply by Being Long-Term Recipients.*** The amendments removed the requirement that long-term TANF recipients exhibit additional barriers to employment. TANF recipients are eligible if they have received assistance for at least 30 months, are within 12 months of reaching a time limit, or have exhausted their TANF benefits due to time limits.
- ***Noncustodial Parents Qualify Under Less Restrictive Rules.*** Noncustodial parents are eligible if: (1) they are unemployed, underemployed, or are having difficulty making child support payments; (2) their minor children are receiving or eligible for TANF, or received TANF in the past year, or are eligible for or receive assistance under the Food Stamp, Supplemental Security Income, Medicaid, or Children’s Health Insurance programs; and (3) they make a commitment to establish paternity, pay child support, and participate in services to improve their prospects for employment and paying child support.

The definition of the 30 percent category was also broadened to include youth who have received foster care, custodial parents (regardless of TANF status) with income below the

poverty level, and TANF recipients who face other barriers to employment specified by the local WIB. Other program changes were also made that expand the types of services that are allowed and simplify some administrative requirements: (1) allowing WtW funds to be used for pre-employment vocational education and job training for up to six months; (2) allowing grantees that are not WIBs to provide job readiness, placement, and post-employment services directly rather than only through contracts or vouchers; (3) streamlining reporting requirements; and (4) permitting child support enforcement agencies to share information on noncustodial parents with WIBs, to help carry out WtW programs.

C. OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION

The congressionally mandated evaluation was designed to focus on five key questions:

1. What types and packages of services do WtW grantees provide? How do they compare with services already available under TANF or Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funding?⁴
2. What are the net impacts of various WtW program approaches on employment and on families' well-being?
3. What challenges do grantees confront as they implement and operate WtW programs?
4. Do the benefits of WtW programs outweigh their costs?
5. How well do Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) and other non-TANF organizations—the primary vehicles for funding and operating WtW programs—meet the challenge of serving those hardest to employ?

The design of the evaluation has evolved somewhat since its inception, in large part because of the long start-up and slow pace of enrollment in WtW programs. Under a modified design

⁴ The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) was enacted by Congress in 1998, and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was terminated. Each local area designates a Workforce Investment Board (WIB), which generally are replacing the former JTPA Private Industry Councils (PIC).

adopted by DHHS, the evaluation plan now includes two main components to address these questions in a narrower way:

- **A Descriptive Assessment of All WtW Grantees.** A mail survey of all grantees in 1998 and 1999 provided an overview of program designs and activities, target populations, characteristics of participants, and—to the extent that they were available—placement outcomes.⁵ Exploratory visits to several dozen grantee programs before the first survey helped develop a fuller understanding of program variations and provided a basis for selecting in-depth study sites.⁶
- **In-Depth Process and Implementation Study.** Structured site visits are being conducted to local programs of eleven grantees, selected because of their innovative approaches, settings, or target groups, or because they are typical of some of the more common WtW interventions. The aim is to identify implementation issues, challenges and lessons. This report is based on the first round of in-depth visits conducted in 1999-2000. A subsequent round of visits will be conducted in 2001. In most of these study sites, follow-up data are being collected through surveys and administrative data and used for analysis of participants' program services and activities as well as their welfare and employment outcomes. Analysis of program costs will also be conducted. Analysis of outcomes and costs will be reported in stages—in mid-2001, late 2002, and mid-2003.

In addition to the components of the core evaluation, a special process and implementation study focuses on tribal programs. It is documenting welfare and employment systems operated by American Indian and Alaska Native WtW grantees, the supportive services they provide, and how these tribal grantees integrate funds from various sources to move their members from welfare to work. Results of the tribal program evaluation will be reported in early 2001.

⁵ For results of the two surveys, see Perez-Johnson, Irma, and Alan Hershey, "Early Implementation of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Report to Congress." Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., March 1999; and Perez-Johnson, Irma, Alan Hershey, and Jeanne Bellotti, "Further Progress, Persistent Constraints: Findings From a Second Survey of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Program." Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research Inc., April 2000.

⁶ For results of the exploratory site visits, see Nightingale, Demetra Smith, Terri Thompson, Nancy Pindus, Pamela Holcomb, Edgar Lee, Jesse Valente, and John Trutko, "Early Implementation of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Programs: Findings from Exploratory Site Visits and Review of Program Plans." Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, February 2000.

D. THE PROCESS ANALYSIS

The general purpose of the process and implementation analysis is to describe the components, services, structure, management, and operations of the programs funded with WtW grants in selected study sites. A complementary objective is to identify lessons from these programs about how to implement an initiative targeting hard-to-employ populations. Various types of data are used: administrative data that tracks individual participants, the services they receive and the activities in which they participate; interviews with administrators and staff of grantee agencies and service providers; and focus groups with participants.

The process analysis addresses issues that fall into three general categories (Table I.1): (1) identifying potentially promising service models, (2) documenting and understanding program operations, and (3) drawing lessons about the structure of welfare-to-work strategies. The structured site visits provide the primary source of information to address this broad range of topics. A general conceptual framework that includes four domains was used to collect and analyze information:

- **External Conditions.** These are factors mostly outside the control of state and local program administrators and staff, but which affect their programs. They include, for example, federal legislation and regulations, funding levels and mechanisms, labor market conditions, sociodemographic characteristics of the target population, historic experience and tradition with similar programs and policies, and state/local political structure and priorities. Such factors influence how a state or locality structures a program and allocates responsibilities among agencies and offices.
- **Program Structure and Management.** This includes the organizational structure, such as the distribution of authority among state and substate jurisdictions, and interagency or interprogram coordination. It also includes general management policies and systems, such as contracting, performance systems, management information and cost accounting systems, and cost-sharing arrangements. These organizational and management factors together in turn influence local operations.

TABLE I.1: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES AND TOPICS

Identifying Promising Service Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What program models are associated with positive outcomes of interest (e.g., sustained employment, increased wages) for the target population or particular subgroups (e.g., limited-English speaking, noncustodial parents, long-term welfare recipients, substance users)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What innovative or promising program models or strategies are implemented and what are the necessary conditions for their replication? How are economic environment, geographic (urban/rural) setting, and the political, organizational, or interprogram context likely to affect replication?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does actual WtW implementation compare to original program designs, and what factors influence evolution and modifications, such as operational experience and changes in labor market conditions, caseload characteristics, provider networks, federal policies/regulations and programs (including 1999 changes in eligibility criteria)?
Documenting and Understanding Program Operations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What types and packages of services are provided under WtW, and how do they compare with services available under the basic TANF programs?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the main features of the overall service delivery system, including the range, nature, length, and intensity of services; the number of participants in various activities or receiving various services; the formal client flow; frequency of staff/client contact; and sequencing of client activities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What operational procedures are used for outreach, recruiting, and informing participants about services available; determining/verifying eligibility; and reaching particularly hard-to-serve populations?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and to what extent do programs provide employment-related services, such as assessment, job placement, job training, unsubsidized employment, subsidized employment, post-employment education and training, and social support services?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are management functions handled, including monitoring and tracking participation activity and employment progress, program planning, contracting, reporting, determining staffing needs and qualifications, staff training, and interprogram coordination (particularly between workforce development agencies and TANF agencies)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What special services do programs provide, such as intensive counseling, case management, coaching/mentoring, job retention services?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the attitudes and perceptions of staff about the WtW programs? How do participants perceive the substance and value of WtW, and how much do they use the services?
Drawing Lessons About the Structure of Welfare-to-Work Strategies and Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the nature and extent of interprogram and interagency interaction in delivering services and implementing the program, with JTPA (and now WIA), TANF, ES/Job Service, One-Stop Centers, Voc Rehab, education, social services, community-based organizations, job placement agencies, child support enforcement, or other key programs, agencies, and service providers?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do workforce development (i.e., workforce investment boards (WIBs)) and TANF relationships affect WtW, and how does WtW affect preexisting relationships? What lessons can be learned about improving WIB/TANF relationships in the future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What organizational challenges arise in coordinating and integrating program administration and funding across the workforce development and welfare systems?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is WtW advanced or affected by interaction with employers and the roles they play?

- **Local Program Operations and Service Delivery.** These include local dimensions of the program, such as operational systems, service delivery mechanisms, and client flow. Also of interest are the types of services offered and how they are delivered and experienced by participants, including approaches to client recruiting, intake, assessment, assignment to activities, and case management. The dynamic interaction between program structure and services and external conditions affects program results.
- **Program Results.** These include program-level performance and outcomes at an aggregate level as well as individual outcomes at a participant level. Results and performance, in turn, have a feedback effect on the program itself, in some cases influencing management, organizational structure, and service delivery decisions to improve results.

This report is based on information obtained through semi-structured interviews with over 900 administrators and staff in WtW-funded programs in eleven study sites. The first round of site visits occurred in late 1999 and early 2000 and focused on implementation issues, program structure, client flow, and program services. The next round of site visits in 2001 will update the status of the programs and their experiences.

E. STUDY SITES

Eleven WtW grantees were selected for the in-depth component of the evaluation, as presented in Table I.2. They were purposively selected to achieve diversity in terms of:

- Geography—urban and rural locations
- Type of WtW grant funding—competitive, formula, discretionary
- Type of grantee host agency—private industry council/WIB, community-based non-profit organization
- Past experience and success serving welfare recipients
- Local economic conditions
- Target populations served

TABLE I.2

WTW EVALUATION IN-DEPTH STUDY SITES

Study Site and Host/Grantee Agency	Name of the Study Program	Types of WtW Funding for the Program
Boston, Massachusetts, Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC)	Employer-Sponsored Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999
Chicago, Illinois, Mayor's Office of Workforce Development	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999
Fort Worth, Texas, Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999; • Competitive Grant Round 2
Southeastern Indiana (19 county area), River Valley Resources, Inc.	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999; • Competitive Grant Round 1
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections for Region 3 (Milwaukee County)	Nontraditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Funds (state's 15%)
Nashville, Tennessee, Nashville Career Advancement Center	Nashville Works/ Pathways Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999; • Competitive Grant Round 2
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation, Greater Philadelphia Works Program	Transitional Work Corp., Phil@Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999; • Formula Funds (state's 15%)
Phoenix, Arizona, City of Phoenix Human Services Department, Employment and Training Division	Employment and Respect Now (EARN) Alliance Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999; • Formula Funds (state's 15%)
West Virginia (29 county area), Human Resources Development Foundation	Comprehensive Employment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competitive Grant Round 2
Yakima, Washington, Tri-Valley Private Industry Council	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formula Grant FY1998, FY1999; • Formula funds (state's 15%)
Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000 (Baltimore County, Maryland; St. Lucie County, Florida; Long Beach, California)	Career Transcript System (CTS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-site Competitive Grant Round 2

- Type of program model, including sites using potentially innovative approaches and sites with more typical strategies

This report is based on exploratory and subsequent in-depth visits to all eleven of these sites. In this report, a “study site” is defined as a WtW competitive grantee or a WIB/PIC, which is a subgrantee of a state’s formula grant, with some variants on this general definition. For simplicity, both grantees and subgrantees are referred to as grantees, recognizing that they have similar administrative responsibility for the grant-funded programs. The evaluation focuses on the program, or cluster of programs, operating in each study site and funded fully or mainly by one or more WtW grants, as noted on Table I.2. In some places, such as Philadelphia, the evaluation is focusing on a particular program operating as one among a complex array of local programs.

The federal grants are being used to implement a wide range of programs and there is much variation across sites in the nature of the programs operating and the types of organizations involved. The resulting system is quite complex. The following chapters provide a descriptive overview of the study sites and the programs that are being operated in those sites as they existed in late 1999 and early 2000. Chapter II describes program enrollment and participant targeting. Chapter III documents the range of employment and supportive services offered to participants. Chapter IV describes the organizational structure of the programs in the study sites, highlighting both the extent of decentralization and the wide-ranging organizational arrangements. Chapter V provides some concluding observations. Summary information and brief profiles of each of the study sites appear in Appendixes A and B. The information and findings presented are intended to complement other components of the evaluation and provide operations and program context for future reports, including the final analysis of individual outcomes and program costs.

II. PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND PARTICIPATION

The federal legislation includes specific eligibility criteria that prescribe who can be served with WtW grant funds. While Congress loosened the eligibility criteria somewhat through amendments enacted in late 1999, the strictness of the initial federal legislative provisions figured importantly in how the programs were implemented in the first two years and the issues on which they focused. In fact, issues related to the eligibility criteria, including identifying and verifying eligible persons, dominated the first two years of operations. For that reason, the enrollment and eligibility issues identified in the study sites are discussed first in this report.

A. PROGRAM START-UP

Due to a number of factors, the WtW programs have had a relatively long start-up phase and the rate of enrollment has been lower than initially expected. By late 1999, though, all the study sites had operational programs, and many had made programmatic changes intended to increase their enrollment levels.

1. All the study programs were fully operational at the time of the site visits in late 1999 and early 2000, but enrollment has proceeded more slowly than originally expected.

The start-up phase of the WtW grants system has been relatively long. Some of the lengthy start-up reflects the fact that many of the programs are newly developed, without pre-existing administrative or operational structures and facilities. However, administrators and staff report that the overriding issue they have had to face is slow enrollment into the programs. There is some evidence that enrollment has begun to increase. Even so, the difficulties with slow enrollment dominated the implementation of the programs in the first two years.

Most of the programs are enrolling participants at a slower rate than they had originally expected. At the time of the site visits, which took place between 12 and 18 months after

enrollment started, programs in about half the study sites had enrolled at least half of their expected number of participants; the rest had enrolled somewhat less than half their ultimate goal. As noted in Table II.1, enrollment levels at the time of the site visits in late 1999 and early 2000 ranged from around 100 to 200 in Fort Worth and Milwaukee to over 3,000 in Chicago.

The pace and level of enrollment has been slower, in fact, than originally expected nationwide. As discussed in the following section, low enrollment represents one of the most difficult challenges program administrators and staff report, both in the field visits and through the grantee surveys conducted to date (Perez-Johnson, 2000). However, across the study sites, there is some variation in the severity of the problem, as noted in Table II.1. In three programs, by the time of the site visit, enrollments had approached the level they had expected at that stage of implementation (Yakima, Chicago, and HRDF in West Virginia), even though they had some minor difficulties during the earlier months of start-up (discussed below). At the other end of the spectrum, in three sites, enrollments continued to lag behind expectations (Fort Worth, Milwaukee, and Nashville).

2. Programs have faced many challenges in locating, recruiting and enrolling eligible participants.

The intent of the legislation authorizing the WtW grants is to provide more intensive employment and supportive services to particularly disadvantaged welfare recipients and noncustodial parents of children on welfare in order to both facilitate their transition from welfare to work and improve their economic self-sufficiency. One of the most frustrating challenges that programs seem to have faced—and many continue to face—is difficulty in

TABLE II.1

ENROLLMENT LEVELS, BY STUDY SITE
(as of mid-2000)

Study Site	Study Program	Enrollment Start Date for the Program	Original Planned Number of Participants	Enrollment Levels (at Time of Site Visit)
Boston, Massachusetts	Employer Sponsored & Enhanced Community Service Programs	7/98	700-900	500 (1/2000)
Chicago, Illinois	Welfare-to-Work Program	7/98	9,000	3,000 (4/2000)
Fort Worth, Texas	Welfare-to-Work Program	2/99	600 (competitive) 1,000 (formula)	200 (12/99)
Indiana (19 county area)	Welfare-to-Work Program	8/98	750	425 (5/00)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Nontraditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program	4/99	900 (original plan) 300-400 (revised)	100 (12/99)
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Works/Pathways Program	7/98	1,875	300 (1/2000)
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Transitional Work Corporation, <u>Phil@Work</u> Program	9/98	3,000 (TWC)	1,200 (12/1999)
Phoenix, Arizona	Employment and Respect Now (EARN) Alliance Program	10/98	1,600 (original plan) 750-1,050 (revised)	500 (4/2000)
West Virginia (29 county area)	Comprehensive Employment Program	3/99	510 (CEP)	400 (12/99)
Yakima, Washington	Welfare-to-Work Program	8/98	800	700 (5/2000)
Baltimore County, Maryland St. Lucie County, Florida Long Beach, California	JHU-SCANS2000 Career Transcript System (CTS)	4/99	1,000 (total 8 sites)	300 (3/2000)

Source: Review of grantee applications and enrollment as reported by program administrators during research site visits in 1999 and 2000.

identifying and reaching their eligible target population. Like other WtW grant programs around the country, most of the study programs have, for a variety of reasons, encountered challenges in locating, recruiting, determining eligibility, and enrolling enough eligible participants to meet their original planned levels. In all study programs, there were difficulties finding individuals who met specific criteria and dealing with participant “no-shows” and attrition.

A combination of factors contribute to the enrollment problems—the eligibility criteria and spending requirements in the legislation, the characteristics of the target population, specific TANF policies and practices, a recent proliferation of programs for welfare clients, and economic conditions.

The original WtW eligibility criteria and spending requirements were quite strictly defined in the legislation, and both posed major operational challenges that hindered enrollment. Administrators and staff in all the study sites report that the original eligibility criteria, in use until at least January 2000, seriously impeded their ability to locate and enroll eligible individuals. They had difficulty determining and verifying, for example, whether an individual had received cash assistance for at least 30 cumulative months, and many felt unnecessarily burdened by having to test individual reading and math ability when there were other obviously serious problems (e.g., no work experience, substance abuse).

In addition to the strict eligibility criteria, the programs were required expend at least 70 percent of the WtW grant funds on (1) long-term TANF recipients or recipients within a year of reaching a TANF time limit, who also have two of three specific problems affecting employment prospects (lack of a high diploma and low reading or math skills; a substance abuse problem; or poor work history); or (2) noncustodial parents of children in a long-term TANF case, who themselves face two of the three specified barriers. Not more than 30 percent could be spent on other eligibles who met less stringent criteria: TANF recipients (or noncustodial parents of

TANF recipient children) who have characteristics associated with long-term welfare dependence, such as being a school dropout or a teen parent, or having a poor work history. The 70 percent requirement resulted in many programs taking a very cautious approach to enrolling anyone who met only the 30 percent criteria, because there was concern that the program might not be able to find and enroll enough people who met the 70 percent rule. Ironically, in some sites, programs were turning away some individuals who were eligible only under the 30 percent category at the same time program staff were having difficulty identifying and recruiting those in the 70 percent category.

Legislative changes taking effect in 2000 should ease some of these concerns, but at the time of the site visits, the original provisions were still a major source of frustration among staff and administrators. They were generally optimistic about the 2000 legislative changes, but the site visits occurred too soon to determine whether, or to what extent, the changes would lead to higher enrollment. Some frustration also was expressed at the local level regarding the congressionally established phase-in of the new amendments, which could cause particular confusion for programs using both competitive and formula funds.

