

SECTION B
ORGANIZING AND GOVERNING
ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

This page intentionally left blank.

Insert blank page here when making double-sided copies.

1. GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT: THE STATE ROLE

INTRODUCTION

The One-Stop initiative depends on the inter-related and simultaneous transformation of workforce development systems at the federal, state, and local levels. Each level of government involved in this system-change initiative must exhibit leadership, the ability to innovate, and a willingness to compromise if the initiative is to succeed in transforming the workforce development services available to individuals and firms into seamless customer-driven services.

In the nine first-round One-Stop Implementation Grant states, states took on leadership roles to guide three aspects of system development. To guide the organizational development of One-Stop state and local systems, the study states undertook the following:

- Negotiated agreements from relevant state and local agencies to join together in implementing One-Stop systems.
- Developed state-level governance structures for One-Stop efforts, which included identifying entities responsible for policy guidance and day-to-day administration of One-Stop system development.
- Developed guidelines for local One-Stop systems to follow in developing their own governance and management structures.

The study states often used activities including the following to guide the development of the infrastructure needed to support One-Stop operations:

- Prepared automated user-friendly information products for self-service use by business and individual customers within One-Stop systems.
- Designed and developed the information technology needed to support the delivery of information products to customers and the exchange of information among One-Stop agency partners.
- Designed performance measurement systems to assess system accomplishments and guide system improvements.

To guide the development of One-Stop services, the study states in most cases:

- Generated and disseminated a common state vision of how One-Stop systems should be organized, how services should be transformed, and how One-Stop centers should fit together into statewide systems.
- Developed guidelines for local One-Stop systems to follow in developing their own One-Stop designs and implementation plans.
- Promoted communication and coordination among state and local One-Stop partners during the system-building process, which included brainstorming possible solutions to implementation difficulties and sharing best practices.

In this chapter, we review these leadership activities as they relate to states' efforts to guide the organizational development of One-Stop systems and the design and delivery of One-Stop services. The roles states played in guiding and developing the various sub-systems needed to support One-Stop operations—including physical facilities, information systems, capacity building efforts, financing, marketing, and performance assessment systems—are discussed within the chapters (3 through 8) describing each of these sub-systems individually.

GOALS FOR GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

Overall state goals for promoting the organizational development of One-Stop systems and guiding the design and delivery of One-Stop services included the following:

1. Building effective state partnerships involving all of the important stakeholders in One-Stop system planning and implementation.
2. Creating state-level structures to govern and manage One-Stop system development.
3. Guiding the development of local One-Stop systems and centers.
4. Promoting communication about and coordination of One-Stop system-building efforts among state and local partners.

Although states' overall goals for guiding One-Stop systems were generally similar, the strategies each state used to develop state partnerships, govern One-Stop systems, guide local One-Stop system development, and coordinate activities among One-Stop partners varied substantially. Below, we describe the different approaches the states used to further each of these goals.

GOAL 1. BUILDING EFFECTIVE STATE PARTNERSHIPS TO GUIDE ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

As described in Exhibit 1-1, the study states all involved a wide range of state agencies in planning their One-Stop systems. In each state, these One-Stop planning partners included the agencies, divisions, or offices responsible for the six mandated DOL-funded programs—Employment Services (ES), Unemployment Insurance (UI), Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS), Older Worker programs funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act, and programs administered under Titles II and III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Each of the study states also included the state agencies responsible for adult basic education, vocational rehabilitation, income maintenance, and welfare-to-work programs. In addition, most states included the state agencies responsible for overseeing the state post-secondary education system (particularly community and technical colleges), elementary and secondary education, and business and economic development.

In developing state-level One-Stop partnerships and guiding local partnership formation, the study states used several different approaches to involve a wide range of workforce development programs and services. One common organizational strategy was to build state interagency work groups to promote collaboration by different state and local agencies in One-Stop planning and oversight. Another organizational strategy—undertaken by some of the study states prior to receiving the One-Stop implementation grant and by others after receiving the grant—was to consolidate authority for multiple workforce development programs within a single state agency or designate a single state agency as the lead agency for the One-Stop initiative.

Developing Structures to Promote Interagency Collaboration

Most of the first-round implementation grant states began by developing work groups to promote interagency discussion about the design of One-Stop systems. In many states, these work groups were designed to involve middle- and upper-level managers of the relevant state agencies in frank and informal discussions about how they could collaborate to improve customer services. Interagency work groups or planning teams were usually distinguished from the formal policy boards with official responsibility for overseeing state workforce development policy. In contrast to the formal policy boards, they were established to do the “real work” of inventing a new workforce development service approach and delivery system that would minimize

**Exhibit 1-1
State Agencies Involved in One-Stop Planning**

	CT	IN	IA	MD	MA ¹	MN	OH	TX	WI
Number of State Agency Planning Partners²	5	6	6/3	6	7	5	7	7/1	8/7
Agency Responsible for Program/Service:									
Employment Services/Unemployment Insurance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Job Training Partnership Act, Title II	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
JTPA Title III and other programs for dislocated workers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community or Technical College System	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
K-12 Education System	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vocational Education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

¹State agencies were originally involved in planning task forces in Massachusetts. However, state agencies are no longer involved in day-to-day planning or oversight, because of interagency tensions, although they have agreed to provide funds to support career center operations through Interagency Service Agreements with the MassJobs Council.

²Where there are two numbers, the first number is the number of state agency partners involved prior to consolidation of responsibilities for workforce development programs; the second number is the number of state agency partners involved after agency consolidation.