Individuals with relatively serious personal and employment problems are particularly difficult to recruit and retain in work programs. Even if the eligibility criteria had been less restrictive from the beginning, one might have expected programs to have special challenges engaging participants because they were to target a population with serious problems and barriers to employment. Several staff in the study sites explained that the populations with which they are dealing have even more serious problems than they had expected. The disadvantaged mothers and fathers who are the target of the WtW legislation have a range of problems and limited past experience with employment programs that make them particularly difficult to engage.

Many disadvantaged mothers on TANF possess multiple personal problems that, in the past, often exempted them from employment programs. Many on TANF, for instance, are affected by substance abuse, limited work history, domestic violence, undiagnosed mental illness, or learning disabilities, and some have several of these problems simultaneously. The personal problems can be compounded by unstable or overcrowded housing and sporadic homelessness, inadequate child care, poor public transportation, and lack of private vehicles. Generally, earlier welfare reform and employment programs did not focus many work-related services on the most troubled clients; these clients were often exempt from work requirements, and agencies were more likely to emphasize family and protective services or counseling for them, rather than employment and training. While there have always been public and community programs available, individuals with the most problems were unlikely to come forth voluntarily for services. They may understand programs to which they are more accustomed, such as those that provide cash, food stamps, Medicaid, housing, and other benefits, but be less familiar with employment, training, and education programs and services.

Many of the fathers of welfare children, who are also a main target of the WtW legislation, tend to face similar personal problems and are equally unfamiliar with work programs. Some also have criminal histories and many face equally daunting transportation problems, which can pose serious barriers to employment. Many are unable to pay child support, and most resist getting involved with the official child support system, even if it is attempting to provide access to employment-related services.

TANF policies and practices in particular states and localities directly and indirectly affect enrollment into WtW programs, and in some places have inadvertently resulted in limiting the number of WtW participants. In all of the study sites, some type of agreement was in effect between the TANF agency and the WtW program agency. These agreements

specified whether and how individuals would be referred to WtW, which TANF clients would be referred or be considered for WtW, how WtW eligibility would be verified, and/or how the TANF work program interacts operationally with the WtW program.

In some sites, the complicated dynamics of the TANF and WtW interactions and agreements have had a (usually unintended) limiting effect on the number of TANF clients enrolling in WtW. For example, in sites where the WtW program relied on the TANF agency to verify an individual's WtW eligibility, the start of services could be delayed until the eligibility certification was received. Similarly, in sites where TANF clients were required first to participate in a TANF work program activity (e.g., job search) before being considered for WtW, the original number of participants for WtW might have been overestimated.

Formal agreements between the TANF agency and the WtW agency sometimes have restricted the potential pool of individuals who could enroll into WtW. For example, procedures were established in most sites to refer eligible TANF recipients to WtW programs, but only after they complete some specific sequence of activities through a TANF work program. In some places, only those TANF recipients who are subject to state work requirements are considered for WtW, thus excluding some with the most serious problems, even though they are a prime target group for WtW. In addition, in a few locales, individuals who are in conciliation, adjudication, or sanction status are not considered eligible for WtW, even if the family is still receiving some cash assistance. In each of these examples, the individual is technically eligible for WtW services under the federal provisions, but more restrictive criteria have been used in practice.

It is not surprising that most WtW grantees assumed that the TANF agency would be in the best position to verify WtW eligibility. However, the complexity of the WtW criteria required some information that even TANF agencies do not routinely collect or maintain (e.g., functional

education level, cumulative months receiving cash assistance). Some WtW programs were actively enrolling only individuals whose eligibility was verified, and the programs were relying on the TANF agency to verify eligibility. This means that in several sites, the “list” of verified individuals the WtW program was receiving from the TANF agency included only a portion of the potential eligible pool—that portion eligible based on the data available in the TANF agency (e.g., those clients whose current spell of welfare is 30 months or longer, but not those currently on welfare with 30 cumulative months of welfare receipt over multiple spells). In addition, some programs experienced additional time delays in enrollment if their procedures called for waiting for eligibility verification from the TANF agency before enrolling participants.

Even when there is no formal agreement for TANF agencies to refer individuals to WtW programs or verify eligibility, TANF policies regarding work requirements and supportive services can affect WtW participation. WtW program staff generally want to assure that their participants are in full compliance with TANF policies regarding work requirements and supportive services, since the benefits and services they receive through TANF are important to their successful participation in WtW activities.

The proliferation of programs and funding sources to serve TANF recipients, while generally welcome, has had the unintended consequence of increasing competition among programs for a decreasing number of recipients. In all the communities included in the evaluation (except for one of the rural Indiana counties), there are multiple programs specifically serving TANF recipients. There are more TANF-funded work program contractors than in the past and in many of the sites there are multiple WtW-funded programs. It is not uncommon for providers to have contracts under both the TANF work program and one or more WtW grants. The new WtW funds and the enhanced TANF funds have created a larger network of programs

than had existed in the past. This provides a welcome opportunity to merge funding streams and create comprehensive service packages.

The expanding number of programs has also increased the competition among programs in some sites. In fact, increased competition among programs can result in some obvious performance benefits. However, WtW program staff in many of the study sites expressed frustration at having to consciously market their program and compete for clients, especially if they had not expected to have to do this when they planned the program.

TANF line staff often lack information about the entire range of work programs and tend to refer clients primarily to established programs and agencies with which they are familiar rather than to newer and smaller programs. The expanded number of work programs available through the WtW grants is occurring at the same time that TANF workers are being expected to ensure that a higher portion of their cases participate in some work-related activity. While the presence of various programs provides more varied opportunities than had existed in the past, in some of the study sites, TANF workers were not fully informed about the various programs, and were more likely to refer individuals to familiar agencies or programs, especially those funded through TANF. This may mean that newer programs that started up with WtW grant funds may get relatively fewer referrals and be underutilized.

The strong economy and high demand for workers suppress demand for intensive developmental programs. The robust economy makes some TANF clients and noncustodial parents, even with multiple problems, somewhat more likely to find employment on their own because employers are more willing to dip deeper into the unemployed pool to fill job openings. To some extent, this is a main objective of welfare reform and TANF: to move individuals quickly from welfare to work. In this regard, many states have established time limits shorter than the federal limit of five years, which further focuses policies on “work first” approaches.

However, the mandate of the WtW legislation is somewhat broader in that programs are designed not only to move individuals into jobs, but also help them improve their work skills so they can move up the job ladder. According to staff in the study programs, some potential WtW participants who might benefit in the long run from work preparation activities and supportive services offered through WtW, the TANF work program,¹ and other programs, are instead quickly finding or being placed directly into jobs. While they may lose that job in a few months when personal problems or skill deficiencies are revealed, in the short term this may reduce the potential number of individuals interested in or referred to intensive employment preparation programs. WtW programs can provide post-employment services, and many increasingly are now doing so, but in most of the study sites, that focus was not initially included in the plans.

3. There are various ways TANF recipients enter WtW programs, based in part on how WtW programs interact operationally with TANF work programs.

WtW is intended to complement the work objectives of TANF, for which each state designs its own work requirements and work programs. Since TANF families are the main target population of WtW grants, the WtW grant programs must operate within the general context of TANF policies and programs in effect in the locality. The study programs interact, or link, with the TANF agency and its programs in various ways. There is no single TANF work program model and no single way that WtW programs interact with the TANF system. There is also no evidence that any particular type of interaction between the two agencies necessarily improves the flow of clients into WtW grants programs, although in some sites, there is a perception

¹ The federal work program under the former AFDC policy was the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program. There is no federal work program for TANF, but every state has a program to implement work requirements and provide employment-related services. Each state's program has a unique name. For simplicity in this report, the work programs associated with TANF are referred to as "TANF Work Programs."

among WtW staff that strict TANF work activity prerequisites has limited the flow of individuals into WtW grant programs.

The study sites fall into four categories in terms of how the WtW program interacts with the TANF work program (Table II.2). These categories represent TANF agencies' degree of involvement in the flow of clients from the TANF agency into the WtW program—TANF First, TANF staff discretion, partially integrated, and fully integrated.²

In “TANF First” sites, clients subject to a TANF work requirement must participate in a TANF-specified work activity before being considered for WtW or any other option. The TANF agency, through its work program, serves as a funnel through which TANF clients move to enroll in the WtW program and into other programs in the community. In every state, some TANF recipients are subject to mandatory work requirements, where the state agency specifies the types of activities (e.g., job search, work experience) an individual can participate in to meet the work requirement. Defined policies and procedures specify which TANF recipients are “work mandatory” and when and how these individuals might enter the WtW program. In four of the sites, TANF recipients who are subject to work participation rules must participate first in some TANF required work activity through the TANF work program.

In sites where TANF staff have discretion on referring clients to a work program, the WtW program is one of several options. TANF workers (eligibility, intake, or case managers) decide where clients who are subject to a work requirement will be referred. Workers also have

² In all categories, WtW programs also conduct their own outreach to recruit TANF recipients, which means that even in communities where there are strong TANF work participation requirements and programs, not all WtW program clients who are TANF recipients come through referral from the TANF agency.

TABLE II.2
EXTENT OF OPERATIONAL INTERACTION BETWEEN WtW AND TANF WORK PROGRAMS,
BY STUDY SITE

Study Site/WtW Study Program	WtW Program Administrative Agency	TANF Work Program Link to WtW			
		Work Mandatory Clients go to TANF Work Program First	TANF Worker has Discretion over where clients go	WtW and TANF Work Program are Partially Integrated	WtW and TANF Work Program are Totally Integrated
Boston, Massachusetts Employer-Sponsored Programs	Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS), Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC) (JTPA/WIA Administrative Agency)			X	
Fort Worth, Texas Welfare-to-Work Program	Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)				X
Indiana (Decatur County) Welfare-to-Work Program	River Valley Resources, Inc. (JTPA/WIA Administrative Agency)				X
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Nontraditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program	[NOW serves noncustodial parents on probation or parole with children on welfare, but no TANF recipients are served]			
Nashville, Tennessee Nashville Works/Pathways Program	Nashville Career Advancement Center (JTPA/WIA Administrative Agency)			X	
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Phil@Work Program	Transitional Work Corporation (nonprofit organization) and Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation	X			
Phoenix, Arizona Employment and Respect Now (EARN) Alliance Program	City of Phoenix Human Services Department, Employment and Training Division (JTPA/WIA Administrative Entity)	X			
West Virginia (29 county area) Comprehensive Employment Program	Human Resources Development Foundation (nonprofit organization)		X		
Yakima, Washington Welfare-to-Work Program	Tri-Valley Private Industry Council	X			
Baltimore County, Maryland SCANS2000 Career Transcript System (CTS)	Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000 Center	X			
Chicago, Illinois Welfare-to-Work Program	Mayor's Office of Workforce Development (JTPA/WIA Administrative Agency)		X		

discretion in terms of whether those who are not subject to the mandatory work requirements are encouraged to participate in work-related activities or referred to work-related programs. TANF intake/eligibility staff are responsible for assessing clients' employability, determining whether they are work mandatory or not, and referring clients to work activities or employment service providers, one of which is the WtW program. In both of the study programs in this category, the HRDF program in West Virginia and the Chicago program, there are some work-related services provided directly by the TANF agency (usually as part of the agency's TANF work program), but TANF line staff (eligibility or case workers) have discretion regarding where clients, especially those subject to work participation, will be referred.

In sites where the TANF work program and WtW are partially integrated, the WtW program has influence over or discretion regarding at least some TANF recipients. WtW programs in this category are operated by agencies that also operate part of the local TANF work program. The WtW agency has TANF work program goals as well as WtW grant program goals, and some discretion over whether and when at least some TANF clients enroll in WtW or in the TANF work program, although there are other TANF service providers as well.

The responsibility for the TANF work program is somewhat complex operationally in the two study sites in this category, Boston and Nashville. In Nashville, the WtW grant agency is also the lead agency in one of four separate agency consortia that operate the TANF work program. Similarly, in Boston, the WtW grant agency is also a lead agency in one of three agency consortia that operate the One-Stop Centers, which in turn are the service providers for most TANF work program components.

Staff in the TANF agencies in this category have discretion in deciding to which TANF work program providers some clients are referred, but TANF staff have less autonomy than staff in

sites categorized as having “TANF Worker Discretion.” In Boston, for example, TANF staff refer work-mandatory clients to one of the three Career Centers for assessment and job search services, but individuals can enroll in other programs to fulfill their work requirements instead. In Nashville, TANF staff refer mandatory clients to providers and attempt to have an equitable distribution of participants in each program, but client requests for a particular program are granted.

In sites where WtW and the TANF work program are fully integrated, the WtW grant program agency is also the sole TANF work program agency. In Fort Worth and in Decatur County, Indiana, the WtW grantee is the TANF work program service contractor and the two programs are totally integrated (both grantees are workforce development agencies). The administrative agency and staff have discretion over whether a TANF client might be enrolled into WtW or co-enrolled into both programs, but their contract with the TANF agency specifies that work-mandatory recipients will be enrolled into the TANF work program.

There is little evidence that the TANF referral procedures *per se* are the main cause of low enrollments. WtW staff in all sites expressed frustration about enrollment difficulties, which they perceive as primarily due to the eligibility criteria included in the federal legislation. However, there is a strong sense among WtW staff that their low enrollments have also been due to slow referrals from TANF or restrictions on which TANF clients the TANF agency will consider for referral to WtW. Based on discussions with TANF case workers, though, there is no evidence that individuals are being consciously diverted by TANF staff from WtW or any other programs. TANF staff in many sites report that the number of cases they are having to actively work with is high, especially given that many clients have multiple problems. It is more likely that the

combination of factors discussed in the prior section together contribute to the enrollment problems.

Some sites where the same agency administers both a WtW-funded program and the TANF work program have had rather serious enrollment problems, while others have not.

4. Strategies to increase enrollment and participation are being implemented.

All of the study programs, regardless of whether they are closely integrated with the TANF and TANF work programs, have grappled with the enrollment issues discussed above. A few of the study sites experienced relatively little difficulty in enrolling eligible participants; in the others, enrollments had begun to increase by early 2000. In most of the programs, aggressive strategies to market and recruit individuals seem to hold promise or have already helped increase enrollment. While in some places a new or modified strategy is targeted at one or more of the discrete challenges delineated above, for the most part strategies were adopted as responses to the generic problem of low or slow enrollment and participation. Based on the field work in the study sites, four general types of strategies are being used to increase enrollment: direct and proactive marketing, tightening the timing and sequencing of the client flow process, providing financial incentives to service providers for recruitment, and expanding the pool of eligible populations on which to target.³

Grantees are increasingly using direct and proactive marketing strategies, rather than passively waiting for referrals. Staff in some of the study programs expressed frustration because they felt that they had to passively await the arrival of clients or lists of clients from the TANF or child support enforcement agency. In response, a number of the programs adopted

³ This section is based on the program brief “Welfare-to-Work Grant Programs Tackle Recruitment Challenges,” by Lynne Fender, Alan Hershey, and Demetra Smith Nightingale (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc, 2000), which covers this topic in more detail.

proactive marketing and outreach strategies to directly recruit participants and improve information about the program. In at least three of the study sites, marketing strategies were part of the program plan from the beginning. The approaches and experiences provide insight into the variety of approaches being used, including:

- ***Marketing more directly to staff in relevant community organizations and institutions.*** Some programs provide detailed information to TANF staff as well as health care providers, churches, homeless shelters, and neighborhood centers.
- ***Targeting outreach to potential participants in specific geographic areas or neighborhoods.*** Many of the service providers in the study programs do extensive canvassing in designated areas, mailing brochures and information sheets to TANF households or to all residents in certain neighborhoods or housing projects.
- ***Sponsoring public service announcements, media messages, and mass-marketing campaigns.*** Some of the programs sponsor regular television advertisements aired during popular programs, in addition to public service announcements on radio and television.
- ***Assessing and refining marketing approaches through research.*** Several of the programs have sponsored professional marketing surveys, focus groups, and participant surveys to gain a better understanding of the motivations of the client population and their employment and service needs.
- ***Locating program staff in local TANF agency offices.*** Most of the programs have staff located for several hours a week at TANF offices, during which time they actively encourage clients to enroll, lead job search workshops, and make presentations about their program offerings.
- ***Designating dedicated outreach staff.*** Some programs (e.g., Boston, Phoenix) have decided that their outreach success can be improved if they designate specialized staff to focus on recruiting specific client groups or in certain neighborhoods or agencies.

Activities and components are being more closely and tightly scheduled or sequenced to reduce the number of no-shows and improve retention in a program. Staff in some of the study sites determined that part of their enrollment problem was related to the fact that many people fail to show up at various stages of the program. Even programs that have generally adequate participation levels reported difficulties with attrition. For example, staff at HRDF in

West Virginia found that between one-third and one-half of the individuals referred by the TANF agency to the program did not show up for the first day of the four-week orientation/job readiness workshop. Similar drop-off rates are not uncommon in welfare employment programs in general. In fact, in some states that follow a strict Work-First TANF philosophy, scheduling may consciously be set to allow time for individuals to seek and gain employment on their own without entering a program component. In WtW, though, where the intent is to actively engage eligible individuals in intensive employment-related services, often in conjunction with a job, it is generally considered important to reach the target group, enroll them, and retain them in programs that have the potential to improve their long-term employment skills.

In the study programs, a number of approaches have been taken to streamline the client flow system and reduce no-shows and attrition. For example, some programs (e.g., Yakima, Fort Worth) attempt to prescreen TANF clients who are eligible for WtW services even if they cannot immediately participate. If they complete job search under the TANF work program and still do not have a job, they can then immediately begin WtW-funded activities. By predetermining eligibility, there is less risk that individuals will lose interest in participating while waiting for this administrative step to be completed.

Special financial provisions or incentives are being included in, or added to, service provider contracts to promote referrals. Many WtW grant programs are decentralized; the agency contracts with other organizations or agencies to deliver services or operate a special program. Such grantees have considerable discretion concerning the types of contractual arrangements they make with service providers. Some agencies have specifically incorporated provisions into these service delivery subcontracts that reward providers for outreach and/or enrollment functions. A few programs included such provisions from the beginning. In Boston,

for instance, a large part of the Career Centers' WtW performance contract (and payment) is based on the number of assessments completed and the number of individuals referred and subsequently enrolled into the WtW-funded employer partner programs. Grantees in other study sites have modified contracts to recognize the fact that their providers were having to do more outreach and recruitment than had been anticipated in the original contracts.

The potential pool of WtW eligibles can be expanded within legislative parameters.

Some programs originally intended to emphasize particular subgroups of the population eligible for WtW services (e.g., non-English speaking, persons residing in certain neighborhoods or areas, TANF recipients subject to work requirements). As programs gained more experience and understanding about the target groups and more precise information about the number of persons who might enroll, some expanded their target groups to a broader part of the eligible pool in order to increase enrollments. For example, in Phoenix, the program expanded its geographic service area to include neighborhoods bordering the enterprise zone rather than limiting participation to those residing within the specific boundary of the zone. The Milwaukee NOW program for noncustodial fathers also broadened its potential pool of parolees and probationers to include men who may have had some history of violent behavior if they were not currently a risk to the mother or children, rather than excluding all who had such histories.

B. TARGETING

As intended by the legislation, the study programs are targeting a diverse hard-to-employ population with multiple problems. There is variation, though, across the programs in the characteristics of the target groups being served at the time of the site visits, mainly because programs emphasize certain subgroups or locate services in certain neighborhoods (Table II.3).

TABLE II.3

PARTICIPANT TARGET GROUPS, BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	Study Program	Formal Programs for Non-Custodial Parents	Focuses on Other Specific WtW-eligible Target Groups	Serves All WtW Eligibles, but Some <i>de facto</i> Emphasis on Special Groups	Serves all WtW Eligibles, No Special Targeting
Boston, Massachusetts	Employer-Sponsored Programs				X
Chicago, Illinois	Welfare-to-Work Program		X (many programs, some target: disabled; Hispanic)	X (because of expertise of service providers)	X
Fort Worth, Texas	Welfare-to-Work Program			X (several programs for special groups: homeless; disabled; substance abusers)	
Indiana (19 county area)	Welfare-to-Work Program	X (planning)		X (rural residents)	X
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Nontraditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program	X (exclusively)			
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Works/ Pathways Program				X
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Transitional Work Corporation, Phil@Work Program				X
Phoenix, Arizona	Employment and Respect Now (EARN) Alliance Program		X (EC residents)	X (Hispanic)	
West Virginia (29 county area)	Comprehensive Employment Program	X		X (rural residents)	X
Yakima, Washington	Welfare-to-Work Program	X		X (tribal members and migrant farmworkers)	
Baltimore County, Maryland St. Lucie County, Florida Long Beach, California	SCANS2000 Career Transcript System (CTS)		X (employed TANF recipients)		

Most programs are serving the general pool of WtW eligibles, addressing the broad range of employment barriers faced by this population. Of the eleven study sites, only the NOW program in Milwaukee, which exclusively serves noncustodial fathers on parole or probation, serves just one special group. The study programs in the other ten sites serve all WtW eligibles who enter their programs, but in many of the sites, the actual participants nonetheless represent particular populations, generally because of the location of the offices or the experience of the service delivery contractor. Targeting subpopulations may be deliberate (e.g., part of the program's stated goals and design) or *de facto* (e.g., as a consequence of the program's location, choice of service providers, etc.).

The subpopulation most often targeted for special focus consists of noncustodial parents (mainly fathers). In addition to Milwaukee, programs in three other study sites were targeting some activities or some programs to noncustodial parents, or were planning to do so in the coming months (Yakima, West Virginia, and Indiana). In addition, noncustodial parents are among the individuals being served through programs targeting on particular groups or in particular areas, including residents of homeless shelters, residents in enterprise communities, substance abusers, the disabled, and monolingual Hispanics.

III. PROGRAM SERVICES

The most common services in WtW grant-funded programs are pre-employment assessment and job preparation, job placement, and pre- and post-employment counseling. A variety of programs are being implemented in the 11 study sites, and each provides a range of services. All the study programs offer supportive social services, such as child care and transportation assistance and personal counseling. Many of the programs also provide subsidized employment including not only basic short-term work experience assignments, but work-based internships and transitional or supportive employment as well. The programs also generally offer post-employment services to improve job retention, and a few have developed more intensive post-employment activities, such as long-term (one year or longer) counseling, coaching, job placement support, education, training, and skills development.

A. PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT

An important objective of the WtW grants program is to prepare individuals with serious employment barriers to move successfully from the welfare rolls to the labor market. Some TANF recipients can make this transition to work with minimal assistance, as attested to by the nationwide caseload declines; others need assistance before they are able to work. The main target population of the WtW programs consists of those TANF recipients with relatively severe barriers to work, many of whom presumably will need assistance and services before they will be ready to work.

All the WtW grant-funded programs in the study sites conduct some type of assessment of participants to determine WtW eligibility, identify what services are needed, and explore employment potential. The intensity of the assessments varies, although all programs conduct

some testing of basic skills. Some programs screen participants to identify personal or family problems.

Given the original WtW eligibility criteria, it is not surprising that all the study programs administer some type of basic skills test to determine reading and mathematics ability level. In most of the sites, a formal procedure is followed for testing basic skills, screening for serious problems (mainly domestic violence), identifying service needs (especially child care and transportation), and identifying occupational interests. Testing is often accompanied by other employment-related assessments, such as an occupational interest inventory, or work-readiness assessment instruments. Then a more individualized counseling and interview approach is used to develop an employment or self-sufficiency plan. In addition, most programs have instituted ongoing assessments of individuals' progress as part of routine case management, and some programs screen for the presence of more serious problems, such as substance abuse or mental health issues, that might require intensive or specialized professional intervention.

1. Testing basic reading and math skills is the most common type of assessment in the study programs.

In all the study sites, formal testing is done by either staff in the TANF agency or staff in the WtW program or its contractors. The most common instrument is the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), used in at least seven study sites. Other tests include the Job Corps Math and Reading Test, the Wide Ranging Abilities Test (WRAT), and the Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE). In a few programs, testing is done at multiple points: up front to determine eligibility for WtW, then again once an individual begins a specific program.

2. Many of the WtW programs that use an intensive case-management approach include individualized assessments of service needs, employability development goals, and progress.

Assessing employability and service needs can be done in a number of ways. Caseworkers can conduct individual interviews with clients or administer formal questionnaires or competency measurement tools. Employment counselors can assess clients as part of personal coaching. All the study programs adopt forms of what is often referred to as case management. Staff, often called counselors or representatives, are assigned a certain number of participants for whom they are responsible. In all the study site programs, the individual one-on-one interaction between the participant and the staff person is the main method for assessing needs and employability. The “case manager” model generally involves informal assessment, and the staff person provides or adjusts services or makes external referrals as needed.

Two of the study programs in particular represent more intensive approaches to assessment and progress monitoring. The Johns Hopkins University (JHU) multi-site grant is being used to implement the Career Transcript System (CTS), built upon the core concepts of the Secretary’s Competencies and Necessary Skills (SCANS) model that has been developed over the past two decades through collaboration among industry groups, educators, and program administrators under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Labor. The basic foundation of the CTS is that employers help identify a core set of skills that are required of the specific individual being hired into an entry-level position (e.g., reading, listening, problem solving). The CTS staff, at community colleges affiliated with JHU through the multi-site grant, work with the employer to clearly define the competencies associated with each key skill. Then CTS assessment modules are used to measure the worker’s skill levels, and eventual progress towards achieving the defined skills. Skills are developed primarily on the job, using work-based learning and

experience. The competencies are measured with assessment instruments that clients complete, including some questions they respond to as they watch short video scenes that pose workplace skill issues. Measures of skill progress are entered into a computerized database, and workers receive certifications of achievement they can use in developing plans for future career paths and as “portable credentials” in searching for a new job.

The Pathways program model being implemented in Nashville with a formula WtW grant represents a very different approach, but still involves close monitoring of progress towards ultimate goals of economic self-sufficiency. Built upon a model developed under Project Match in Chicago, the Nashville program encourages participants to take a variety of “small steps” towards employment, with close coaching and support, regular monthly peer support groups, and individualized self-assessment as well as ongoing reassessment of progress. The steps can include achieving personal or family goals, community activities, soft skills (attitude, motivation, self-esteem), basic education, and ultimately skills development and employment. Once an individual becomes employed, the counselor prepares an annual status report based on periodic and continuous contact and intervention as needed. In Chicago, the WtW-funded program operated by Catholic Charities incorporates dimensions of the Pathways model for participants with serious employment barriers and substance abuse problems.

3. Both WtW and TANF staff report that they are increasingly aware of, and alert to, substance abuse, mental health problems, and domestic violence.

Staff in TANF agencies and WtW programs in the study sites report that, compared with the past, they are more aware of the possibility that clients might have serious personal problems, such as domestic violence, mental health concerns, or substance abuse. Some of this awareness reflects the changing characteristics of the caseload. As the TANF caseload has declined, a

higher proportion of the remaining cases have such problems. Some staff also attribute the increased focus on families with problems to federal policies, such as those that allow domestic violence victims special exemptions from TANF work requirements. In at least seven of the study sites, WtW or TANF staff report that they informally screen for substance abuse and mental health, generally by asking clients whether they have a problem with drugs or alcohol. According to administrators in both agencies, this was at first intended in part to help identify individuals who met the original WtW eligibility criteria.

In several of the sites, special experts on domestic violence issues are located in the TANF office, and TANF eligibility staff and caseworkers can refer clients to them. In some states, such as Massachusetts and Illinois, computerized intake systems include special screens for identifying mental health, domestic violence, substance abuse, or other special needs. In addition, many of the TANF-Work and WtW programs include discussions of domestic violence and child abuse issues as part of their orientation sessions or job search workshops.

A few of the programs provide for more intensive professional assessment of individuals who may have mental health or substance abuse problems, mainly to help identify treatment options. Goodwill programs funded under WtW grants in Fort Worth and Boston, for example, have strong vocational rehabilitation services and offer psychological or behavioral testing available on site. Several of the many programs funded by the WtW grant in Chicago also use various behavioral and diagnostic screening tools to help develop individualized plans for clients that include employment preparation as well as treatment and counseling.

B. SUPPORTIVE SOCIAL SERVICES

While TANF block grant funds can certainly be used for all major social services, it is the general sense of local staff that WtW funds can be used more easily, quickly, and flexibly.

TANF policies and regulations are set at the state level, and exceptions typically require state approval; local WtW grantees can make decisions about how to use grant funds within federal guidelines.

Easy access to a broad range of supportive services is an important feature that in many localities distinguishes WtW grant programs from TANF programs. Administrators and staff in both TANF agencies and WtW programs indicate that the TANF agencies have more funds than has historically been available for supportive services such as child care and transportation assistance. These are considered critical for welfare to work programs, but staff note that a wider range of supportive services is needed by many clients. Staff in both WtW and TANF report that a broad range of services can also be funded under WtW than under TANF, and that WtW funds are considered to be more flexible in that they can be accessed by local staff more quickly to meet special participant situations.

WtW programs tend to use TANF funds first for supportive social services whenever possible. When a participant requires a service for which TANF funds cannot be used or cannot be accessed quickly, then WtW funds are used. WtW staff often describe the supportive services they provide as “filling gaps,” or going over and above what is allowed under TANF. States can use their TANF block grant funds for any social services, and many states have expanded their services, particularly child care and transportation assistance. However, TANF and WtW staff in the study sites explained that it is often easier to use WtW funds for some services because decisions about exceptions can be made at the local level, whereas TANF policies are generally set at the state level. For example, WtW funds in many sites are used to pay for after-hour child care, van and livery pick-up services, non-medical rehabilitation, and work or school supplies.

TANF funds could be used for these services and are used as well, but according to local staff, WtW funds sometimes can be accessed more quickly than is possible through the TANF agency. In cases that have special or immediate service needs, for instance, local WtW program staff can authorize payments directly, whereas if the services were to be arranged through TANF it might take several days or weeks to process the paperwork necessary to authorize payment. Two examples local staff offered were special transportation (e.g., cab or van service for nighttime employment) or work-related expenses (e.g., certification or license fees, books, uniforms). Again, this is not meant to imply that TANF funds cannot be used for the same services, just that in several WtW programs, staff report that is often easier and faster for them to use WtW funds for some supportive services, since they can authorize the spending directly.

In addition, while most states provide TANF-funded transitional child care and transportation for one or possibly two years after leaving TANF, WtW supportive funds are being tapped to extend the time period in some programs, both while an individual is actively involved in a program, as well as for one or more years post-employment. Consistent with the federal WtW legislation, there is no termination date for WtW-funded services in most of the study sites; services, staff counseling and follow-up assistance can be provided as long as the participant desires it or can stay in contact, at least until the period for using federal WtW grant funds expires.

C. EMPLOYMENT AND WORK ACTIVITIES

WtW-funded programs are implementing a range of employment and work models, including workplace-based and post-employment activities. Consistent with the work orientation of TANF and the initial prohibition against stand-alone training and education under the WtW legislation,

the WtW programs in the study sites are primarily work focused. The programs in the study sites provide a broad range of activities including:

- **Pre-employment preparation**, such as job readiness classes or workshops, that includes job development and placement assistance and often integrates occupation preparation or basic computer instruction with soft-skills instruction;
- **Work experience and/or community service jobs**, or internships, usually paid hourly wages (generally minimum wage);
- **Subsidized employment** with subsidies to employers, as in traditional on-the-job training programs, as well as arrangements that allow a tryout period, and programs that provide participants with ongoing intensive services, counseling, and support;
- **Wage supplements or bonuses** paid directly to workers; and
- **Post-employment** components, including follow-up and job retention services, and, in several programs, employment or basic skills development

The types of employment services provided in the study programs are summarized in Table III.1. All programs provide basic job readiness skills instruction, usually through workshops or classes, but in a few non-metropolitan sites this is handled through individual job counseling. All programs also provide general job development and placement assistance, and all involve some type of services or support to improve job retention.

Some of the study programs are implementing special employment or development components. For example:

- The Johns Hopkins University CTS system includes an ongoing work-based skills competency development and assessment package.
- The Nashville Pathways Program is adapting Project Match's intensive approach to achieving a series of individual goals towards the ultimate end of employment and self-sufficiency.
- Seven of the sites include among their main activities paid work experience or community service jobs, with the pay generally set at the minimum wage.
- The HRDF program in West Virginia provides wage supplements to individuals.

TABLE III.1
EMPLOYMENT-RELATED SERVICES PROVIDED, BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	Study Program	Main Employment Services Provided at the Time of Site Visit
Boston, Massachusetts	Employer-Sponsored Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job readiness classes (general and occupational) • Paid work experience/internships • Guaranteed job with employer partner • Post-employment retention and personal support, and some skills development
Chicago, Illinois	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job readiness classes • Job development/placement • Paid work experience (some “tryout”) • Some supportive/ “pathways” services and coaching • Post-employment retention, some personal support, some skills development
Fort Worth, Texas	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job readiness workshops • Job development/placement • Post-employment retention support
Indiana (19 county area)	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual employment services and counseling • Job development/placement • Subsidized employment • Paid work experience (“tryout” employment) • Post-employment retention support
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Nontraditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual employment services and counseling • Job development/placement • Post-employment retention support
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Works/ Pathways Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensive supportive work preparation (coaching, job readiness, peer support) • Paid and unpaid work experience • Post-employment retention and personal support
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Transitional Work Corporation, Phil@Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job readiness classes • Paid work experience (transitional employment), integrated with education/training/life skills • Post-employment retention and personal support
Phoenix, Arizona	Employment and Respect Now (EARN) Alliance Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job readiness classes • Job development/placement • Post-employment retention support, some basic skills development
West Virginia (29 county area)	Comprehensive Employment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job readiness classes • Job development/placement • Paid work experience • Wage supplements • Post-employment retention support
Yakima, Washington	Welfare-to-Work Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual employment services and counseling • Paid work experience • Job development/placement • Post-employment retention support
Baltimore Cty, Maryland St. Lucie Cty, Florida Long Beach, California	SCANS2000 Career Transcript System (CTS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-employment work-based skills competencies and employability development

- The Boston and Phoenix programs emphasize developing and maintaining partnerships with specific employers or industries that guide the pre-employment preparation components, sponsor work-based internships, and agree to hire individual participants as regular employees.
- Post-employment skills training for career development is provided in the JHU-CTS programs, the Phoenix program, some of the Boston employer partner programs, and some of the Chicago programs.
- Intensive, individualized, and ongoing counseling, services, and peer support, before and after entry to employment, are important aspects of the Nashville Pathways program and the Philadelphia TWC.

At the time of the site visits, the programs were still refining these employment service strategies, many of which focus on sustaining employment, work-based employer partnerships, and intensive individualized support to participants both before and after starting a job.

IV. PROGRAM STRUCTURE

The administrative structure of the WtW grants program is complex at both the national and at the state and local levels. Congress placed administrative responsibility for the WtW grants program at the national level with DOL, in recognition of the employment emphasis of the initiative. A two-pronged method was used to allocate the funds to the field: each state was eligible for a certain amount of funds based on a legislatively defined formula, and organizations and agencies could apply to DOL for direct, competitively awarded grants. States were required to pass on 85 percent of their formula grant funds to local WIBs (formerly PICs), and most WIBs, like most competitive grantees, contract with other agencies for service provision. There is an expectation in the legislation and in DOL's policy guidance that WtW programs are to complement TANF programs to achieve state welfare reform objectives, but TANF agencies *per se* have no formal responsibility for WtW.

The organizational and administrative system within which the WtW grant programs are operating is thus complex and decentralized. The eleven study sites consist of multiple program models often operated in multiple locations by multiple service providers. The grantees visited include workforce investment boards (WIBs), nonprofit organizations, and a university policy center. The diversity of administrative and program structures is a defining feature of the WtW grants program at the local level, but there is no evidence that one particular administrative structure or program model is necessarily preferable to another in terms of ease of implementation.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The WtW grants program itself represents a hybrid funding and programmatic mechanism at the national level (administered by DOL, with much of the population being in the HHS TANF caseload). At the local level—the focus of the evaluation—the structure becomes quite complex. Since a main research focus of the process analysis is to consider the way WtW complements and interacts with both TANF and JTPA/WIA, it is important to understand the basic organizational structure through which the WtW grant-funded programs are administered.

1. Most WtW administrative agencies in the study sites are WIBs, and most have a formal role in a TANF work program.

Similar to grantees nationally, most of the study grantees are workforce investment boards (WIBs), which are responsible for programs authorized under the Workforce Investment Act (which replaced the Job Training Partnership Act-JTPA). This does not necessarily mean, though, that the WtW programs or grantees are separate from the TANF system. Most of the grantee agencies in the study sites—those that are WIBs as well as those that are not—also have some substantial role in the TANF work program, generally either administering the entire TANF work program or as a major service delivery contractor to the TANF agency.

Grantee Agency Types. Nationwide, WIBs are the most common local administrative entity for WtW grants because, according to the legislation, they receive most of the state's formula grant funding and also because many apply for competitive grants. However, there are other types of grantee agencies as well, including nonprofit organizations, other public agencies, educational institutions, national associations, and consortia of organizations.