Exhibit 1-1 (Continued)

Agencies Responsible for Program/Service	CT	IN	IA	MD	MA	MN	OH	TX	WI
Income Maintenance and Welfare-to-Work programs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Economic Development	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Adult Basic Education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Additional Partners:									
Vocational Education	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Department of Aging/Elder Affairs			✓				✓	✓	
Department of Mental Health					✓				
Department of Corrections									✓
Veterans Affairs							✓		✓
Community Service							✓	✓	

duplication of effort by customers or across partner agencies and encourage the emergence of integrated workforce development services at the local service delivery level.

Exhibit 1-2 describes the interagency work groups that evolved in selected case study states. Often, these groups included representatives from both state-level and local-level One-Stop partner agencies, an arrangement based on the understanding that some workforce development and education programs (such as ES and U I) have a strong tradition of state administration, while others (such as JTPA and primary and secondary education programs) have a strong tradition of local control. In most states, One-Stop interagency work groups were broad in scope and involved the agencies responsible for each of the recommended programs listed above.

Interagency work groups were used by all the study states during the early stages of One-Stop planning. In addition to overseeing system development as a whole, these work groups often formed subcommittees or task groups to take responsibility for developing state One-Stop strategies for particular aspects of system development, such as marketing, capacity-building, designing self-service options, and developing consolidated information systems. Although their participatory decision-making process sometimes made it difficult for these groups to make decisions quickly, interagency work groups succeeded in giving a large number of agencies a voice in state-level One-Stop planning.

In a number of states, interagency work groups continued to function as One-Stop executive committees during the first year of One-Stop implementation. Other states found that interagency structures were either less workable or less necessary during One-Stop implementation. For example, in Massachusetts, the emergence of the MassJobs Council as the lead One-Stop administrator—responsible for convincing existing public agencies to transfer funds and program responsibilities to newly chartered career center operators—made continuing dialogue between the state agencies previously responsible for One-Stop programs and the council difficult to maintain. In both Iowa and Texas, the creation of a new consolidated workforce development agency during the early stages of One-Stop implementation also changed the dynamics of interagency collaboration. In these states, there was a shift over time from interagency collaboration to internal management of the One-Stop initiative by the new lead One-Stop agency, as further described below.

Exhibit 1-2
Examples of Interagency Committees
Formed to Support One-Stop Development

Connecticut	An Interagency Statewide Planning Committee has assumed the lead in implementing statewide One-Stop implementation policy. With representation from both state agencies and local workforce development boards, this committee includes the state agencies responsible for ES/UI/JTPA, welfare/vocational rehabilitation, K-12 education, higher education, and economic and community development.
Iowa	<p>During One-Stop planning efforts, an interagency Workforce Development Management Team included representation from all state partner agencies including the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES and UI, welfare, education/vocational rehabilitation, and others.</p> <p>Since the creation of a consolidated workforce development agency responsible for ES/UI/JTPA, the remaining independent state-level partners have had a harder time collaborating as equals with the “lead” Workforce Development Department on One-Stop planning issues.</p>
Indiana	An informal One-Stop Advisory Council oversees the details of One-Stop implementation. The council includes representatives of the SHRIC and representatives of state and local workforce development agencies, including the state agencies responsible for ES/UI/JTPA/workforce literacy/vocational and technical education, welfare/vocational rehabilitation, commerce, and education. Additional members include representatives of the community college system, labor unions, the state chamber of commerce, and employers.
Massachusetts	During the early stages of One-Stop planning, seven interagency work groups promoted participation in One-Stop planning by a variety of state agency representatives. However, during the first implementation year, several interagency committees made up of high-level staff from participating agencies tried to maintain ongoing coordination linkages but failed.

Exhibit 1-2 (Continued)

Maryland	The CareerNet Steering Committee is made up of representatives of key state and local partner agencies. State agencies represented include the agencies responsible for ES/UI/JTPA, welfare, K-12 education/school to work/vocational rehabilitation, higher education, and business and economic development.
Minnesota	A Workforce Center System Issues Team includes key state and local workforce center partners. This group met twice a month during the first implementation year to address implementation issues.
Ohio	A One-Stop Governance Council with representation from all participating state agencies and departments oversees hands-on planning and development of the One-Stop system. Members of the Governance Council lead individual interagency work teams on specific implementation issues.

Consolidating Workforce Development Authority

Consolidating authority for multiple workforce development programs within a single state agency was another approach used to facilitate collaboration across programs. Prior to receiving One-Stop implementation grants, a number of the first-round One-Stop states had already consolidated the state-level administration of the Employment Services and Unemployment Insurance programs as part of an effort to achieve integration of services for these two programs at the local level. In addition, six of the nine first-round One-Stop states (Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) already administered the ES, UI, and JTPA programs from within the same state agency.

In response to the One-Stop goal of promoting coordinated planning and service delivery across multiple workforce development programs, four of the nine case study states undertook further consolidation of state workforce development agencies. Organizational reforms in Iowa and Indiana simplified administrative responsibilities for a number of different programs. In Iowa, the formation of the new Department of Workforce Development in July 1996 brought together DOL-funded programs that had been housed previously in three different agencies. Progressive agency consolidation efforts in Indiana also resulted in the formation of a consolidated Workforce Development Department responsible for a broad set of programs. By 1994, Indiana's Workforce Development Department was responsible for JTPA, ES, UI, workforce literacy, vocational and technical education, workforce proficiency standards and the state occupational information coordinating council.