In most (eight) of the study sites, the WtW grant(s) or subgrants from the state are administered through the same agency that administers WIA (and formerly JTPA), some of

TABLE IV.1

TYPE OF ORGANIZATION ADMINISTERING THE WtW GRANT, BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	Host/Grantee Agency	Type of Organization			
		SDA/ PIC/WIB	Non- Profit	Public Agency	Educational Institution
Boston, Massachusetts	Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC)	X		X	
Chicago, Illinois	Mayor's Office of Workforce Development	X		X	
Indiana (19 county area)	River Valley Resources, Inc.	X	X		
Fort Worth, Texas	Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)	X	X		
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections for Region 3 (Milwaukee County)			X	
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Career Advancement Center	X	X		
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation, Greater Philadelphia Works Program, Phil@Work	X	X	X	
Phoenix, Arizona	City of Phoenix Human Services Department, Employment and Training Division	X		X	
West Virginia (29 county area)	Human Resources Development Foundation		X		
Yakima, Washington	Tri-Valley Private Industry Council	X	X		
Baltimore County, Maryland; St. Lucie County, Florida; Long Beach, California	Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000				X

which are nonprofit corporations (e.g., RVR in Indiana and Tarrant County Workforce Development Board) (Table IV.1). Others are agencies of the government (Boston Office of

Jobs and Community Service, Chicago Mayor's Office of Workforce Development). One is another type of public agency (Wisconsin Department of Correction), one is a nonprofit organization (HRDF in West Virginia), and the final grantee is a policy center at a university (JHU-SCANS2000).

Organizational Role of WtW Grantee Agencies in TANF. Even though most of the eleven grantee organizations are workforce investment boards, they nonetheless have fairly established organizational roles in TANF, especially the TANF work programs (and formerly the AFDC-JOBS program), as already noted in the previous chapters. In most of the sites, the WtW grantee agency has some formal responsibility for the TANF work program (Table IV.2):

- In Indiana, Boston, Nashville, and Philadelphia, the WtW grantee is the WIB administrative agency and also is a major provider of services under the TANF work program, under contract from the TANF agency.
- In Ft. Worth and Phoenix, the TANF agency is under the authority of the same state department as workforce development programs, and as such the two are integrally linked.
- In Philadelphia, the Mayor's workforce development agency administers the WEIB and the WtW grant and is also a partner in the interagency "one-stop" office where the main TANF work program services are delivered (although the WtW grant program services are located elsewhere).

Even in the sites where the grantee agency has no formal TANF role, there are interagency arrangements between the two agencies specifically for WtW, and the WtW grantee often has other indirect links to TANF. In Yakima and Chicago, for example, while the WIB/WtW grantees have no formal contract from TANF, mainly because they do not provide direct

TABLE IV.2

ROLE OF WtW GRANTEE AGENCY IN TANF PROGRAM, BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	WtW Grantee Agency	WtW Grantee Agency (as WIB) also Administers the TANF Work Program	WtW Grantee Agency is also a TANF Work Program Service Contractor	WtW Grantee Agency has no Formal TANF Responsibility, but Interagency Agreements for WtW and Indirect Links Exist
Boston, Massachusetts	Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC)		X	
Chicago, Illinois	Mayor's Office of Workforce Development			X
Fort Worth, Texas	Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)	X		
Indiana (19 county area)	River Valley Resources, Inc.	X (some counties)		X (some counties)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections for Region 3			X
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Career Advancement Center		X	
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation and Transitional Work Corp., Phil@Work Program		X (PWDC)	X (TWC)
Phoenix, Arizona	City of Phoenix Human Services Department, Employment and Training Division	X		
West Virginia (29 county area)	Human Resources Development Foundation		X	
Yakima, Washington	Tri-Valley Private Industry Council			X
Baltimore County MD, St. Lucie County FL, Long Beach, CA	Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000; with Community College of Baltimore County (MD), Indian River Community College (FL); Long Beach Community College (CA)	X (FL)	X	

services, many of the service providers in the community have contracts from both the WIB and TANF, meaning that some programs blend funds from TANF, WtW, and the WIB.

In two of the study programs that operate in multiple jurisdictions (JHU and the RVR in Indiana), in some localities the grantee agency has a formal role with TANF. In the RVR programs in Indiana, which operate in multiple jurisdictions, there are formal links to TANF in some localities where RVR administers the TANF work program. The community college partner of JHU's in Florida is the operator of the One-Stop Center, which includes the TANF work program, and the community colleges in Baltimore County and Long Beach have separate contracts from the TANF agency and the WIB to serve welfare recipients.

Similarly, in Milwaukee DOC and West Virginia HRDF, while there is no formal role for the WtW grantee agency in TANF, both have formal interagency arrangements for WtW and interact operationally with TANF. HRDF had previously been a JOBS contractor in large parts of West Virginia, and even though it is not currently a TANF work program contractor, staff from the two agencies maintain close working relationships. In Milwaukee, the DOC grant-funded program contracts with the Wisconsin Works (W-2) agencies, the primary organization in the state's welfare, or W-2 program.

B. SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE

The WtW program service delivery structure in the study sites is very decentralized, with most grantees contracting with multiple service providers. Nonprofit organizations are the primary service delivery entity, but others are also involved, including employers, who participate in designing programs as well as hiring participants.

1. The WtW grantees in the study sites rely heavily on subcontracts with other agencies, particularly nonprofit, community-based organizations, to provide WtW services and/or operate distinct programs.

With the exception of rural programs, WtW grantees tend to use the WtW grants to contract with other agencies and organizations to provide direct services (Table IV.3). Nine of the eleven study grantees use contract service providers to deliver WtW services. This includes the JHU-CTS program, which contracts with six community colleges around the nation, three of which are included in the evaluation. Two of the nine grantees in this study (Philadelphia and Milwaukee) use a combination of in-house services and services provided by contractors. The grantees for the two rural study sites (RVR-Indiana and HRDF-West Virginia) provide services directly in their WtW-funded programs.

Among the WIBs that are grantees, the use of contractors depends generally on whether the WIB has historically delivered JTPA-funded services directly or subcontracted out for most services. For example, the Tarrant County Workforce Development Board in Fort Worth, the Boston JCS, and the Chicago Office of Workforce Development contract out all services, although they are all now in the process of implementing the new WIA requirement to emphasize vouchers (Individual Training Accounts) rather than contractors. Those WIBs, not surprisingly, chose to use their WtW grants to fund services and programs through contractors.

Community-based organizations (CBOs) are an integral part of the WtW service delivery structure. One of the more significant features of the WtW grant programs in many of the study sites is the extensive role of nonprofit, community-based organizations in delivering services. In Chicago, the grantee agency has twenty service provider contractors, all but two of which are nonprofit organizations. In Nashville and Boston, each grantee agency contracts with

TABLE IV.3

WtW GRANTEE'S STRUCTURE FOR PROVIDING SERVICES, BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	WtW Grantee Agency	In-house Staff Deliver All WtW Services Directly	Contracts Out All WtW Service Delivery	Uses a Mix of In-house WtW Services and Contracts
Boston, Massachusetts	Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC)		X	
Chicago, Illinois	Mayor's Office of Workforce Development		X	
Fort Worth, Texas	Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)		X	
Indiana (19 county area)	River Valley Resources, Inc.	X		
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections for Region 3			X
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Career Advancement Center		X	
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation and Transitional Work Corporation, Phil@Work Program	X (TWC)		X (PWDC)
Phoenix, Arizona	City of Phoenix Human Services Department, Employment and Training Division		X	
West Virginia (29 county area)	Human Resources Development Foundation	X		
Yakima, Washington	Tri-Valley Private Industry Council		X	
Baltimore County, Maryland St. Lucie County, Florida Long Beach, California	Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000; with Community College of Baltimore County (MD), Indian River Community College (FL); Long Beach Community College (CA)	X (Community College Partners)	X (JHU)	

about a dozen community-based organizations to implement a general service program model developed with the WtW grant; in Boston, each community organization partners with specific employers to provide services to participants. In Milwaukee, four of the five W-2 contractors, key WtW providers, are nonprofit organizations: Goodwill Industries (also referred to as Employment Solutions of Milwaukee), United Migrant Opportunity Services, Inc., the YWCA, and the Opportunities Industrialization Corporation (OIC).

In addition to nonprofit agencies operating as service providers under subcontract to the grantee agency, several of the grantee agencies in the eleven study sites are themselves nonprofit organizations. The Nashville Career Advancement Center and RVR in Indiana are the administrative entity for the WIB in local areas as well as being the WtW grantee, and HRDF is a major nonprofit service provider in rural West Virginia. Table IV.4 lists the major nonprofit organizations involved in significant aspects of the WtW service delivery in the study sites, and all major contractors for each study site are noted in Appendix A.

Employers are a key partner in many of the WtW programs in the study sites. Employer partnerships are the centerpiece of some of the programs in the study sites. Their involvement includes participating as a key partner in program design and service delivery as well as eventually becoming an employer of WtW participants. In some sites, employers are the key partners in the service delivery structure, and not just recipients of the product of WtW programs. For example, in Boston, employers have partnered with nonprofit organizations to design and staff pre-employment preparation components. In Phoenix, a local Marriott Hotel provides training to WtW participants.

TABLE IV.4

MAJOR COMMUNITY-BASED NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN WtW SERVICE DELIVERY,
BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	WtW Grantee Agency	Major Nonprofit Organizations Involved
Boston, Massachusetts	Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC)	Jewish Vocational Services, Jamaica Plains Neighborhood Development Corp., Fenway CDC, St. Mary's and Infant Ctr., Caritas Christi, Crittenton Hastings House, Life Focus Center, YMCA, Jobs for Youth, Urban League of Eastern Mass., Morgan Memorial Goodwill Industries, Greater Boston Food Bank, Action for Boston Community Development Two of three One Stop Career Centers operated by CBOs (Jewish Vocational Services with JCS, Dimock Community Health Center with Morgan Memorial Goodwill, and the Women's Educational and Industrial Union)
Chicago, Illinois	Mayor's Office of Workforce Development	Catholic Charities, Easter Seals
Fort Worth, Texas	Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (Work Advantage)	The Women's Center of Tarrant County, Arlington Night Shelter, Goodwill Industries of Fort Worth, Women's Second Chance, Volunteers of America, Camp Fire
Indiana (19 county area)	River Valley Resources, Inc.	RVR
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Wisconsin Dept. of Corrections, Div. Of Community Corrections for Region 3	Goodwill Industries, United Migrant Service Organization, YWWorks, OIC-GM (all W-2 agencies)
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Career Advancement Center	Catholic Charities, the Martha O'Bryan Center, the Nashville Urban League, Nashville READ, the PENCIL Foundation (Public Education Nashville Citizens Involved in Leadership), YWCA, OIC, Bethlehem Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Workforce Development Corp. and Transitional Work Corp.	TWC
Phoenix, Arizona	City of Phoenix Human Services Dept., Employment and Training Div.	Phoenix Enterprise Community (EC), Chicanos Por La Causa
West Virginia (29 county area)	Human Resources Development Foundation	HRDF
Yakima, Washington	Tri-Valley Private Industry Council	People-for-People, Yakima Valley OIC, Northwest Community Action Center, Yakima Valley Family Workers Clinic
Baltimore County MD, St. Lucie County FL, Long Beach, CA	Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000; with CC of Baltimore County (MD), Indian River CC (FL); Long Beach CC (CA)	Community colleges

2. The WtW program system is highly decentralized, with multiple programs and multiple service locations.

Regardless of whether services are delivered by a contractor or the grantee itself, WtW service delivery is highly decentralized, with each grantee supporting program services at multiple locations and most involving multiple entities. Many grantees planned a strategy of contracting with community organizations and allowed those organizations to propose the kind of programs they would operate. This is the main approach used in Chicago and Fort Worth, where the grantee agency funds distinct programs operated by service providers selected through a competitive bidding process.

In other sites, the grantee's plan called for contracting with various service providers that were to implement a fairly similar program model developed by the grantee agency. In some of these places, such as Boston, it was understood that there would still be some discretion at the contractor level. Not surprisingly, some programmatic variants exist across contractors, reflecting the service provider's expertise, characteristics of the participant groups and the hiring and business practices of the employer partner.

Decentralization also results from grantees and service providers subcontracting for special services. These services may include testing or intensive assessment, referral and information systems, or tax and financial assistance. In Chicago, for example, there are special "supporting role" contractors that provide services that can be drawn upon by participants from any of the WtW grant-funded programs. The Center for Law and Human Services provides tax counseling and instruction on taxes, especially the Earned Income Tax Credit, and the Shore Bank, a community development bank, administers Individual Development Accounts for WtW

participants.¹ Among the eleven study sites, only in some of the most rural West Virginia locations is there no formal partnership or subcontract with another organization or company to provide some services.

Thus, both by design and because of the need for special services for some individuals, there are considerably more than just eleven distinct programs in the eleven study sites, and many types of services and providers. WtW grant funds are being used to operate a broad mix of programs, and there are as many as 30 very distinct programs operating (Table IV.5).

¹ WtW funds are used to match participants' own deposits to an IDA (\$2 for every \$1 deposited). IDAs can be used for a down payment for a home, education, or starting a small business.

TABLE IV.5

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OPERATING UNDER THE WtW GRANT, BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	WtW Grantee Agency	Program Models Operating
Boston, Massachusetts	Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corporation (EDIC)	<u>2 Program Models, 11 variants and 2 variants</u> 1) Employment Partnership Programs (11 variants): 11 employer/ CBO programs, each a variant of the general model 2) Enhanced Work Experience Programs (2 variants): 2 CBO programs, each a variant of the general model
Chicago, Illinois	Mayor's Office of Workforce Development	<u>2 General Models, 16 variants (distinct programs)</u> WtW: 16 separate contractors, very distinct programs, plus special contracts for cross-program support and activities
Fort Worth, Texas	Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)	<u>1 General Model, 7 variants (distinct programs)</u> 1) WtW: 7 contractors, individualized services, extending TANF (CHOICES) services, 7 distinct programs (3 other contracts for cross-program support and activities)
Indiana (19 county area)	River Valley Resources, Inc.	<u>1 General Model, 19 variants</u> 1) RVR WtW: operating in 19 separate counties, each with its own TANF IMPACT program; RVR operates TANF-WORK IMPACT program in some sites but not others. County welfare system and variations in RVR role lead to WtW program variations
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections for Region 3	<u>1 Program Model, 5 variants</u> 1) NOW for noncustodial parents on parole/ probation; 5 W-2 agencies are main service provider, each has variant of the general model
Nashville, Tennessee	Nashville Career Advancement Center	<u>1 Program Model, 3 variants</u> 1) Nashville Works/Pathways Program: 3 service provider contractor collaboratives, each has variant of the general model
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation and Transitional Work Corporation, Phil@Work Program	<u>2 Program Models, 1 with 8 variants</u> <u>PWDC: 1 General Model, 8 variants</u> 8 RSCs provide WtW funded services, each operated by service contractors with variants of the general model <u>TWC: 1 Program Model, no variants</u> Phil@Work Program operated by TWC centrally
Phoenix, Arizona	City of Phoenix Human Services Dept., Employment and Training Division	<u>1 General Model, 3 variants</u> EARN Program, with 3 major contractors for specific services (Marriott Pathways, NAPIC-HPL, Behavioral ICPS) services
West Virginia (29 county area)	Human Resources Development Foundation	<u>1 Program Model, 6 variants</u> HRDF-CEP; Services provided through 6 HRDF district hubs, each with slight variations of the general model
Yakima, Washington	Tri-Valley Private Industry Council	<u>2 Program Models, 1 with 3 variants</u> WtW: 1 model, 3 variants. Subcontracts with to 3 CBO providers, each with own variant of the general model SHARE: for noncustodial parents, centrally operated by PFP
Baltimore County, Maryland St. Lucie County, Florida Long Beach, California	Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000; with Community College of Baltimore County (MD), Indian River Community College (FL); Long Beach Community College (CA)	<u>1 Program Model, 3 variants</u> JHU-CTS: JHU contracts with 8 community colleges (3 are study sites), each with own variants of the basic CTS model

V. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The descriptions in the previous chapters are based on the first round of visits to the local programs in the eleven sites included in the WtW evaluation. The intent of these visits was to document the structure and operations of the programs, including the types of services being provided and the structural interaction between the WtW grant-funded programs and both TANF and JTPA/WIA. A few general observations are possible, but it is important to note that they are based on experiences in these sites only and cannot be extrapolated to all WtW programs nationwide. First, WtW services are delivered through a highly decentralized service delivery system that relies heavily on contract service providers. Those providers include public agencies and institutions, but nonprofit, community-based organizations play a particularly strong role, at least in the programs in these study sites.

Second, the WtW grant-funded programs exist within a complex organizational structure. At the local level, this complex structure, involving TANF and workforce development agencies and their associated programs and also involving other service providers in the community, generally predates WtW. In most of the study sites, WtW expanded an existing structure, and new programmatic options were implemented, such as programs for special populations, specific employer partnerships, subsidized employment, and wage supplements. The new program services are being implemented both within the pre-existing welfare and job training systems and within the nonprofit service organization networks.

Third, the problems that most WtW grant programs had concerning slow enrollments dominated the first two years of program implementation. In most of the study sites, administrators and staff had identified ways to address the enrollment problem. Staff and administrators are optimistic that outreach and recruitment efforts, along with the 1999

congressional changes to the eligibility criteria, will help increase the flow of participants into their programs. However, based on the site visits in early 2000, it seems that the early enrollment problems, especially regarding the tight eligibility criteria, greatly affected the general implementation of the programs and required an extensive amount of staff and administrator time and effort in the grantee and TANF agencies.

Nonetheless, there is a strong feeling at the local level that the presence of the WtW grants has contributed to the development of some innovative programs targeting services to population groups that have not typically been served in the study communities. Some programs, for example, target substance abusers, persons with limited basic skills and English language ability, individuals with disabilities, and welfare recipients living in homeless shelters. Programs are seriously attempting to reach and serve noncustodial parents (mainly fathers). Several staff and administrators indicate that the presence of the WtW grants encouraged a more serious focus on fathers.

In addition to targeting very difficult populations, some of the programs in the study sites are also implementing employment-based activities that integrate skills development with work-based subsidized employment. All the study programs are providing job retention services, and a few are expanding their post-employment services to include skills and competency development.

Thus, despite the difficulties associated with the strict eligibility criteria and the fact that the implementation phase has been longer than originally expected, promising work is being done in many of the sites. It is not yet possible to determine whether or not these innovations will result in positive outcomes for individuals, but there is a clear sense at the local level that these programs are committed to providing intensive services for as long as necessary (or as long as

federal funding allows) in an attempt to produce better outcomes. Future reports from the evaluation will address program outcomes and the evolving implementation of the programs.