Even more ambitious consolidation efforts were undertaken in Texas and Wisconsin, where the resulting consolidated agencies were responsible for welfare-to-work programs as well as other workforce development programs. A major state reorganization in Wisconsin in July, 1996, merged the agency previously responsible for ES, UI, JTPA, and the school-to-work initiative with the state welfare agency, previously responsible for income maintenance, welfare-to-work programs, and vocational rehabilitation. In June 1996, Texas consolidated the responsibility for workforce development programs previously administered by seven different state agencies within the new Texas Workforce Commission. Among the key programs included were ES, UI, JTPA, Job Corps, literacy programs, welfare-to-work programs, adult education, apprenticeship training, post-secondary vocational and technical training, and school-to-work planning. States that consolidated responsibility for a broad range of workforce development programs within a single agency hoped that this

new arrangement would make it easier to develop unified information systems, intake procedures, service delivery designs, and reporting and accountability systems across these programs. Although this goal was achieved by most states, the mere fact of agency consolidation did not automatically result in the development of a unified agency philosophy, staff, or program regulations. Such unification required continued discussions and negotiations among the members of the new management team of the consolidated agency.

The states that created consolidated agencies with responsibility for welfare-to-work as well as other workforce development programs faced perhaps the most dramatic challenge—that of creating a culture and policies for the new consolidated agency that would simultaneously further both welfare reform and One-Stop customer service objectives. Finding a way to weave together the “work first” philosophy of many state welfare-reform initiatives and the “customer-driven” philosophy guiding the One-Stop initiative was not a simple task, even where both initiatives were housed within a single agency.

In the long run, agency consolidation may very well be a sound strategy for furthering the goal of increased collaboration across programs. However, in the short run, consolidation efforts appeared to divert several One-Stop implementation states from the immediate task of guiding local One-Stop system development, particularly in states that underwent major governmental reorganizations. Because these states needed time to develop an integrated state-level management structure and policy framework for the new consolidated agency, they were less able than other One-Stop states to respond to requests for guidance from local One-Stop implementation sites during the initial months of local One-Stop implementation.

GOAL 2. CREATING STATE-LEVEL STRUCTURES TO GOVERN AND MANAGE ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

Each of the study states developed several different types of One-Stop governance and management structures. These structures were designed to (1) provide policy direction, (2) oversee the planning phase and develop the detailed design of different aspects of the state’s One-Stop system, and (3) provide day-to-day support to and oversight of local One-Stop system development.

Providing Overall Policy Guidance

To guide and oversee the development of One-Stop workforce development systems, each of the study states developed one or more policy boards. Exhibit 1-3 describes the policy boards responsible for guiding One-Stop system building in the different case study states.

In four states—Massachusetts, Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin—a single policy board, designated as the official state human resources investment council (SHRIC), is responsible for providing policy oversight of One-Stop system development as part of its mandate to guide all human resources and workforce development issues. In these states, the SHRICs provide detailed oversight of One-Stop system building, which includes designating service delivery area boundaries, developing criteria for certification of local career centers, and determining which centers and local boards are ready for certification.

Some other states, including Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, and Ohio, have found it helpful to have two policy bodies with different levels of responsibility. These states have developed a two-tiered system of policy guidance for the development of integrated workforce development systems. The first tier consists of the SHRIC or another board mandated to provide broad policy guidance on welfare-to-work, school-to-work, and workforce development topics. These broad policy boards often played a key role in developing the early vision and framework for the state's One-Stop system. The second tier is a more narrowly focused policy body with the responsibility for overseeing the details of One-Stop implementation. The second-tier entities providing detailed One-Stop policy guidance consist variously of a formal state Workforce Development Council (in Iowa), a standing subcommittee of the full SHRIC (in Ohio); a One-Stop advisory council that makes recommendations to the SHRIC (in Indiana); and a designated state lead agency, which shares its policy oversight role with the SHRIC (in Maryland).

Coordinating One-Stop System Planning and Implementation

Across all states, One-Stop interagency task groups or subcommittees have taken on responsibility for developing detailed plans for the different aspects of One-Stop design and implementation. These task groups have been assigned a number of different planning tasks, including addressing issues of state and local governance and accountability for One-Stop systems, developing state-level criteria or blueprints for guiding local One-Stop service design and delivery, and guiding and developing the

**Exhibit 1-3
State One-Stop Policy Boards**

Connecticut	<p>The Connecticut Employment and Training Commission is the policy board designated by the state legislature in 1994 to oversee the development of a statewide system of Job Centers focused on the delivery of workforce development services to the general public.</p> <p>However, the informal Interagency Statewide Planning Committee has assumed the lead role in overseeing the implementation of statewide One-Stop policy.</p>
Iowa	<p>The Council on Human Investment was established in 1993 to provide global policy for welfare reform, economic development, and workforce development.</p> <p>The Iowa Workforce Development Council, created by executive order in 1994 and formalized by the state legislature in 1996, is responsible for guiding the development of local interagency workforce development centers.</p>
Indiana	<p>Indiana has three levels of policy support: (1) The Indiana Policy Council supports interagency and cross-program collaboration by removing barriers between agencies; (2) the State Human Resources Investment Council, formed in 1993, addresses human investment and welfare reform issues and oversees individual workforce development programs; and (3) a One-Stop Advisory Council oversees the administration of the DOL One-Stop Implementation Grant and provides non-binding policy recommendations to One-Stop partners.</p>
Massachusetts	<p>The MassJobs Council, designated as the official state human resources investment council in 1993, is responsible for overseeing state workforce development programs.</p>
Maryland	<p>The Governor’s Workforce Investment Board, established in 1993 as the state human resources investment council, is the original initiator of the statewide One-Stop approach. Day-to-day administration of the One-Stop initiative has now shifted to the Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation.</p>
Minnesota	<p>The Governor’s Workforce Development Council was established as the state human resources investment council in 1995.</p>