APPENDIX A:

**WtW PROGRAMS IN THE STUDY SITES—
GENERAL INFORMATION**

APPENDIX A: WtW Programs in the Study Sites—General Information

Study Site/ Grantee Program	General Model(s)	Programs/Locations	WtW, TANF and JTPA link	WtW status
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS Office of Jobs and Community Service (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corp. (EDIC)				
Employer-Sponsored Programs	2 models. 1) employer partnerships (1 or more employers plus 1 CBO, pre-employment internship, guaranteed hire, post-empl.), 11 variants; 2) enhanced work experience, 2 variants	<p>13 programs: 11 employer partnership programs and 2 enhanced work experience programs</p> <p>Intake at 3 career centers, then flow to the 13 programs [6 locations, main and 1 satellite each]</p> <p><u>11 Employer Partnerships:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Benjamin Health Care with Jewish Vocational Services [1 location] 2. Boston Neighborhood Employment Collaborative (Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital, Children's Hospital, Colonnade Hotel, Boston Back Bay Hilton, Jamaica Plains Neighborhood Development Corp.) with Fenway CDC [1 location] 3. St. Mary's Women and Infants Center with Caritas Christi [1 location] 4. Filene's Basement with Crittenton Hastings House [1 location] 5. Kid's Palace Daycare with Life Focus Center [1 location] 6. Marriott with Crittenton Hastings House [1 location] 7. Mellon Bank with YMCA, Training Inc., and Jobs for Youth [1 location] 8. Partners Health Care with Jewish Vocational Services and Worksource Staffing [1 location] 9. Roche Bros. Grocery, TJX Warehouse, Greater Boston Food Bank with Urban League of Eastern Mass. [1 location] 10. TJX with Morgan Memorial Goodwill Industries [1 location] 11. U.S. Trust with Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD) [1 location] <p><u>2 Enhanced Community Service Programs:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ABCD [1 location] 2. Jewish Vocational Services [1 location] 	EDIC-JCS is the SDA (there is a separate PIC); also EDIC-JCS is the chartered contractor (with Jewish Vocational Services) of one of the 3 Career Centers in Boston; also each Career Center has a contract from DTA (Welfare dept). To provide some components of the TANF work program.	WtW formula funds FY98 and 99

Study Site/ Grantee Program	General Model(s)	Programs/Locations	WtW, TANF and JTPA link	WtW status
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS Mayor's Office of Workforce Development (MOWD)				
Welfare-to-Work Programs	<p>2 program models, with 19 contracts—16 for separate and distinct programs plus 3 support contracts for services available to participants in all programs</p> <p>1) "Macro-matrix placement models": job readiness, job placement and some with intensive support: many variants</p> <p>2) Business-focused and industry-focused programs: job readiness, placement and some with intensive support, working with specific firms and/or industry sectors</p> <p>3) Support Contracts: available to all WtW funded programs</p>	<p>Multiple locations; each contracted program has one or more location for delivering services.</p> <p><u>Contractors:</u> Employment and Employer Services, Inc. Operation ABLE Maximus, Inc. Catholic Charities Easter Seals</p> <p><u>Contractors:</u> Pyramid Partnership (hospitality, retail) Sinai Community Institute (health care, child care, mfg.)</p> <p><u>Contractors:</u> Center for Law and Human Services (tax counseling for participants) Shore Bank (IDAs for participants) Employer Project (voice mail for participants)</p>	<p>MOWD also contracts for the 5 Chicago One-Stops; EES operates 3 of the 5</p> <p>No formal contract from TANF for Work activities, all WtW programs are among the options to which TANF staff can refer clients.</p>	
FT. WORTH, TEXAS Tarrant County Workforce Development Board (aka Work Advantage)				
WtW	1 model: supplement/extend work services, individualized services, case management, post-employment services [7 variants]	<p>Welfare funnels all TANF recipients to 7 Career Centers, then funneled to providers (TANF and/or WtW); WtW funds and services supplement and/or extend TANF services [7 one-stop locations plus 2 satellite offices]</p> <p><u>WtW service contractors:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Women's Center of Tarrant County [1 location] 2. Arlington Night Shelter [1 location] 3. Tarrant Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse [many locations throughout the county] 4. Goodwill Industries of Fort Worth [1 location] 5. Tarrant County Mental Health/Mental Retardation (new) [60 locations] 6. Women's Second Chance (new) [1 location] 7. Volunteers of America (formerly a contractor in 1999, but not in 2000) 	Tarrant County is current contractor for the 7 Career Centers; also administers TANF-CHOICES and FSE&T	WtW formula grant FY98 (FY99 on hold) and a round 2 competitive grant

Study Site/ Grantee Program	General Model(s)	Programs/Locations	WtW, TANF and JTPA link	WtW status
Ft. Worth (Continued)		<u>WtW capacity-building contractors:</u> 1. Tarrant County ACCESS (develop client tracking system) 2. Camp Fire (expand child care slots) 3. Fort Worth Housing Authority (develop marketing campaign)		
INDIANA (19 county area) River Valley Resources, Inc.				
Welfare-to-Work Program	1 model, 19 variants (each county is slightly different): job placement, case mgt., subsidized employment, unsubsidized employment, basic skills, retention services	RVR has branch offices in 19 counties	RVR is the administrative entity for 2 WIBs. RVR is the TANF-IMPACT (Work Program) operators in 7 of the 19 counties	Round 1 competitive grant; formula grant for 2 PICs/WIBs for FY98 and FY99
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Correction for Region 3				
Nontraditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program	1 model: employment services, post-empl., case mgt., parenting skills, and child support enforcement services for noncustodial fathers on parole or probation; 5 variants	1 NOW office--Holton Street [1 location; 8 DOC/NOW case managers receive individuals from 350 parole/probation agents in multiple offices throughout Milwaukee County] Participants are referred by DOC/NOW to one of 5 W-2 agencies with 13 locations total	All W-2 agencies are also TANF-work agencies; PIC coordinates W-2 in Milwaukee	15% funds, plus a DOC match equal to about 80% of the 15% amt.
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE Nashville Career Advancement Center				
Nashville Works/Pathways Program	1 model: Pathways, individualized services, peer accountability, case mgt., gradual steps, support, post-empl.; 3 variants	1. Families First Partners, Inc. (consortium of Catholic Charities of Nashville, the Martha O'Bryan Center, the Nashville Urban League, and Nashville READ) [4 locations] 2. The PENCIL Foundation (Public Education Nashville Citizens Involved in Leadership, in collaboration with the Board of Education) [1 location] 3. YWCA (consortium with Nashville Opportunities Industrialization Center [OIC] and the Bethlehem Center) [2 locations]	NCAC is the PIC's administrative entity. NCAC is also one of several TANF-Families First contractors. All Pathways contractors are also TANF/Families First work contractors/ consortia	formula funds FY98 (FY99 on hold) and round 2 competitive funds

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA Philadelphia Workforce Development Corp., Greater Philadelphia Works (GPW) Program				
Transitional Work Corporation, Phil@Work Program	1 model: transitional subsidized jobs	TWC [all in 1 location] : clients funneled from 8 Regional Service Centers [8 locations](and recently some come direct from CAO's)	PWDC is the WIB; also administers the TANF work program; also administers GPW through 8 RSCs and TWC and 2 different programs funded by a competitive WtW grant (one for non custodial parents, one for teen mothers). GPW is one of several options TANF can choose after completing job search at the CAO (welfare office). RSCs do job search, placement, follow-up, services, TALENT (for teen parents), Work Opportunities (Community Service)	GPW: competitive, formula, 15% and state money; TWC: GPW money (including WtW) and Pew grant
PHOENIX, ARIZONA City of Phoenix, Human Services Dept., Employment and Training Div.				
Employment and Respect Now (EARN) Alliance Program	1 model: job readiness, job search, placement, post-empl. Instruction, retention services; 3 variants	All intake at EARN office [1 location], then refer to Marriott Pathways, or Mesa Community College/ICPS; post-empl. Could enroll in NAPIC-HPL(High Performance Learning); 2000 no Mesa CC contract; nearly all go through Marriott, then behavioral component by ICPS, then HPL job placement (3 locations), and some get HPL post-employment at worksites	City HSD is the main contractor for TANF case management and sanctioning services; and is administrative entity for JTPA (and therefore has formula funds)	competitive WtW grant (round 1)
WEST VIRGINIA (29 county area) Human Resources Development Foundation, Inc.				
Comprehensive Employment Program (CEP)	1 model: job readiness workshop, job placement assistance, supported work experience, case management, post-empl. skills upgrading, stipend for participation in activities, wage supplements, job retention bonuses; 6 variants	6 HRDF district offices (hubs) covering a 29-county service area operate CEP; all referrals are from welfare dept (DHHR) 1. Morgantown (Monongalia, Preston, Marion and Taylor Counties) [1 location] 2. Clarksburg (Harrison, Doddridge, Barbour, Lewis, Upshur, Gilmer, and Braxton Counties) [1 location] 3. Parkersburg (Wood, Pleasants, Richie, Wirt, Calhoun, and Jackson Counties) [1 location]	HRDF is also a major JTPA service contractor. HRDF is also a subcontracted service provider under WtW formula grant contract from the PIC of W.Va.. The HRDF formula WtW program is also operated through the 6 districts, but with a slightly different program model.	round 2 competitive funds
WEST VIRGINIA (continued)		4. Charleston (Kanawha, Roane, Clay, Lincoln, and Boone Counties) [1 location]		

Study Site/ Grantee Program	General Model(s)	Programs/Locations	WtW, TANF and JTPA link	WtW status
		5. Beckley (Raleigh, Fayette, Nicholas, and Wyoming Counties) [1 location] 6. Princeton (Mercer, McDowell, and Summers Counties) [1 location]		
YAKIMA, WASHINGTON Tri-Valley Private Industry Council				
Welfare-to-Work Program	2 models: 1) WtW: job placement (unsubsidized or subsidized), retention services; 2) SHARE: noncustodial parents job placement and retention services	1) individual TANF clients funneled to 1 of 3 WtW providers, from 2 DSHS (TANF) offices if not employed after TANF-Work (by ESD, 1 location); People for People [1 location], Yakima Valley OIC [1 location], Northwest Community Action Center/Yakima Valley Fam Workers Clinic [1 location, within Yakima Indian Nation boundary] 2) delinquent noncustodial parents referred by prosecuting attorney office to WtW-SHARE, operated by People for People [1 location]	Tri-Valley PIC is the WIB. DSHS contracts with Employment Security Dept. for TANF-Work First Program. WtW-funded programs are three options to which DSHS can refer clients who are not employed after the ESD Work First	Formula funding FY98 and FY99
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY (multi-site grantee) Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, SCANS2000 Center				
Career Transcript System (CTS)	1 model: post-employment, work-based employment skills competency development	JHU contracts with 8 Community Colleges around the nation; each uses the SCANS2000 CTS curriculum and procedures, with some procedural variations. TANF recipients who become employed and their employers are identified by the TANF agency at the CC-CTS liaisons for the CTS program <u>Study sites: 1) Baltimore County, MD 2) St. Lucie, FL, 3) Long Beach, CA</u> <u>Other JHU sites: 4) Chicago, IL 5) Davenport IA, 6) Hartford, CT 7) Portland, OR, and 8) State of Rhode Island</u>	Each CC has a different role with TANF and WIB. None of CCs in study sites are WIB administrators; Indian River CC (FL) operates the One-Stop, which includes TANF Work Program;; Baltimore County CC and Long Beach CC are WIB providers and TANF providers	Round 2 multi-site competitive grant to JHU; other funds from National Science Foundation and USDOL-ETA Office of National Programs

APPENDIX B:
PROFILES OF WtW GRANT PROGRAMS
IN ELEVEN STUDY SITES

Grantee: Office of Jobs and Community Services (JCS) in the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Corp. (EDIC)

Location: Boston, Massachusetts

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The Boston JCS-EDIC, a workforce development agency under the direction of the Mayor, has used WtW Formula Grant funding to establish two major initiatives to serve WtW-eligible individuals in Boston: (1) Employer-Sponsored Programs that offer pre-employment preparation and internships linked with specific employers, and (2) Enhanced Community Service Programs that offer occupational-specific work experience. The objective of the Employer-Sponsored Programs is to prepare welfare recipients for entry-level jobs that are in demand in the community by working directly with employers who design and help implement the pre-employment program and commit to hire those who complete the program. These programs run in fixed cycles with a limited number of individuals per cycle and are intended for individuals who are more job-ready than those entering enhanced community service. Each employer partners with a specific non-profit organization, which provides personal counseling and case management to participants. The Enhanced Community Service programs provide a more structured supported work-type assignment (three to six months long), designed as pre-employment preparation for specific occupations. This initiative involves 20 hours per week of community service in a specific occupational slot plus 15 hours of “enhanced” activities (e.g., basic skills) as appropriate.

Key Partners: EDIC/JCS contracts directly with the 11 employers under the employer-sponsored program component and two community-based organizations (CBOs) under the enhanced community service program component. Together JCS and the Boston Private Industry Council (PIC) developed the model for the work-based training provided under this initiative. The 11 pre-employment preparation Employment Partner Programs are: Marriott Corporation; Benjamin Health Care; Partners Health Care; U.S. Trust Corp./Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD); TJX/Goodwill; Caritas-Christi Health; Filene’s Basement; Roche Brothers Grocery, TJX Warehouse and the Greater Boston Food Bank; Kid’s Palace Daycare; Mellon Bank; and the Boston Neighborhood Employment Collaborative (a collaborative that includes hotels, hospitals and neighborhood organizations). The two occupation-based Enhanced community service programs are: Action for Boston Community Development Inc. (ABCD), a child care teachers’ assistant training project; and Jewish Vocational Service (JVS), a training program for various health and hospitality occupations. The three Boston Career Centers serve as intake points for the project are: (1) The Workplace, operated by JCS and Jewish Vocational Services; (2) Boston Career Link, a collaborative of Dimock Community Health Center, Morgan Memorial Goodwill Industries, Inc., and the Women’s Educational and Industrial Union; and (3) JobNet, operated by the Massachusetts Division of Employment and Training (DET).

Program Model(s): The main focus of the initiative is to transition welfare recipients into full-time jobs within the private for-profit and non-profit sectors through employer-based training. Under the employer-sponsored program, there is a strong employer focus—employers help with selection of participants for their training program and then structure training so that when participants complete training they can fill full-time positions. Training is conducted at the employer site, is short-term (usually about six weeks), and involves a combination of employability skills training and job-specific training. Under the enhanced community service program, participants work at supported work-type assignments for three to six months. Typically, job-specific training in a community service job is supplemented with up to 15 hours of basic skills training or other types of activities to increase employability. There is no formal commitment to hire in the enhanced community service program, but each program is industry-specific and the organization commits to placing participants into related jobs with benefits (within the host organization or elsewhere).

Number of Program Offices/Locations: Three main intake locations (at the three Boston Career Centers) and separate service sites for each of the thirteen programs.

Funding Sources: WtW Formula Grant

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target Population(s): There is no special targeting of subpopulations or neighborhoods—all WtW-eligibles are considered for enrollment. All individuals referred from Career Centers are enrolled under the 70 percent eligibility criteria, unless they live in an enterprise zone (EZ). Residents of EZs are eligible under the 30 percent criteria.

Enrollment: As of January 2000, 445 had been enrolled and served under the program, 271 of whom had been placed in unsubsidized employment.

Outreach and Referral: The three Boston Career Centers are the intake points. The outreach includes: passing out flyers in Department of Temporary Assistance (DTA) offices; referrals directly from DTA workers; visiting community centers, churches, housing projects, etc. to pass out flyers and make presentations; and “word-of-mouth” referral. JCS has a full-time “outreach coordinator” to increase the community outreach efforts to explain the range of opportunities available to welfare recipients through the Career Centers. The outreach coordinator works with numerous CBOs, the Boston Housing Authority, and the Boston Medical Center.

Employment-Related Services: The structure of employment services varies across the employers and CBOs involved in this project. The employer-sponsored program model is generally six weeks long, although some last longer. The first segment consists of job readiness workshops and the second segment is on the job (e.g., internships, apprenticeship, job shadowing).

For example, Marriott offers a six-week, 180-hour training program, which includes pre-employment and job-specific skills training. The first 60 hours is classroom training dealing with pre-employment skills; life skills; confidence/self esteem building; personal finance; diversity in the workplace; hospitality/customer service skills; and safety, first aid, and sanitation. Regular Marriott personnel teach all of these classes. The remaining 120 hours is hands-on experience through job shadowing. The six-week training is unpaid. Individuals receive weekly performance feedback once they are in the job-shadowing portion of the program. Case managers are around during lunches and breaks to help individuals with any issues that arise during the training. Upon completion of the program, individuals can be placed into a variety of different jobs at any one of four Marriott locations in Boston. Possible job placements at Marriott include: front desk clerk, housekeeper/housekeepers aide, PBX operator, utility worker, dining room attendant, restaurant server/banquet server, and engineering help. Under the enhanced community services program component, there are two initiatives operated by CBOs (ABCD and JVS). Each provides 20 hours per week of community service in specific jobs/occupations, supplemented with 15 hours of “enhanced readiness services ” (e.g., ESL, basic education). ABCD places individuals in day care teacher aide assignments; JVS works with a collaborative group of agencies that work mainly with immigrants and place individuals in health and hospitality assignments.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

The most innovative feature of this program is the very active and direct involvement of businesses in designing the program, selecting the participants, conducting the pre-employment preparation and the on-the-job component, and making an up-front commitment to hire those who complete the program. All program components occur on site at the workplace.

Second, each employer program has either a CBO partner that performs the case management (or in-house case management services) during the program and for up to one year after starting as a regular employee after the program. The case manager is fully integrated into the program model on a day-to-day basis, but has specific responsibilities for brokering services, counseling participants, and intervening/advocating with outside agencies as necessary.

Third, the program is well integrated with Boston's Career Centers and the state's welfare reform initiatives. The Career Centers are the central focal point for referral into all of the programs. The Career Center staff and the employer-sponsored program case managers coordinate routinely with the welfare agency to report attendance, etc. The Career Centers in Boston already have nearly all features required under the new federal Workforce Investment Act. The Career Centers also hold the major contracts for large parts of the state's TANF work program (TAFDC-ESP).

Grantee: Mayor's Office of Workforce Development (MOWD)

Location: Chicago, Illinois

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: Using WtW Formula funds, MOWD has funded two rounds of grants to a total of 26 agencies in Chicago to provide a wide range of employment, training, and support services for WtW-eligible TANF recipients living in Chicago. In addition, MOWD has partnered in a significant way on two other WtW Competitive Grants: (1) a Competitive WtW Round One Grant to provide 6-months of free public transportation assistance for WtW eligible individuals, and (2) a Competitive WtW Round Two Grant to provide employment, training, and support services for WtW-eligible residents of public housing units in Chicago. MOWD, which does not provide direct client services, selects and oversees WtW contract service providers.

Key Partners: Under the WtW Formula Grant, the major partners include the Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS), which provides most referrals of WtW-eligible TANF recipients through local IDHS offices located in the City of Chicago, and 26 subcontracted human service agencies, which provide case management, employment, training, and other support services for WtW-eligible TANF recipients. Some examples of the subcontracting agencies include: Asian Human Services, the Center for Law and Human Services, Easter Seals, Employment and Employer Services, MAXIMUS, Goodwill Industries, Operation ABLE, Pyramid Partnership, Shorebank Neighborhood Institute, Catholic Charities, and Suburban Job Link. Under the Round One Competitive Grant, MOWD is collaborating with PACE (a suburban transportation system) and the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) to make monthly transit passes available for use on buses and subways throughout the Chicago metropolitan area (over a six-county area). Under the Round Two Competitive Grant, MOWD is collaborating with the Chicago Housing Authority on administration of the grant and has selected three contractors to provide direct client services: the Abraham Lincoln Center, Pyramid Partnership, and Career Works.