Exhibit 1-3 (Continued)

Ohio	<p>The Governor's Human Resources Investment Council was established in 1993 to coordinate economic development, education, and human resource investment services.</p> <p>A One-Stop Standing Committee of the council deals with the details of One-Stop system development.</p>
Texas	<p>The State Council of Workforce and Economic Competitiveness was created in 1993. The council is responsible for making overall recommendations to the governor about school-to-work and welfare-to-work initiatives, as well as identifying local workforce development areas, developing criteria for certifying local workforce development boards, and approving local board plans.</p>
Wisconsin	<p>Initially, a State Human Resource Investment Council was established in December 1994 with oversight over all workforce development programs. This was superseded in 1996 by a smaller Council on Workforce Excellence.</p>

infrastructure needed to support One-Stop operations. In most cases, a number of different task groups have been formed to consider different aspects of each general task. For example, to plan for One-Stop services, most states have convened different task groups on such topics as integrated intake, job-entry assistance, career exploration assistance, uniform assessment, remote access, and employer services. To ensure that the recommendations developed by these groups address concerns of partners at both the state and local level, states have often encouraged participation in task groups by both state and local agency representatives.

Interagency task groups have played different roles during the different stages of One-Stop planning and implementation. In a number of states, interagency task groups began by meeting weekly or bi-weekly during the initial planning stages. Interagency task groups often prepared concept papers proposing state One-Stop policies as they completed their initial planning tasks. After a work group had completed its initial plan, the group's recommendations were usually circulated to other task groups (so that different task groups could coordinate their efforts), to the rest of the One-Stop practitioner community for discussion, and to the state One-Stop governing board for policy action. Some states have continued to use interagency task groups during the first and second years of One-Stop implementation, by reformulating task group assignments and membership as implementation issues have arisen. During the implementation phase, interagency task group meetings have in some cases declined in frequency.

Supporting and Overseeing Local System Development

Once One-Stop policies were approved by the appropriate state-level policy board, the responsibility for managing state One-Stop implementation and supporting and overseeing local One-Stop system development was usually delegated to a state One-Stop project management team housed within a designated lead agency. In most of the study states, the designated lead agency is the agency responsible for the ES, UI, and JTPA programs. In some states—such as Connecticut, Indiana, and Maryland—the agency responsible for the mandatory DOL-funded programs was somewhat narrowly focused on these programs. As a result, the One-Stop initiative in these states took on the identity of a “labor department” initiative, even though a number of other partners had participated in One-Stop system planning. In other states—such as Minnesota—it was emphasized that the ongoing responsibility for One-Stop system implementation was shared equally by the agencies responsible for workforce development, education,

vocational training, and welfare programs, even though a single lead agency had been designated to manage the One-Stop implementation grant.

The individuals assigned to the One-Stop project teams within the lead agency were often recruited from a number of different state agency partners and carefully selected so that several key skills were represented, including (1) familiarity with and enthusiasm about the goal of integrated workforce development services; (2) expertise in a number of the particular implementation issues facing state and local areas (e.g., interagency collaboration, service design, financing, technology, and information system development); and (3) a commitment to state–local collaboration in the system building process.

Several states referred to the staff members of the state One-Stop project team as “brokering agents” for the system as a whole; as such, they helped support partnership building at the state and local level and share information and resources as necessary to keep the overall state One-Stop system building effort on track. Staff within state One-Stop project offices usually described their role as leading, guiding, and supporting local One-Stop implementation efforts—as well as learning from staff in well-developed local systems—rather than as monitoring or auditing local implementation efforts. Specific responsibilities commonly assigned to the members of state One-Stop project teams included the following:

- Coordinating the activities of the different interagency work groups, task groups, and policy boards involved in One-Stop planning and management.
- Serving as the hub for collecting and disseminating information about One-Stop implementation, which included facilitating communication among state partners, between state and local partners, and among local partners.
- Promulgating state guidelines for the formation of local One-Stop policy boards, and the certification of local One-Stop systems and centers.
- Providing technical assistance to local One-Stop implementation sites.

GOAL 3. GUIDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL ONE-STOP SYSTEMS AND CENTERS

In their One-Stop implementation grant applications to the U.S. Department of Labor, states described their plans for building statewide One-Stop systems. As

summarized in Exhibit 1-4, policy makers often described the appropriate state role as providing a coherent vision and guidelines within which local areas could develop specific One-Stop partnerships and designs suited to local conditions. However, the balance between state guidance and local discretion varied widely from state to state. Three of the first-round implementation grant states—Connecticut, Indiana, and Maryland—planned for direct state-level participation in developing and overseeing each One-Stop career center. Five states—Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas—planned to delegate much of the responsibility for local One-Stop system design and oversight to regional workforce development policy boards. These states envisioned that regional policy boards would assume the responsibility for issues such as specifying how many local One-Stop centers would be established, determining who the local One-Stop partner agencies would be (within parameters established by the state), and, in some states, selecting the entities that would provide One-Stop services locally. Wisconsin, the remaining state, gave substantial discretion to local collaborative planning teams in the early stages of One-Stop planning, but at the time of the site visits had not yet established a formal local governance structure to counter-balance state administration of the ongoing One-Stop system.