Program Model(s): The focus of the programs funded under WtW grants administered by MOWD is to serve large numbers of TANF recipients living within the city of Chicago and provide employment, training, retention, and support services needed to rapidly move participants into unsubsidized jobs. Overall, there is a strong work first emphasis that cuts across all funded agencies. However, with funding provided to date to more than 20, there is also a broad range of service delivery approaches and subpopulations served under the program. There are also a number of agencies that provide specialty services, such as help for WtW participants to establish Individual Development Accounts (Shorebank Neighborhood Institute), to receive the Earned Income Tax Credit and other tax credits (the Center for Law and Human Services), and to set up voice mail to facilitate job placement efforts (The Employment Project).

Number of Program Offices/Locations:

WtW program services are provided through a large number of contracted agencies (including 26 agencies under the WtW Formula program). Some contracted agencies serve WtW recipients throughout the city, while others serve a particular area within the city. Some agencies have a single service location; others have several locations.

Funding Sources:

WtW Formula and Competitive Grant funds

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s):

The WtW program serves all WtW-eligible participants residing within the city limits. Several contracted agencies have experience in targeting and serving special subpopulations—e.g., Goodwill and Easter Seals (individuals with disabilities); Asian Human Services and Spanish Coalition for Jobs (immigrant populations); and The Inner Voice (homeless individuals).

Enrollment:

Round One job placements (through June 2000) had reached in excess of 3,000 WtW participants.

Outreach and Referral:

IDHS local offices refer virtually all WtW-eligible individuals to the subcontracted WtW agencies. Contracted agency staff market their services by maintaining communications with the individual IDHS staff who make referral decisions. Each IDHS local office has a targeted number of slots each month for particular WtW contractors' programs. IDHS local office staff are aware of these assigned slots and are guided by them, but they can also send a client to a particular contractor even if the IDHS office has no more official slots there. Some contractors also recruit small numbers of WtW participants through their own efforts and referrals from other agencies. Contractors notify IDHS of individuals who are directly recruited.

Employment-Related Services:

There is a strong emphasis among all subcontracted agencies on providing job readiness and placement assistance (including job readiness workshops, help with resume preparation and interview skills, and help with job leads). This focus is in accordance with a strong "work first" orientation of the WtW program. However, each subcontracted agency has substantial flexibility in determining the types of employment-related services to make available to participants. Hence, there is much variation across sites. For example, some agencies place a strong emphasis on rapid attachment of participants to unsubsidized jobs, generally featuring a work readiness workshop and substantial help with job placement (such as Employment and Employer Services, Operation ABLE, and Maximus). Other subcontracted agencies feature paid work experience or shelter workshops, followed by placement into subsidized and unsubsidized jobs (such as Catholic Charities and Easter Seals). Other agencies, such as Pyramid Partnership and Sinai Community Institute, have close ties to a single or several employers—the contracting agency provides screening and job readiness instruction, which is followed by participant referral to an employer for a short period of on-the-job training and then placement into a full-time, unsubsidized

job. Most agencies provide some form of basic skills education and remediation, either directly or through referral to other agencies. Although not a major focus, referral for short-term training to other training institutions or agencies is also available. Through its performance-based reimbursement system for WtW subcontracted agencies, MOWD has made the provision of job retention services a priority for agencies. To date, most job retention efforts have centered on frequent employer and client contacts (especially to troubleshoot problems before they lead to job loss), provision of ongoing support services (such as provision of monthly public transit passes), and assistance with upgrading basic skills to enhance employability.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

MOWD has modified contract provisions during its second round of WtW Formula funding in an effort to encourage contractors to focus more on job retention and advancement services. The Round Two contracts set incentives for longer-term retention efforts, with reimbursement each month partially linked to the number of WtW participants reaching 30 days of employment or 150 out of 180 days of employment.

MOWD has funded three “supporting role” contractors to provide specialized services that can be drawn on by participants in any of the other contractors’ programs. First, the Center for Law and Human Services provides tax counseling and training on taxes and the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) for contractor staff and for WtW clients. Second, Shorebank, a community development bank, is providing Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) for WtW participants. WtW funds are used to provide a match for participants’ own deposits to the IDAs (\$2 for every \$1 deposited by participants). IDA funds can then be used to help with a down payment for home purchase, offset the cost of education or training to upgrade worker skills, or for setting up a small business investment. Third, The Employment Project provides a community voice-mail service, which will eventually offer 1,000 active lines allocated to the various contractors. Contractors can assign lines to individual WtW participants for periods of up to six months and then reassign them to new participants as the earlier ones succeed in stabilizing their living situations and getting their own telephone service. The service is intended to provide a reliable, dignified way for participants to receive messages from employers. It also allows the contractors to communicate mass messages to all of their participants who are using a voice mail line.

Under one of its WtW Competitive Grants, MOWD is partnering with PACE and the Chicago Transit Authority to provide over 1,000 free monthly transit passes for WtW eligible individuals in Chicago. This partnership is characterized as a win-win situation for all involved. Participants benefit because they get unlimited use of the six-county system, which enables them to broaden their job search to include openings throughout the metropolitan area (e.g., in suburban areas, if they live within the city). This helps to expand the number of job openings considered by individuals and bolsters the prospects of higher wages. Also, once an individual secures a job, it reduces transportation problems and enhances prospects for job retention.

WtW contracting agencies benefit because it makes it possible for these agencies to offer participants a valuable support service at no cost to the agency. Agencies also

use the passes as a tangible benefit to engage participants in services and to facilitate post-placement client contact and long-term tracking (i.e., participants are often required to attend such program activities as a job retention workshop in order to receive passes). Employers benefit because it increases the pool of available workers (to alleviate shortages). The passes also help workers get to the job on time and facilitate job retention. Finally, the partnering transportation agencies—CTA and PACE—benefit because the program promotes long-term ridership.

Grantee: Tarrant County Workforce Development Board

Location: Tarrant County (including the cities of Fort Worth and Arlington), Texas

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The Tarrant County Workforce Development Board, also referred to as Work Advantage, administers employment and training services for residents of Tarrant County. Through its seven Work Advantage Career Centers (and two satellite centers), the Board administers both the Formula and Round Two Competitive Welfare-to-Work (WtW) Grant funds, as well as CHOICES (Texas' TANF work program), WIA, and Food Stamp Employment and Training programs. In terms of the program structure, the WtW program is closely connected with the TANF and CHOICES program. WtW provides supplemental funding that enables Work Advantage Career Centers to extend services beyond when TANF/CHOICES assistance is available.

Key Partners: Under WtW, the Workforce Development Board contracts with area community-based organizations to provide WtW-sponsored services. Using WtW Competitive Grant funds, the Board has contracted with The Women's Center of Tarrant County, Inc.; Tarrant County ACCESS; Tarrant Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse; Camp Fire; and the Fort Worth Housing Authority. Under the WtW Formula Grant, the Board has contracted with The Women's Center of Tarrant County, Inc.; Arlington Night Shelter; Goodwill Industries of Fort Worth, Inc.; Tarrant County Mental Health/Mental Retardation; Volunteers of America; and Women's Second Chance. The program is closely linked with the TANF system, with the Texas Department of Human Services (DHS) local offices providing referrals of WtW-eligible individuals to WtW subcontracting agencies.

Program Model(s): Formula and Competitive Grant funds are being used to supplement and extend services available through TANF and CHOICES. The main focus of service delivery is on rapid work attachment. All direct client services are provided through contracted local service providers which have considerable flexibility to develop service delivery systems within the basic constraints of a "work first" approach. Some WtW Competitive funds have been designated for capacity building initiatives designed to enhance systems (e.g., increase numbers of day care providers, improve information and referral systems, and involve faith-based organizations) rather than serve specific individuals.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: Each of the subcontractors has at least one project location, with many having multiple site locations.

Funding Sources: WtW Competitive and Formula Grants

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s):

In general, the WtW program in Tarrant County is not targeted to specific subpopulations. Rather, it serves all individuals eligible under WtW rules. However, several service providers have expertise with certain subpopulations, and therefore, their WtW initiatives serve specific populations. For example, Tarrant Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse provides services to individuals with substance abuse problems. The Arlington Night Shelter uses its experience serving homeless individuals to provide job readiness and placement services to individuals in transitional housing. Goodwill Industries has extensive experience working with disabled individuals and generally serves recipients with multiple barriers to employment.

Enrollment:

As of December 31, 1999, a total of 191 individuals had been enrolled and served under the WtW Competitive or Formula Grant programs.

Outreach and Referral:

Individuals may enter the WtW initiatives from two avenues – they may be referred through the TANF/CHOICES program (i.e., the TANF work program) or recruited by service providers and determined eligible through a "reverse referral" process. Program administrators estimated that about 1/3 of participants are recruited through the CHOICES program and 2/3 through WtW service providers. A TANF client's first contact with one of the Work Advantage Career Centers is when she is referred by DHS to the Career Center orientation as part of the TANF eligibility determination process. Each individual attending the orientation is given an appointment to return to the Career Center for assessment and service planning. Only CHOICES mandatory clients are required to return for this session, called the employment planning session. Clients are screened for WtW eligibility at these employment planning sessions. WtW service contractors also recruit clients through outreach methods utilized for other programs they offer. For example, the Women's Center may enroll clients in WtW who come to the center for counseling. The agency also conducts "family celebrations," described as community parties, to recruit women for services (including WtW-funded services). The Arlington Night Shelter conducts targeted outreach to individuals living in transitional housing and motels near the shelter. Recruitment techniques include knocking on doors, distributing fliers, and establishing relationships with landlords and motel supervisors who refer individuals for services. The United Community Centers and Goodwill also screen participants in their other programs for WtW eligibility.

Employment-Related Services:

The employment-related services and support services provided through the WtW Formula and Competitive Grant programs are determined by each WtW service contractor and vary somewhat across contractors. Contracted service providers have generally adopted a "work first" orientation, with emphasis on rapidly transitioning TANF recipients into employment primarily through intensive case management, job readiness training, job search/placement assistance, and provision of support services. As yet, pre- or post-employment job training has not been a major focus of subcontracted service agencies. These agencies have provided post-employment case management, troubleshooting, and support services to enhance job retention.

Several examples of strategies employed by contractors follow:

- Arlington Night Shelter case managers help WtW participants by providing job leads and support during the job search process. The agency also has a job readiness workshop that aims to prepare participants to secure and retain jobs.
- Goodwill offers intensive case management with a structured job readiness component (i.e., a four-week class devoted solely to WtW participants as well as one-on-one job counseling) and an unpaid work experience component called Assisting Self Through Helping Others (ASTHO). ASTHO positions generally last two weeks—though participants can hold a series of positions—and are offered through community organizations and private employers with whom Goodwill has developed relationships. Goodwill staff encourage WtW participants to pursue their GED or adult education through the CHOICES program before or in addition to their WtW activities.
- The Women's Center offers three basic employment services: (1) Jobs Now, which provides short-term job search assistance and is the program option in which most WtW participants are enrolled; (2) Strengthening Families, which assists families to move out of poverty through rapid job placement, education assistance, job retention and advancement assistance, life skills classes, and intensive case management; and (3) Individual Employment Advisement, which utilizes volunteers to advise those interested in changing jobs or careers.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

Work Advantage has also funded through its Competitive Grant several efforts to increase the capacity of systems that serve low-income populations in general. For example, it has contracted with Camp Fire to expand availability of licensed child care homes and evening child care accessible to TANF recipients in need. Additionally, Tarrant County Access is using WtW Competitive funds to continue an effort to create a wide area computer network that will allow community service providers (specifically small, often church-based, providers) to access a common set of data regarding individuals served, services received, and services available.

Another innovative use of WtW funding is a social marketing effort being coordinated by the Fort Worth Housing Authority. Through this initiative, a marketing firm has been hired to research what motivates low-income individuals and families to participate in programs designed to assist them in becoming self-sufficient. The research will help with developing a consistent and effective message to help market WtW services to the target population (such as the U.S. Army's "be all that you can be" campaign) and is expected to lead to changes in behavior to promote self-sufficiency.

Several service providers receiving WtW or TANF funds are faith-based organizations. For example, Family Pathfinders is a faith-based initiative administered in the county by the Tarrant Area Community of Churches (TACC),

whereby welfare recipients are matched with individuals from a group of volunteers (usually from a church congregation). The team then works with the family to help them achieve self-sufficiency and connect with the community. The help provided, which is intended to supplement those available through public programs, includes the following: help with occasional rides to and from work; help with child care in special situations (for sick children, after-school care, or irregular work hours); assistance in working out a family budget; help finding affordable housing and negotiating with a landlord; tips on grooming, job interviews, and workplace expectations; job placement assistance; help identifying community resources; and mentoring.

Grantee: River Valley Resources (RVR), Inc.

Location: Southeastern Indiana

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: RVR is the WIA administrative entity for two workforce development areas in Southeastern Indiana. In several of the counties it serves, the organization is also a contractor under Indiana's TANF work program, IMPACT. RVR's WtW program is designed to supplement the job readiness, placement, and supportive services offered by IMPACT. WtW also represents an important enhancement to IMPACT, which does not offer any paid work experience opportunities to participants. RVR delivers all WtW services directly to eligible participants, rather than subcontracting with other organizations.

Key Partners: The principal partner for RVR's WtW program is the Indiana Department of Family and Children (DFC), the state's TANF agency. While RVR is charged with determining eligibility for WtW and this enables its staff to enroll eligible persons directly, DFC is the principal source of referrals to the WtW program.

Program Model(s): RVR's Welfare-to-Work program is based on intensive case management, direct placement in unsubsidized positions for job-ready clients, and subsidized employment for less job-ready participants. Supportive services beyond what is typically made available through IMPACT are also central to the program. Finally, RVR provides WtW clients with intensive case management, before, during, and after subsidized and unsubsidized employment.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: RVR provides employment and training services through a network of branch offices located in each of the 19 counties the organization serves. WtW services are available at each branch office.

Funding Sources: As a JTPA/WIA administrative entity, RVR has received substate allocations of Indiana's Formula-based WtW Grants (for FY 1998 and FY 1999). The organization was also awarded a Round One WtW Competitive Grant. Programmatically, the services offered under RVR's Formula and Competitive WtW Grants are the same, with one exception. RVR set aside some of its Competitive funds to support the development of special, self-sustaining local initiatives called "community demonstration projects." These projects nevertheless represent a small share of the organization's WtW Competitive resources.

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target Population(s): RVR serves all WtW eligibles without targeting any subpopulations. To date, noncustodial parents (NCPs) have not been a focus of the program, although in some counties RVR staff has recently made more effort to identify and recruit eligible

NCPs, and/or to secure additional funding to develop specialized programs for this subpopulation.

Enrollment:

As of August 31, 2000, RVR had enrolled a total of 598 WtW participants across its 19-county service area.

Outreach and Referral:

Early on, RVR conducted “community forums” with staff from local DFC offices and other IMPACT providers, as well as important community resources in every county. The objective of these meetings was to familiarize other organizations with the WtW program (including eligibility criteria) and to encourage referrals of potentially eligible participants, emphasizing that WtW was designed as a complementary rather than a competing initiative.

As was noted earlier, RVR staff is responsible for certifying WtW eligibility. Thus, all walk-ins and referrals to the organization’s various programs (e.g. WIA/JTPA) are screened for WtW eligibility. To date, DFC has nevertheless been the principal source of direct referrals to the WtW program.

Employment-Related Services:

The structure, sequence, or emphasis of the WtW services that RVR staff provides vary slightly across its branch offices. Common principles nevertheless guide local WtW efforts. Intensive case management services are provided to all WtW participants before, during, and after they are placed in subsidized or unsubsidized employment. After determining eligibility for WtW, RVR case managers typically begin an intensive assessment process, covering the participant’s personal/family situation, work history, transportation and/or childcare issues, marketable skills, and educational attainment and goals. Assessments can take several in-person meetings to complete. Once completed, RVR staff develop an individualized plan of job readiness activities for the client.

After assessment and job readiness activities are completed, WtW participants proceed to job placement. RVR case managers determine whether to place a WtW participant in unsubsidized or subsidized employment taking into consideration (1) the client’s overall job readiness, (2) his/her employment preferences, and (3) the overall availability of subsidized and unsubsidized positions in their locality. WtW clients deemed job ready are directed to unsubsidized employment; those determined to be harder-to-place are directed to subsidized employment.

RVR offers two types of subsidized placements: (1) work experience positions and (2) job creation positions. Under work experience, participants become employees of RVR and are paid a wage comparable to what the employer would pay an unsubsidized employee in the position. (The client’s TANF grant is adjusted to account for this income, minus applicable income disregards.) Work experience placements are for up to 40 hours per week and can last up to three months, depending on what would be a typical probationary period. Employers are not required to hire WtW participants at the conclusion of the work experience period. However, RVR staff encourage employers to do so and reported that most clients are hired. Job creation positions are also subsidized by RVR. However, the WtW client

becomes an employee of the employer, who is also expected to hire the client at the end of the subsidy period. Another difference between job creation and work experience positions is that the former should be newly created for WtW participants. That is, job creation is not viewed as a mechanism to fill existing vacancies.

Once placed in unsubsidized employment, RVR case managers continue working with their WtW clients for as long and as frequently as their need for case management and supportive services persists. Officially, there is no termination to a client's WtW eligibility. Resources and individual needs therefore guide decisions regarding the ongoing provision of services.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

Given that IMPACT does not offer any paid work experience opportunities, RVR's use of subsidized positions to help WtW-eligible clients gain valuable work experience and overcome barriers to employment seems an innovative practice. Another noteworthy practice is that RVR case managers may conduct home visits to WtW participants. As part of assessment, these visits can help staff develop a better sense of the client's home environment and potential barriers to employment. A missed appointment or an employer's call that the participant did not report to work may also trigger a home visit. Home visits thus represent an important intervention that can help deepen the relationships between RVR staff and WtW clients and help assure services are provided to promote job retention. Finally, some RVR local offices have developed special WtW components that extend beyond the basic services described above, for example, by linking clients to community mentors and/or offering classes aimed at improving self-esteem and general life skills.

Grantee: Wisconsin Department of Corrections (DOC)

Location: Milwaukee, Wisconsin

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The Wisconsin Department of Corrections (DOC) received a three-year grant from the Governor’s WtW 15 Percent Discretionary funds to design and implement the Non-Traditional Opportunities for Work (NOW) Program in Milwaukee County. The NOW program—which targets noncustodial parents (NCPs) on probation or parole—is closely connected with the Wisconsin Works (W-2) system, with most employment, training, and support services under the program being provided through five W-2 agencies.