In the remainder of this section, we describe how the states varied in the guidelines they developed to influence local One-Stop system development. We briefly address the states' roles in guiding the following aspects of One-Stop system development: (1) the development of local One-Stop partnerships, (2) the governance and day-to-day management of local One-Stop systems and individual centers, and (3) the design and delivery of One-Stop services.

Guiding the Development of Local One-Stop Partnerships

Exhibit 1-5 summarizes the guidelines developed by different states regarding the inclusion of different agencies within local One-Stop partnerships. Some of the study states identified the agencies that were required to participate in the development of local One-Stop plans; other states identified the programs that were required to be accessible to customers through local One-Stop centers.

All states required, at a minimum, involvement of the agencies responsible for Employment Services, Unemployment Insurance, Veterans Employment and Training Services, programs funded under Titles II and III of the Job Training Partnership Act, and Older Worker programs under Title V of the Older Americans Act. States required that these agencies be involved in One-Stop planning and that all full-service One-Stop

Exhibit 1-4
State System-Building Goals

Connecticut	Connecticut’s goal is to establish 19 <i>Connecticut Works</i> centers jointly administered by the Connecticut Department of Labor and 9 Regional Workforce Development Boards. Centers will provide a full range of DOL-funded services through co-location and the integration of services among center partners.
Indiana	Indiana’s goal is to establish 26 full-service One-Stop career centers distributed throughout the 16 state planning units, so that every Indiana resident will be within 50 miles of a One-Stop center. Planning, oversight, and evaluation of One-Stop centers will be shared by the Indiana Department of Workforce Development and local policy boards. Full-service centers will be supplemented with additional staffed, unstaffed, and remote access points to automated One-Stop services.
Iowa	Iowa wants to promote development of at least one One-Stop center in each of Iowa’s 16 service delivery areas. The state role is to provide state leadership and encourage local ownership. Detailed designs for local systems are initiated at the local level, in response to criteria established by the state. Local policy boards will ultimately be able to designate One-Stop service providers.
Massachusetts	Each of Massachusetts’ 16 workforce development regions is expected to have at least two competing career centers after the One-Stop transformation is completed. Local One-Stop systems are designed by Regional Employment Boards following state guidelines. The goal is a “centrally-guided, locally-driven” system.
Maryland	Maryland is planning to establish a statewide network consisting of at least 50 staffed One-Stop career centers distributed across its 12 service delivery areas, supplemented by unstaffed career information centers and remote access opportunities. The state provides local areas with automated core One-Stop services and the technology to support them. Local areas may add enhanced services, additional components, and compatible technology.
Minnesota	Minnesota is planning to establish 50 Minnesota Workforce Centers across its 17 workforce service areas. The state goal is to provide state guidance and support local implementation by establishing minimum criteria for certification of local One-Stop centers.

Exhibit 1-4 (Continued)

Ohio	Ohio's initial goal was to establish at least one One-Stop center in each of its 30 service delivery areas. Rather than encouraging a standardized approach, the state encourages the development of multiple models for local One-Stop systems. Full-time co-location of local system partners is not required.
Texas	Texas hoped to have at least one One-Stop center in each of its 28 workforce development areas by the end of 1996. The goal is to guide the development of locally-driven One-Stop systems. Certified local workforce development boards have substantial discretion over the service delivery design and providers used within their local service areas.
Wisconsin	Wisconsin is planning an extended network of 62 Job Centers statewide. The state has developed a general blueprint for what a local Job Center should look like in the form of Job Center standards. Each service delivery area is encouraged to develop at least two full-service centers in addition to additional staffed and self-service sites.

Exhibit 1-5
State Guidelines on Local One-Stop Partnerships

Key:	✓ = Required Local Partner or Program + = Recommended Local Partner								
	CT	IN	IA	MD	MA	MN	OH	TX	WI
Employment Services/Unemployment Insurance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Veterans Employment and Training Services	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Job Training Partnership Act, Title II	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
JTPA Title III and other programs for dislocated workers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Older worker programs under the Older Americans Act	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community or technical college system	+		+	✓		✓	✓		✓
Vocational Rehabilitation and/or Services for the Blind		✓	✓		✓	✓	+		✓
Income maintenance and/or welfare-to-work programs	+	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Adult basic education	+		+			✓	✓	✓	✓

Exhibit 1-5 (Continued)

	Key: ✓ = Required Local Partner or Program + = Recommended Local Partner									
	CT	IN	IA	MD	MA	MN	OH	TX	WI	
Vocational education			+				✓		✓	
USDOL-approved apprenticeships	+	✓								
School-to-work programs			+			+	+	✓		
Migrant/seasonal farmworker programs under Title IV, JTPA			+		+	✓				
Indian and Native American programs under Title IV, JTPA			+			✓				
Homeless programs under McKinney Act			+			✓				
Community Action programs						+				
Programs for displaced homemakers under Carl Perkins Act	+					+				

centers provide information about the eligibility requirements and services from each of these agencies and arrange for appropriate referrals to “make these services accessible to” all One-Stop customers.¹ As described below, however, there was substantial variation in whether states required the co-location of all mandatory One-Stop partners within One-Stop centers.

States’ requirements concerning the participation of non-DOL-funded program partners were less uniform. There was variability in both which agencies were required or encouraged to be included as local One-Stop partners and which were required or encouraged to be located on-site to deliver services to customers at One-Stop centers. Most states either specified or recommended some additional partners. Ohio developed a more complicated scheme, with a second tier of four “optional” partners (at least three of which had to be included in each local system) plus a third tier of “recommended” partners.²

Seven of the nine case study states required local areas to include the agency responsible for welfare-to-work programs as a local One-Stop partner.³ However the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 has introduced uncertainty in many states as to how income maintenance and workforce development agencies will share the responsibility for helping families move from welfare to work and what role One-Stop centers will play in that process. Among the study states, Texas and Wisconsin—the two states in which the One-Stop lead agency is also responsible for administering welfare-to-work services—have arranged for the One-Stop system to be used as the primary delivery system for welfare-to-work services. A similar commitment has apparently been secured in Connecticut, even though the welfare agency was not previously a required local One-Stop partner.

¹The one exception occurred in Massachusetts, which could not arrange for JTPA Title II funds to be allocated to chartered One-Stop career center operators during the first two years of One-Stop implementation, because these funds had already been used to contract with JTPA service providers not associated with the career centers. However career center operators were required to make referral arrangements to provide career center clients access to JTPA services.

² In Exhibit 1-4, we have listed Ohio’s “optional” partners as required, since three of the four partners must be included in each local One-Stop system.

³In Texas, One-Stop centers were required to include the DOL-funded partners at the outset. At the end of the first year of One-Stop operation, they were required to have developed a plan for also incorporating welfare-to-work, adult basic education, and school-to-work programs within local One-Stop centers.

Four of the study states—Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, and Minnesota—required local One-Stop systems to include the agencies responsible for vocational rehabilitation services as planning partners. Rather than requiring co-location of staff providing vocational rehabilitation services at One-Stop facilities, most states require only that centers ensure that One-Stop customers will “have access to” vocational rehabilitation services. Minnesota, however, calls for the co-location of vocational rehabilitation staff within One-Stop centers and the integration of rehabilitation services with all other required One-Stop services.

Three case study states—Maryland, Ohio, and Wisconsin—call for community or technical college systems to be included in the One-Stop planning process and ongoing local One-Stop partnerships. These states view such institutions as valuable partners not only in providing enhanced education and training services to individual students but also in offering customized training to One-Stop business customers. Iowa also expects community colleges to play an important role in planning and providing One-Stop services in many local areas.

Smaller numbers of states require or recommend participation by additional agencies. Three case study states—Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin—call for adult basic education agencies to be included as One-Stop planning and service delivery partners. Two states—Ohio and Wisconsin—require the agencies responsible for secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs to be involved in One-Stop planning. One state (Texas) requires that local One-Stop systems include as a planning partner the policy group responsible for the local school-to-work initiative and plan for the integration of school-to-work and One-Stop services within One-Stop career centers. Three other states highly recommend participation by school-to-work agencies in local One-Stop planning and service delivery.

As described in the next chapter, local areas have developed dramatically different partnerships in response to these different guidelines. Some local areas have included only the required partners; others have taken advantage of the discretion permitted local One-Stop systems to add additional partners beyond the required agencies. As a result, the number of local One-Stop partners across the 14 local sites included in the evaluation varied from two primary agency partners (usually the two agencies responsible for ES/UI/VETS and JTPA) to more than ten active local agency partners.

Guiding the Governance and Day-to-Day Management of Local One-Stop Systems and Centers

In developing guidelines for the governance of local One-Stop systems, states have tried to ensure that local One-Stop policy boards have broad representation of One-Stop partner agencies and other stakeholders, including employers, educational institutions, and local elected officials. As described in Exhibit 1-6, two different strategies emerged among the study states.

Four states—including Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio—created flexible guidelines for the establishment of local One-Stop policy boards. Three of these states let local areas modify and expand local JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) as needed to ensure that all local One-Stop stakeholders were represented. The fourth state (Maryland) called for the creation of a new informal One-Stop planning and management team with a minimum of five members representing the PIC chair, the Employment Service manager, the JTPA staff director for the local service delivery area, and one additional employer. In several of these states, local policy boards were cautioned to separate their JTPA administrative responsibilities from their role in guiding One-Stop system planning and oversight, although they were not prohibited from continuing to provide JTPA services directly.

Another four states—Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, and Texas—required local areas to develop new formal policy boards responsible for the design and implementation of integrated workforce development services. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, regional employment and training policy boards with a relatively broad mandate were already in existence prior to the receipt of the One-Stop implementation grant. In response to the One-Stop initiative, state legislatures in these states expanded the mandate of these local boards to include policy oversight of local One-Stop systems. In three states (Iowa, Massachusetts, and Texas) the new One-Stop policy boards were given substantial authority over the design of local One-Stop services and the selection of local service providers.