Key Partners: Major partners include the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development (DWD) and five W-2 agencies. DWD, which has overall responsibility for administration of employment, training, and welfare programs in the state, assisted with the original design of the initiative and determines WtW eligibility for potential NOW participants. DOC contracts with W-2 agencies to provide case management, employment, training, parenting, and other support services. The five Wisconsin Works (W-2) agencies are: Employment Solutions of Milwaukee (affiliated with Goodwill Industries); United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS); Opportunities Industrialization Center of Greater Milwaukee (OIC-GM); YW Works; and Maximus.

Program Model(s): The NOW program seeks to enhance employability, job retention, and capacity to pay child support among ex-offender NCPs. The program approach, which has *not* been modeled after other programs, has a clear “work first” focus. Services closely parallel those provided for TANF recipients under other welfare reform programs administered by the five W-2 agencies. Each W-2 agency has flexibility to implement its own program strategies, so there is considerable variation across agencies in the types of services provided for NOW participants.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: NOW program services are provided principally by the five W-2 agencies at their 13 job centers in Milwaukee County. In addition, the W-2 agencies refer NOW participants for training and a range of other support services delivered by other service providers throughout the county.

Funding Sources: Governor’s WtW 15 Percent Discretionary, along with matching funds provided by Wisconsin Department of Corrections

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s):

NOW targets NCPs on probation or parole or who are soon-to-be-released inmates of minimum security facilities. While initially the program served only noncustodial fathers, enrollment was extended to noncustodial mothers on probation or parole (though few had been served at the time of our visit). NOW excludes NCPs if participation in the program poses a threat to the custodial parent or other family members (e.g., domestic violence offenders are excluded unless the custodial parent is aware of and agrees to the noncustodial parent's participation in the program).

Enrollment:

A total of 130 people were enrolled from July 1998 through June 2000.

Outreach and Referral:

The NOW program identifies most WtW participants through direct referrals by DOC probation and parole agents. DOC probation and parole agents refer from their caseloads NCPs who potentially meet the WtW eligibility criteria and would likely benefit from participating in the program. The NOW project coordinator compiles a list of referred NCPs and sends the list to DWD for WtW eligibility determination. WtW-eligible NCPs are enrolled in the program and reassigned to the caseload of one of 10 probation and parole agents who are specially assigned to work with NOW. NOW participants are referred to one of five W-2 agencies based on a geographic match of the participant with a W-2 agency. In addition to referrals from DOC, W-2 agencies are encouraged to conduct their own outreach efforts to recruit ex-offenders into the NOW program.

Employment-Related Services:

Individuals comprising the target population, most of whom have recently been released from prison, are primarily interested in services that facilitate job placement. Thus, there is a strong emphasis among all W-2 agencies on providing job readiness and placement assistance (including job readiness workshops, help with resume preparation and interview skills, and help with job leads). Although in less demand by the target population, W-2 agencies also make available (as appropriate) short-term, career-focused job skills training (e.g., through referrals to the Wisconsin Technical College Systems and the University of Wisconsin Extension Program). W-2 agencies also provide basic computer skills training and referral to basic education and remediation programs (e.g., area literacy councils, Even Start Family Literacy Programs). W-2 agencies have links with the employer community for subsidized jobs and on-the-job training opportunities. W-2 agencies can also refer participants back to DOC for work experience opportunities under DOC's Community Corrections Employment Program (CCEP) or the Wisconsin Conservation Corps (WCC) program. With job retention and upgrading posing major challenges for many ex-offenders, W-2 agencies provide an array of post-employment services, including frequent employer and client contacts (especially to troubleshoot problems before they lead to job loss), provision of ongoing support services (such as help with car repair and bus tickets), and assistance with upgrading basic and job-specific skills to enhance employability (e.g., basic education, ESL, and occupational skills training).

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

Two of the five W-2 agencies have implemented parenting/fatherhood program components and the other W-2 agencies are in various stages of planning or implementing these components. For example, Employment Solutions offers a comprehensive, 26-session parenting/fatherhood workshop for NOW participants (using a formal curriculum entitled *Fatherhood Development: A Curriculum for Young Fathers*). Workshop sessions cover topics such as values, manhood, understanding the child support system, understanding children's needs, coping as a single father, male/female relationships, men's health, and substance abuse issues.

The project places strong emphasis on case management. Each NOW participant has two case managers—a DOC/NOW parole and probation agent and a W-2 agency case manager. The DOC/NOW parole and probation agent retains final decision-making authority on services provided and sanctioning of the participant (i.e., revocation of probation or parole status, as well as other sanctions). W-2 agencies assign each incoming participant to a W-2 case manager or counselor, who is responsible for planning and arranging services and closely tracking participant involvement in the NOW program. The two case managers complement one another: the DOC/NOW agent brings to the project an understanding of the ex-offender population and the corrections system, while the W-2 agency case manager brings strong linkages with employers, trainers, and support service providers, as well as expertise on how to obtain and retain employment.

Grantee: Nashville Career Advancement Center (NCAC)

Location: Nashville, Tennessee

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The Nashville Career Advancement Center, the new WIA administrative entity and a one-stop center, is responsible for administering employment and training programs for the Nashville/Davidson County area, including the WtW Formula Grant as well as a Round Two Competitive Grant. The NCAC is also the lead agency for one of four consortia of local community-based organizations that contract with the Tennessee Department of Human Services to provide services for its TANF work program, called Families First. NCAC uses its WtW funds to operate the NashvilleWorks/Pathways program, which allows participants to count a variety of "small steps" toward their work activity requirement.

Key Partners: Major partners include the Tennessee Department of Human Services (DHS) and the three contractor consortia that operate Pathways programs (and also contract with DHS to provide Families First employment services). These are: Families First Partners, Inc. (includes Catholic Charities of Tennessee, Nashville Urban League, Martha O'Bryan Center, and Nashville READ), PENCIL Foundation, and the YWCA. Pathways was operated by NCAC itself as a pilot program during its initial year of operation but NCAC turned over responsibility for program enrollment, meetings and case management, as planned, to the three contractor consortia in summer 1999.

Program Model(s): The NashvilleWorks/Pathways WtW program is based on the Project Match model and is designed to help eligible WtW participants find and keep employment by emphasizing a supportive, peer group environment. Participants are required to participate in monthly meetings in which they make a plan for what they will accomplish in the next month and review fulfillment of the previous month's plan. Pathways staff, with caseloads purposely kept small, provide highly individualized, intensive case management and problem-solving support, as well as job coaching and job readiness activities. A key program feature is the waiver that allows Pathways participants to count family-related tasks and volunteer work as work activities toward the 40-hour-per-week work requirement for Families First. Staff can also offer supportive services that go beyond what is normally available to TANF recipients in both amount and flexibility.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: As of January 2000, Pathways programs were being offered at seven locations throughout Davidson County—four sites operated by the Families First, Inc consortium, one site by PENCIL, and two sites by the YWCA.

Funding Sources: WtW Formula and Round Two Competitive Grants

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s): This program is not targeting any specific subpopulations within the WtW-eligible population. Some efforts have been made to recruit noncustodial parents through coordination with the Child Support Enforcement office.

Enrollment: A total of 255 people were enrolled from July 1998 through mid-January 2000.

Outreach and Referral:

Pathways operates as one option that can be chosen by participants in Tennessee's Families First program to fulfill their work activity obligations. Pathways must attract participants, but once they enroll in Pathways, it becomes a mandatory part of their Personal Responsibility Plan. As of December 1999, DHS sends to NCAC a weekly list of all TANF recipients who have gone through redetermination interviews, identifying the Pathways/Families First contractor to which the individual has been assigned for Families First services. Once WtW eligibility has been determined, NCAC sends a letter to these potential participants that describes the Pathways program and the services available, and informs them that they will be contacted by the Pathways contractor to which they have been assigned (which is also the Families First contractor to which they were assigned). Pathways contractors are also expected to recruit participants from within their own existing Families First caseloads.

In addition, Pathways staff are also stationed in the local DHS office on a rotating basis to heighten awareness and understanding of the services Pathways has to offer and to encourage Families First participants to take advantage of the program. Other outreach efforts have included a public relations campaign of radio spots, TV ads and transit posters, as well as presentations by NCAC staff throughout the community.

Employment-Related Services:

The emphasis in the Pathways program is not simply on getting people into employment but has a more holistic, human development focus that seeks to help people make gradual steps toward employment. The formal employment-related services are generally provided through the Families First program, which either precedes or coincides with enrollment in the Pathways program. NCAC Pathways staff recently began focusing on developing more paid work experience slots with local employers, as these are both popular with and frequently utilized by participants and are not available through the Families First program. Job retention services—such as home visits and intensive case management characterized by flexibility and off-hours availability—are an important component of the array of Pathways services. Pathways staff can also offer participants additional supportive services to “fill the gaps” above and beyond similar services provided through Families First (e.g., car repairs, emergency transportation vouchers).

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

The Pathways program is an intensive, highly individualized service delivery model with no one standard sequence of services for all clients. It has been implemented such that it replicates the same model throughout the city of Nashville and thus represents an attempt to bring a very intensive case management model up to a substantial scale by developing an extensive contractor infrastructure.

Grantee: Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation (PWDC)

Location: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: Philadelphia's WtW program, Greater Philadelphia Works (GPW), is an important part of the city's overall welfare reform strategy. The initiative, administered by PWDC (the WIA administrative entity), was designed to augment the city's efforts to help large numbers of welfare recipients transition into employment.

Key Partners: Major WtW partners include the Office of the Mayor; the Philadelphia County Assistance Office (CAO) of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare (the TANF agency); and private contractors who operate various GPW program components. Staff from the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning spearheaded Philadelphia's efforts to plan for the city's use of federal WtW funds. Staff from the 19 CAO district offices refer welfare recipients to GPW programs. Two private contractors—Educational Data Services, Inc. (EDSI) and Jewish Employment and Vocational Services (JEVS)—operate the Regional Service Center component of GPW (described below). The Transitional Work Corporation, a new intermediary organization, was created with WtW and foundation funds expressly to run the subsidized employment component of GPW, the Phil@Work program (also described below).

Program Model(s): GPW encompasses several program models aimed at helping welfare recipients obtain and retain employment. Regional Service Centers (RSCs) offer work readiness, job search assistance, and retention services to individuals determined to be job ready. Phil@Work combines work readiness activities with subsidized employment followed by placement in unsubsidized work and job retention services for harder-to-place welfare recipients who have little or no prior work experience. Specialized programs targeting eligible teen parents and noncustodial parents were also created with WtW Competitive Grant funds. Finally, specialized alcohol and drug counseling services are made available to all WtW participants through the various GPW program options.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: As of February 2000, eight RSCs were geographically distributed around Philadelphia. EDSI operates five of the eight RSCs; JEVS operates two and PWDC operates one. TANF recipients choosing to participate in GPW are assigned to an RSC based on the welfare district in which they reside. The Phil@Work program operates at a single location in downtown Philadelphia.

Funding Sources: The PWDC has received Formula WtW subgrants (for both FY 1998 and FY 1999) a Round One Competitive WtW Grant, and a share of the Governor's 15 percent Discretionary funds. TANF funds and a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts also support elements of the GPW program.

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s):

In contrast to TANF-funded and other work-oriented program options available to welfare recipients in Philadelphia, GPW focuses on individuals nearing or past the state's two-year time limit for work participation. As was noted, the RSC programs target primarily job-ready recipients. In contrast, Phil@Work targets harder-to-place welfare recipients who have little or no work experience. Specialized programs targeting eligible teen parents and noncustodial parents are also offered.

Enrollment:

As of October 1999, GPW had enrolled approximately 8,000 WtW participants. As of December 1999, 1,200 had enrolled in the Phil@Work program.

Outreach and Referral:

In keeping with the "client choice" philosophy of welfare reform in Pennsylvania, formal media campaigns have been a major part of Philadelphia's WtW outreach strategy. In the first year of WtW, PWDC ran a comprehensive promotional campaign in print, radio, television, and billboards on public transit buses and trains, targeting both potential employers and TANF recipients about to reach their two-year time limit. A subsequent campaign, aimed at encouraging welfare recipients to consider GPW program options, ran in the second year. Together, these campaigns triggered more than 40,000 calls to a permanent toll-free GPW information hotline, included with all media spots and advertisements.

Staff from the RSCs and Phil@Work are also outstationed in the CAO district offices to make presentations at client orientation sessions and to recruit and pre-screen potentially eligible TANF recipients. The only way a welfare recipient can actually reach a GPW program, however, is through her/his CAO caseworker, who acts as the gatekeeper to all work-oriented programs. CAO caseworkers determine whether the client is required to participate in work activities and refer clients to a suitable work activity.

Employment-Related Services:

The RSCs represent a rapid job attachment model. After attending a brief general orientation, clients participate in two weeks of combined job readiness (for 1 ½ hours each day) and directed job search activities (for four hours each day). The program's objective is for clients to find unsubsidized jobs within this two-week period. Hence, each RSC has job developers who identify existing work opportunities and generate new ones by working directly with employers. Employment opportunities are posted in job boards. RSC job developers also organize job fairs for program participants. RSC participants who fail to secure employment within 30 days from enrollment must be placed in paid community service positions (while continuing to search for work). Alternatively, they can be referred to the Phil@Work program or referred back to their CAO caseworker for re-evaluation and assignment to another program or exemption from work requirements (as appropriate). Once RSC participants become employed, employment advisors maintain contact with them for up to one year to promote job retention. During the first month of employment, the RSC employment advisors contact participants several times each week. For the next two months, staff aims to maintain semi-monthly, in-person contacts. After that, staff tries to maintain monthly contact with both RSC participants and their employers.

In contrast to the RSCs' rapid attachment philosophy, the Transitional Work Corporation's Phil@Work program represents a supported work model. Individuals referred to Phil@Work are immediately placed on TWC's payroll, receiving minimum wage (\$5.15 per hour) for 25 hours per week for up to the six-month duration of the core program. (Participants' TANF grants are adjusted to take into account this income minus their earnings disregard.) Program participation begins with a two-week orientation, which provides an overview of Phil@Work and covers basic job-readiness topics. During the second week of orientation, participants interview for and are placed in their "transitional work" assignments. Clients can choose positions from three occupational areas (clerical, custodial, or health) in government agencies or not-for-profits, and are paid by the hours worked by TWC. While in "transitional work," participants spend 3 ½ consecutive days at their assigned work sites and 1 ½ days in "wraparound training." Wraparound training is designed to help participants improve their language or math skills, attain a GED, and/or learn computer and other marketable job skills. Participants are also assigned a "work partner" at their transitional work sites, who supervises the Phil@Work participants and provides biweekly assessments of job performance to TWC career advisors. These TWC staff members serve as the participants' case managers while engaged in transitional work and afterwards, once placed in unsubsidized employment. Once deemed job-ready or after their fifth month of transitional employment, Phil@Work participants are brought back to TWC to commence unsubsidized job search. Placement assistance is provided by staff from both the RSCs and the TWC. To promote job retention, career advisors maintain at least monthly telephone contact with those Phil@Work participants who find unsubsidized employment.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

Several features of PWDC's Greater Philadelphia Works program are innovative and/or noteworthy. First, the Phil@Work program features a six-month paid, highly coached, and closely monitored work experience. Thus, it represents a promising model aimed at helping the hardest-to-employ recipients of public assistance obtain valuable work experience and overcome barriers to self-sufficiency. To provide additional support and incentives for retention, Phil@Work participants who secure unsubsidized positions become eligible for a maximum of \$800 in retention bonuses (after 150 days of continuous employment). To help offset the burden imposed on work partners, TWC also pays \$50 per month per participant to the transitional work supervisors or employers of Phil@Work participants. Finally, to promote career/wage advancement among WtW participants, GPW's performance-based contracts with RSC operators feature a schedule of *bonuses* for wage progression among placed participants (in addition to payments for service delivery, job placement, and retention), as well as for enrolling and helping participants complete career training programs.

Grantee: The City of Phoenix—EARN Alliance

Location: Phoenix, Arizona

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: Arizona administers its TANF, Food Stamps, and child care programs (as well as the Unemployment Insurance program and One-Stop Career Centers/Job Service) through the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES). DES screens TANF recipients and provides a two-week job readiness class and job search/job club. All other services are provided by contractors. The City’s Human Services Department (HSD) is the main TANF case management and sanctioning services contractor in the Phoenix Area.

EARN, a non-profit organization housed within the City of Phoenix HSD/ Employment and Training Division, was created specifically in response to DOL’s RFP for WtW Competitive Grants. EARN was created to address the needs of current and potential TANF residents in the City’s Enterprise Community (EC). The EARN Alliance is one of the primary organizations to which DES can refer clients for services.

Key Partners: Originally, EARN contracted with two organizations—Marriott Corporation and Mesa Community College—to provide a two-week, on-site, job readiness course. At the time of our site visit, EARN had recently terminated its contract with Mesa, but was formalizing an agreement directly with Mesa’s subcontractor, Interview, Coaching, and Preparation Services (ICPS), Inc. to provide a third week of job readiness training that incorporates peer support, mentoring, and support groups for EARN participants. EARN has also partnered with a third organization, Chicanos Por La Causa (CPLC), Inc. to provide services to monolingual Spanish speaking participants and other participants in need of GED and adult education services. Finally, EARN has partnered with the City’s High Performance Learning Project (HPL) to provide: (1) a week of job search and placement services for all participants immediately after the three week job readiness course and (2) a post-employment distance learning course offered on computer to some participants.

Program Model(s): EARN incorporates three strategies into its WtW program: (1) assist WtW clients through barriers that prevent them from working, (2) partner with small employers in the EC and provide them with incentives to hire EARN participants, and (3) provide WtW participants opportunities to engage in distance learning and provide ongoing case management to improve job retention and advancement in the workplace.

During the first year of the grant, the program focused on start-up and pre-employment activities. During the second year of the grant, the focus has shifted toward post-employment. This shift has inspired some restructuring within the organization.

Number of Program Offices/Locations:

EARN has one office, located in the heart of the EC. Services are also provided at contractors' offices.

Funding Sources:

Round One Competitive Grant

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target Population(s): EARN does not specifically target individuals with any particular barriers, but because the grant focus is that area in and around Phoenix's 75 percent Hispanic EC—it is, by default, targeting members of the Hispanic community, many of whom have limited English skills. A recent grant modification expanded its target population from individuals residing within the EC only, to individuals residing within and just outside the borders of the EC. To date, EARN has not served and does not have immediate plans to serve noncustodial parents.

Enrollment:

As of April 2000, over 500 participants had enrolled in EARN.

Outreach and Referral:

EARN's Outreach Specialist Unit is responsible for all client recruitment activities. Outreach Specialists are current or former EARN participants who are hired—just as they are by any other area employer—after completing the Marriott/ICPS job readiness course. Two of the Outreach Specialists speak Spanish.