The study states tended to provide less detailed guidelines for the day-to-day management of local One-Stop centers than they did for the structure of local policy boards (See Exhibit 1-6). Nonetheless, several states called for participatory management structures. For example, Iowa's guidelines for local One-Stop center management call for all partners to participate in the development of the center's

**Exhibit 1-6
State Guidelines for Local One-Stop Governance
and Day-to-Day Center Management**

	Local Governance	Center Management
Connecticut	<p>In 1992, 9 JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) were expanded to form regional workforce development boards (RWDBs).</p> <p>In 1994 the state legislature gave RWDBs responsibility for approval annual service plans developed by local One-Stop centers.</p>	<p>Centers are administered by local management committees co-chaired by the local ES/UI office manager and the staff director of the regional workforce development board.</p> <p>Additional management committee members may represent public or non-profit entities. The management committee selects a center director.</p>
Indiana	<p>Each of the 16 regional planning units must develop a One-Stop policy structure that allows participation by all local stakeholders. Boards are usually expanded JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs).</p> <p>Each of the 26 One-Stop centers must form an informal advisory board with representation by local stakeholders.</p>	<p>Planning, evaluation, and oversight of One-Stop centers is shared by local policy boards and the state Department of Workforce Development.</p>
Iowa	<p>Since the evaluation site visit, the state has undertaken the formation of advisory local workforce development policy boards. Local boards will play an important role in recommending local service providers to the state.</p>	<p>Centers must permit all partners to participate in decisions about the center mission, goals, resources, and facility oversight. Local centers may be administered by a management team or a designated center director.</p>

Exhibit 1-6 (Continued)

	Local Governance	Center Management
Maryland	Local service areas must develop a One-Stop planning and management team with participation by five persons: the PIC chair or representative, the Job Service manager, the JTPA service delivery area director, a community college representative, and one additional employer.	Co-location and co-administration of centers is not required. Each One-Stop center must be “hosted” by at least one of the three key agency partners.
Massachusetts	16 regional employment boards are responsible for overseeing the restructured One-Stop workforce development system, including chartering center operators and approving service design.	Each career center operator must develop its own integrated management structure. Center operators may be public or private entities or consortia.
Minnesota	Minnesota has passed state legislation authorizing local workforce councils. The structure is determined by state statute, however, the size is determined at the local level. Planning for service delivery within the Workforce Centers is done annually by all partners.	Determined at local level.
Ohio	Ohio allows local flexibility in the creation of a local policy board. However, it must include representation from all stakeholders and be linked to JTPA Private Industry Council (PIC) and ES Job Service Employer Council (JSEC).	Determined at local level.

**Exhibit 1-6
State Guidelines for Local One-Stop Governance
and Day-to-Day Center Management**

	Local Governance	Center Management
Connecticut	<p>In 1992, 9 JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) were expanded to form regional workforce development boards (RWDBs).</p> <p>In 1994 the state legislature gave RWDBs responsibility for approval annual service plans developed by local One-Stop centers.</p>	<p>Centers are administered by local management committees co-chaired by the local ES/UI office manager and the staff director of the regional workforce development board.</p> <p>Additional management committee members may represent public or non-profit entities. The management committee selects a center director.</p>
Indiana	<p>Each of the 16 regional planning units must develop a One-Stop policy structure that allows participation by all local stakeholders. Boards are usually expanded JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs).</p> <p>Each of the 26 One-Stop centers must form an informal advisory board with representation by local stakeholders.</p>	<p>Planning, evaluation, and oversight of One-Stop centers is shared by local policy boards and the state Department of Workforce Development.</p>
Iowa	<p>Since the evaluation site visit, the state has undertaken the formation of advisory local workforce development policy boards. Local boards will play an important role in recommending local service providers to the state.</p>	<p>Centers must permit all partners to participate in decisions about the center mission, goals, resources, and facility oversight. Local centers may be administered by a management team or a designated center director.</p>

mission and goals and in the oversight of the center facility and resources. Similarly, Wisconsin calls for centers to be managed by a “partnership of equals.”

Guiding the Design and Delivery of One-Stop Services

The One-Stop implementation states communicated their vision of transformed One-Stop services to local One-Stop partners in a variety of ways. Some states encouraged local One-Stop planners to visit “model” One-Stop centers in other states. Others sponsored the development of early pilot One-Stop centers within the state and then disseminated information about the most well-developed One-Stop pilot centers to other sites. Most sites developed written certification guidelines and descriptive evaluation criteria specifying what One-Stop centers would have to do to qualify for designation as an official state One-Stop center.

In this section, we describe how states tried to influence the design of local One-Stop services through guidelines specifying required universal and enhanced services for job seekers and employers. We also describe how states encouraged the integration of services under the One-Stop initiative.

Guidelines for Job Seeker Services

As described in more detail in Chapter 9, most states encouraged local One-Stop centers to develop a three-tiered structure for delivery of One-Stop services. Tier 1 services consist of services that customers can access with a minimum of staff assistance; these are commonly referred to as “self-service” options or “self-access” services. Tier 2 services consist of guided services—such as assessment, counseling, or brokering additional services—that require individualized attention from a One-Stop staff member, or brief group workshops. Tier 3 services consist of more intensive education and training services as well as ongoing counseling or case management services.

Exhibit 1-7 presents examples of states’ requirements for the delivery of universal services for job seekers. These required universal services tended to be Tier 1 services. They include the following (listed in declining order of frequency):

- Automated job listings.
- Labor market information.
- Inventories of education and training opportunities.
- Information on careers.