Outreach methods include making repeated telephone calls, posting flyers, sending mailings and bill stuffers, speaking at DES orientations and community events, and going door-to-door at public housing developments and apartment complexes. Outreach Specialists carry application forms with them, which can be filled out on the spot. They also receive monthly lists of TANF recipients from DES from which to recruit. To help with the recruitment effort, EARN has designed a number of promotional items (e.g., brightly colored pens and pads, refrigerator magnets with the EARN logo and address, etc.) and has started a word-of-mouth incentive program (e.g., giving out movie tickets to everyone who successfully refers someone into the program). Originally, the majority of program participants were located by door-to-door canvassing of the estimated 3,600 TANF households within the EC and through presentations at community events. More recently, however, the most effective methods have been mass marketing through paid television advertising during the shows that are most popular among the target population and through personal referrals.

Employment-Related Services:

EARN offers a continuum of services from pre-employment to post-employment job retention. Most clients attend three weeks of pre-employment classes. During this time, a Career Facilitation Specialist assigned to the client at intake/orientation continues to work with the client, assisting the client with any issues that arise, such as transportation, child care, or referrals for other services.

If the client is considered job-ready at the completion of the three-week pre-employment phase, her case is moved to the Business Specialist unit. The first week

of employment implementation, provided by the HPL project, includes several scheduled tours and interviews with HPL partner companies. In addition, one hour per day is spent using the HPL pre-employment curriculum using computers at EARN.

Some clients are hired by HPL partners during the week of job search activities with HPL. For those who have not received a job offer, the Business Specialist works individually with each client. Activities include job interviews and tours, improving resumes and interview skills, and working on pre-employment skills or basic keyboarding using computer-based programs at EARN. Those clients who need to develop their job skills further are placed in subsidized employment.

Clients become the responsibility of the Retention unit when they are placed in a job (either subsidized or unsubsidized). In-house, post-employment services include counseling, vouchers, and clothing. GED and ESL instruction is contracted out. Other services are provided by referral. There is no time limit for retention services and retention services are provided to all participants. EARN staff make employer visits frequently. More frequent contact, including home visits and worksite visits as needed, is provided for those clients that have issues affecting their employment. For those participants who are in the High Performance Learning program, EARN gets additional feedback via computer that indicates the frequency with which clients are using the HPL program and how they are progressing through the curriculum.

For clients who have been employed one year, EARN provides counseling, encouraging them to move up in their company or move on if they are ready. Clients may come in on their own at one year to attend resume writing classes or to update their resumes (which are kept on disk at EARN).

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

EARN offers examples of innovations or promising practices with respect to outreach, client participant incentives, and relationships with employers. Two innovations should be noted with respect to EARN's outreach efforts—the use of former participants as outreach workers and the use of television spots during shows that are likely to be popular with potential clients. Clients receive “EARN cash” for attending all classes, doing well in a class, etc. These incentive “coupons” can be used at the “store” operated by EARN, which contains donated clothing, make-up samples, and other items clients need to dress for the workplace.

EARN has established relationships with a number of large employers in the Phoenix area. For these employers, EARN provides a pool of applicants and transportation to/from job interviews. The personal support provided by EARN helps employers retain workers—employers can call EARN if there is a problem with a worker such as attendance. Employers generally have one liaison to work with at EARN, which employers found helpful.

Grantee: Human Resource Development Foundation, Inc.

Location: West Virginia (29 County Area)

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The Human Resource Development Foundation, Inc. (HRDF), has used its WtW Round Two Competitive Grant to design and implement the Comprehensive Employment Program (CEP) in 29 mostly rural counties of West Virginia. The program provides a four-week job readiness workshop, work experience, job placement assistance, skills enhancement, case management, and a range of supportive services. Through CEP, HRDF program administrators intended to build a service delivery system that could reach out to TANF clients “trapped” in rural areas, where there are limited opportunities for skills enhancement and job placement. CEP is intended to link them to more urbanized areas (i.e., “hubs”) where resources and jobs are more readily available. HRDF has divided the 29 counties it is serving into six districts. Each district has a city that acts as a “hub” for service delivery. The hubs are in cities with well-developed infrastructures, fairly strong labor markets (with low unemployment and job opportunities), and opportunities for skills upgrading.

Key Partners: The structure of CEP is relatively uncomplicated, with HRDF serving as the Competitive WtW Grant recipient, designing and implementing the service delivery system, and directly providing most services. Its principal partner in the effort is the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources (DHHR), the state TANF agency. DHHR local offices provide all referrals to the WtW program. While DHHS and HRDF together provide a wide range of employment, education, job training, and support services, when necessary HRDF refers program participants to other local social service agencies including ABE/GED courses provided by local education authorities, WIA/JTPA-funded training provided through local workforce development agencies, rehabilitation services provided by the West Virginia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, and a variety of other local human services agencies.

Program Model(s): HRDF’s CEP program is designed to provide WtW-eligible TANF recipients (and, if a referral network can be established, a small number of noncustodial parents) with pathways to economic independence and long-term employment by providing opportunities to obtain work experience, job training, counseling, enhanced supportive services, job readiness, job search assistance, job placement assistance, financial assistance, and mentoring. Drawing on its experience from the Supported Work Demonstration, the approach underlying HRDF’s CEP program is to gradually increase the level of stress on the participant. As a result, a key emphasis of the program is on providing supported work experience over an extended period (usually about six months).

Number of Program Offices/Locations:

CEP program services are provided principally by six “hub” offices established and operated by HRDF. The offices are distributed around the 29 county service area in an effort to make services accessible to all eligible clients.

Funding Sources:

WtW Round Two Competitive Grant

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s):

HRDF’s Competitive Grant is available to all WtW-eligible TANF recipients residing within the 29-county service area. HRDF is planning to serve 50 noncustodial parents. While the program is not specifically targeted beyond the eligibility requirements of the WtW legislation, because of the counties involved, many served by the program come from small towns and rural areas. The program is serving many outlying areas in mountainous regions of the state that have no public transportation and are often difficult to reach even by car.

Enrollment:

As of December 1999, a total of 395 TANF recipients had been enrolled by HRDF under the WtW Competitive Grant.

Outreach and Referral:

DHHR local offices have been the sole source of referrals of WtW-eligible individuals to HRDF hubs. DHHR family support staff refer many of their most difficult-to-serve participants—those facing multiple and serious barriers to employment—to HRDF. HRDF staff notify local DHHR offices of when the next WtW session will be held in their county. DHHR family support specialists discuss work requirements and referral options with each TANF recipient before referral occurs. If the family support specialist determines that HRDF’s program is best suited to provide the services needed by the WtW-eligible TANF recipient and an HRDF workshop is scheduled in the coming weeks in the county, the family support specialist completes and forwards a referral form to the appropriate HRDF hub office.

Employment-Related Services:

All participants are required first to attend and successfully complete a four-week, 100-hour orientation and job readiness workshop. Each individual receives a training-related payment (referred to as a “stipend”) of \$1.60 for each hour in the workshop or in transit to and from the workshop. Major topics covered in the four-week workshop include the following: self-esteem, assertiveness/ aggressiveness, motivation, self-management, time management, domestic violence, self-awareness, decision-making, career identification, resumes, goal setting, communication, meaning and value of work, employment skills, interviewing techniques, and interpersonal skills. Immediately following the workshop, CEP participants are placed into some type of work activity (subsidized or unsubsidized). In most instances, participants are placed in a supportive work experience slot, generally with a public or non-profit organization (referred to as Occupational Exploration or OE), though a small proportion of participants—those with job skills and experience—enter into work experience slots with private sector employers (referred to as Occupational Exploration Toward Employment or OETE). While involved in an

OETE or OE, the participant continues to receive his/her TANF benefits, supplemented by a stipend of \$1.60 per hour worked paid by HRDF. In addition to providing work experience and an opportunity to enhance employability, HRDF is hopeful that OE/OETE employers will hire workers once they see the individual perform on the job. Where possible, HRDF involves participants in skills enhancement activities—basic skills and/or vocational training—while they are involved in OETE. CEP participants are expected to conduct their own job search, but are provided with job leads where feasible and ongoing counseling and assistance in finding a job. HRDF also uses OJT slots as one strategy for moving individuals into full-time unsubsidized employment. Job retention and advancement is an important focus of HRDF's program design, which includes wage supplements, employment incentive payments, and ongoing job support provided by peer mentors and HRDF staff.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

Because the service area is large and for the most part rural, a key feature of HRDF's WtW program is providing the transportation needed to facilitate participation in the job readiness workshop, skills enhancement activities, work experience, and other CEP activities. HRDF has 21 vehicles (including vans, four-wheel drive jeeps, and passenger cars) purchased through a state government surplus program. District offices often use CEP participants to operate the vehicles (an activity that counts toward meeting TANF work requirements) to pick up and transport other participants to CEP activities. In addition, where necessary and to supplement assistance available under TANF, HRDF provides bus passes/tickets, subsidies for car insurance (liability), emergency vehicle repair, and reimbursement for mileage.

To encourage participants to stay in the program and retain work, the program offers participants several types of financial incentives: (1) stipends of \$1.60 per hour for participants involved in job readiness workshop, job training, and other project activities; (2) wage supplements for up to 24 weeks for individuals placed in lower-wage jobs; and (3) retention bonuses at 90 and 180 days after job placement. HRDF supplements the wages of CEP participants in unsubsidized jobs who earn less than \$7.75 per hour for the first 24 weeks of employment. The payment scale for supplements is graduated so that individuals earning less receive higher supplements and those supplements are reduced over time. The 24-week period is broken down into three 8-week periods in which participants receive an hourly wage supplement to bring wages up to the following amounts: first eight weeks, \$7.75; second eight weeks, \$6.80; and third eight weeks, \$5.80. In addition, all individuals placed in unsubsidized jobs receive an employment incentive payment of \$200 after the first 90 days of employment and an additional \$300 after the second 90 days of employment (i.e., for a total of \$500), if they are employed at least 32 hours a week during the respective periods.

Grantee: **Tri-Valley Private Industry Council**

Location: Yakima, Washington

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The Tri-Valley Private Industry Council (PIC) is the WIA administrative entity serving Yakima, Kittitas, and Klickitat counties. WtW services are offered primarily through three contract service providers. WtW services for noncustodial parents (NCPs) are offered through the WtW-funded Support Has Rewarding Effects (SHARE) program, a collaborative effort of the Division of Child Support Enforcement, the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and one of the three WtW contractors.

Key Partners: Major partners include the Washington Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS; the state TANF and child support enforcement agency) and three contractor service providers. DSHS is the primary source of referrals of WtW-eligible TANF clients to the contractors. The Division of Child Support Enforcement (DCSE) within DSHS is the primary source of referrals to the WtW program for noncustodial parents (NCPs). The three contractors are People for People (PfP), Yakima Valley OIC, and the Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic. The PIC serves as an administrative and organizing entity facilitating meetings, fulfilling reporting requirements, and distributing referrals among the three contractors.

Program Model(s): Tri-Valley's WtW program is based on an individualized, work-focused approach. Each of the three service providers offers individualized case management and services tailored to meet individual needs. Services include job search assistance, direct job placement, placement in subsidized work positions, and supportive services.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: As of March 2000, WtW services were offered primarily through the offices of the three contract service providers. YVFWC is located nearby the Yakima Nation Reservation, providing services to both tribal members as well as residents of the southern part of the county. In addition to its main office in Yakima, PfP also has three satellite offices throughout the three-county service area.

Funding Sources: Formula WtW Subgrant, State Formula WtW Matching Funds, Governor's 15 Percent Funds

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target Population(s): In addition to serving all WtW-eligible TANF recipients, the Tri-Valley PIC program also serves eligible noncustodial parents. There is no additional targeting of eligible subpopulations.

Enrollment:

A total of 651 individuals were enrolled as of the end of May 2000.

Outreach and Referral:

The primary source of clients for the WtW program is referrals from the Department of Social and Health Services. Referrals of noncustodial parents are generated by the Division of Child Support Enforcement within DSHS. To enhance the identification of WtW-eligible clients, in the spring of 2000 the Tri-Valley PIC hired an individual to temporarily focus on screening TANF clients in the mandatory job search workshop for WtW eligibility.

Employment-Related Services:

Washington's TANF program, WorkFirst, requires that all non-exempt clients participate in a job search workshop as their first activity. Clients who are unable to obtain employment through the workshop may then be referred to contract service providers for further assistance with their transition from welfare to work. One referral option is to the WtW program. Clients referred to a WtW contractor can receive additional assistance seeking an unsubsidized job, or may be placed in a paid work experience position. These positions are most often with non-profit community based organizations and are intended to provide the client experience and work maturity skills. Employers are not expected to hire clients at the end of the subsidy period. The WtW program provides ongoing case management services throughout a client's involvement with the program and, in addition, provides supplemental supportive services beyond what can be funded by TANF.

Innovative Practices and/or Services:

The Tri-Valley WtW program is characterized by high levels of collaboration among the PIC, its WtW contractors, and the TANF agency (DSHS). This local level collaboration is in part responsive to local planning efforts required by DSHS and planning required to implement the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Although these local planning efforts are required, coordination between the PIC and its three contractors is also based on long-standing working relationships among these key members of the workforce development community. Additionally, the PIC has had a long-standing role as a facilitator of local initiatives and organizer of workforce development services in the communities it serves.

In addition to the work-related services noted above, the WtW grant is being used to expand the availability of transportation services. People for People has received a supplemental WtW grant to help fund a van service available to participants in programs offered by TANF, WtW, and the Employment Security Department.

Finally, as noted above, WtW services are made available to eligible noncustodial parents through the SHARE program. Potentially eligible NCPs are referred by the child support agency to the Prosecuting Attorney's Office where WtW services are presented as an opportunity to assist parents in obtaining a job so that they may fulfill their child support obligations. This process is described as a contempt avoidance strategy. That is, if the noncustodial parent does not find a job on his own, or participate in WtW, in an effort to meet child support obligations, he will face the possibility of being held in contempt of court and jailed. Clients wishing to avoid contempt proceedings are referred to People for People for WtW services similar to those provided to other WtW participants.

Grantee: Johns Hopkins University (JHU), Institute for Policy Studies
SCANS/2000 Center

Location: Seven program sites across the country (study sites include Catonsville, MD, Long Beach, CA, and Ft. Pierce, FL)

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Program Structure: The SCANS/2000 Center received a grant to establish a skills assessment and career ladder advancement program called the Career Transcript System at subgrantee community colleges across the country. JHU funds programs over two phases at community colleges that had previous experience in workforce development and/or welfare programs. JHU grants fund case managers called Workplace Liaisons at each site, while subgrantees or their partner TANF or workforce development agencies provide office space, materials and supplies along with supervision of program staff. JHU furnishes their subgrantees with assessment and evaluation tools for use with employers and employees, a database for participant Career Transcripts, and training and ongoing assistance and advice in program design and operations.

Key Partners: Major partners with the community colleges are workforce development service providers (in at least one case the program is housed in the One Stop) and/or local TANF offices, both as referral sources and to provide access to supportive services for CTS participants.

Program Model(s): The Career Transcript System is designed to enroll already employed, current and former TANF recipients and to assess, document, and improve workplace skills. Workplace Liaisons work with employed individuals and their employers to help participants retain jobs and ultimately identify and move up a career ladder. Video-based assessments of participants' interactive, listening or other general workplace skills are conducted at the outset by Workplace Liaisons. Employers (usually the immediate supervisors) review a list of 37 workplace skills and choose 6 to 7 skills most important to successfully perform the job held by the participant. Information from this review is then combined with scores from the video-based assessments to create a participant-specific evaluation that employers complete, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the participant they employ. Liaisons use both the evaluation and assessments to plan a strategy to strengthen specific skills via counseling, coaching, or referring participants to education and training opportunities. They help mediate interactions between participants and their workplace supervisors when conflicts or difficulties arise, and may also help participants address personal needs or gain access to supportive services. Participants are retested and reevaluated at regular intervals, with all assessments, evaluations, and improvements documented in an on-line Career Transcript.

Number of Program Offices/Locations: As of September 2000, CTS programs were being operated or implemented at seven locations. Participating colleges are: Indian River Community College in Fort Pierce, FL; Community Colleges of Baltimore County, Catonsville, MD; Long Beach City College in Long Beach, CA; City Colleges of Chicago, IL; Eastern Iowa Community

College in Davenport, IA; Manchester and Tunxis Community Colleges in Hartford, CT; and Mount Hood and Portland Community Colleges in Portland, OR.

Funding Sources: Round Two multi-site Competitive Grant, and in-kind contributions by subgrantees and local partner agencies (some subgrantees have also received small grants from local foundations or other sources to support program operations)

SERVICES AND PROGRAM FOCUS

Target

Population(s): This program is not targeting any specific sub-populations other than the general WtW-eligible population. However, the program enrolls individuals who are already employed, as it is a post-employment program.

Enrollment: A total of 354 people were enrolled as of September 2000.

Outreach and Referral:

CTS programs identify and enroll participants in two ways. They may receive individual referrals from TANF and/or Welfare-to-Work providers or vendors seeking post-employment services for their clients (referral sources and processes differ among subgrantees depending on the structure of local TANF and WtW programs, and on the specific relationships between the community college and provider agencies). Participation is voluntary and requires agreement by the participant's employer (who participates in evaluations and usually allows the Liaison access to the participant at the worksite) as well. A second approach is to contact employers who are likely to have eligible employees and, once agreement to participate is obtained, identify and recruit eligible employees at the worksite.

Employment-Related Services:

Although Workplace Liaisons often help their clients address a variety of job- and family-related needs, as well as helping them to access services such as transportation, child care, housing or various treatment programs, the focus of the Career Transcript System is on general workplace skills (often called soft skills). The program offers a systematic way to measure and document both the levels and changes in these skills over time as participants gain workplace experience in entry-level jobs, as well as to help them identify longer-term employment goals and objectives. In some cases, Liaisons must help their clients find employment in order to retain them in the CTS program when they have left or lost a job, though this was not a part of the original program design.

In addition to providing individualized services to participants, Liaisons can conduct workplace seminars or provide employee or supervisor training courses or materials at the request of participating employers. These services can be provided by the Liaisons themselves, or through the community college or workforce development partner(s). The employer often pays a fee for these programs or services.

***Innovative Practices
and/or Services:***

The Career Transcript System provides ongoing (and often intensive and extensive) services to support job retention in cooperation with both WtW-eligible participants and their employers and immediate supervisors. This active participation by the employer is one unique feature of the program, which seeks to address the high cost of turnover as well as the need of some employers for improved employee evaluation and supervision tools and approaches. It offers employers assistance in working with entry-level employees with little job experience, and provides a structure (via the assessment and evaluation materials and procedures) for working with low-skilled and inexperienced individuals to improve retention. This program design facilitates regular, ongoing interaction with program participants over a period up to a year or more.