Exhibit 1-7
Examples of State Guidelines for
Universal Services for Job-Seekers

Connecticut	Universal services must include automated job listings, labor market information, inventories of education and training opportunities, information on job search available through resource libraries, and orientation to customers interested in registering for ES or UI services (information about all services available through the center). Case management services may be provided to individuals not in categorical programs upon request.
Indiana	Required services include self-service registration, information, and assessment, orientation sessions describing available services, the provision of an information resource area or library, staff-directed services for intake, registration, counseling, assessment, and referral, the provision of a training area for testing and workshops.
Maryland	Each career center will have identical core services and technology and standardized materials in a local resource area. The state provides software and hardware for core automated services including a job-finding cluster, a career-exploration cluster, and a customer-development cluster. Local agency host must provide a resource area specialist to staff the resource room.
Minnesota	Minnesota has established 11 required universal services for job seekers: (1) service consultation and eligibility determination; (2) provision of a resource center; (3) access to Minnesota Career Information System; (4) labor market information; (5) information on required knowledge, skills, and abilities for jobs; (6) information on education and training programs; (7) job development and job listings; (8) information on employer hiring requirements; (9) preparation of employer profiles; (10) job matching services; and (11) referrals to support services.
Texas	Texas has identified six core services to be available at local workforce development centers: (1) labor market information; (2) common intake and eligibility determination; (3) independent assessment and the development of individual service strategies; (4) coordinated and continuous case management and counseling; (5) individual referral for services including basic education, classroom skills training, on-the-job training, and customized training; and (6) supportive services.

- Self-service job search information available through resource areas or libraries.
- Self-assessment tools, such as self-administered career interest or aptitude inventories.
- Employer profiles, including descriptive materials on local firms, that job seekers can review to prepare for job interviews.

In addition, some states required One-Stop centers to provide to all customers unified “front-end” services, which may either be automated or guided by One-Stop staff. These services include the following:

- Common intake and initial eligibility determination.
- Orientation to available services.
- Information about and referral to categorical workforce development programs targeted to customers meeting specific eligibility criteria.
- Referral to non-DOL agencies and services, including social services, vocational rehabilitation, and basic education, post-secondary education, or vocational education programs.
- Referral to support services available from One-Stop partners or through referral to other community agencies.

Several states also required that local One-Stop centers provide all job seekers with some services from Tier 2. Examples include the following:

- Assistance with job search, job matching or job development needs (Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Ohio).
- Basic needs assessment and counseling to help customers identify relevant services (Indiana, Massachusetts, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin).
- Case management upon request (Connecticut, Texas, and Wisconsin).

Several states encouraged local One-Stop sites to make additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 services available to all One-Stop customers. For example, Connecticut recommended that One-Stop centers make available to all job seekers workshops on pre-employment skills, vocational exploration, job search skills, and other topics. Maryland encouraged local sites to supplement the standardized automated CareerNet services by adding compatible technology-based services as well as staffed services (such as workshops). Several states invited local sites to develop a menu of enhanced services available to job-seeker customers for a fee.

Guidelines for Employer Services

Most states offered less detailed guidance about services to employers, perhaps because their initial attention was focused primarily on redesigning One-Stop job-seeker services. Nonetheless, three of the nine case study states prepared blueprints describing the universal and enhanced employer services that were required for certification of local One-Stop centers (See Exhibit 1-8). Each of these states—Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Minnesota—emphasized the importance of providing a wide range of business services.

Universal employer services required by these three states included the following:

- Labor exchange services (e.g., job listings, job matching, job development, and recruitment, screening, and referral of job applicants).
- Information about and referral to economic development services and other government-funded programs for hiring or training targeted workers by qualifying firms.

One or more states required One-Stop centers to make available to all employers the following additional services:

- A skills-based job-seeker pool for review by employers (using the Talent Bank or a state-initiated skills bank).
- Information relevant to business needs, including labor market information and information about regulations for government programs.
- Management and business consulting services, to be provided through linkages to agencies with expertise in this area.
- Seminars on topics of interest to local employers.

Government-funded services that one or more states required local One-Stop centers to provide to eligible firms included the following:

- Downsizing support to employers and their workers, provided by the state's dislocated worker unit and rapid response teams.
- Assistance with customized training, manufacturing and technology assistance, and apprenticeship training programs.

Two of these states—Massachusetts and Minnesota—also encouraged One-Stop centers to develop fee-based services for employers, including customized applicant testing and screening services, the customized analysis of labor market information,

Exhibit 1-8
Examples of State Guidelines for
Services for Employers

Connecticut	To qualify as a One-Stop center, the following business services must be available: (1) <i>labor exchange and recruitment services</i> , including job listings, job matching, job development, recruitment and screening of applicants, and post-referral follow-up of applicants; (2) <i>workplace consultation services</i> , including assistance to employers to help them maintain or attain competitiveness; (3) <i>workforce development services</i> , including assistance with customized training, manufacturing and technology assistance, and apprenticeship training programs; and (4) <i>downsizing support</i> to employers and their workers.
Massachusetts	Core services for employers must include screening and referral of job applicants, on-line access to job bank, and referral to sources of funds for worker training. Non-core or enhanced services must be provided by each career center. However, the content, delivery system, and fee structures are to be determined locally.
Minnesota	<p>Centers must have the following universal services available for employers: (1) an employer library and employer seminars; (2) a skill-based job-seeker pool for review by employers; (3) information from agencies specializing in different types of disabilities about how to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act; (4) provision of available labor market information; (5) referral to economic development services; (6) information about and referral to customized training supports and other employer subsidies; (7) provision of other universal employer services, including job development, access to the statewide job bank, resume-matching services, hiring advice, and information on government regulations for such programs as workers compensation, equal opportunity, and unemployment insurance.</p> <p>Centers must also provide enhanced services for employers (fee-based or eligibility-based services) including case management services from a designated account representative, employer-requested testing of job candidates, provision of business data and customized analysis of labor market information, customized employee training, skills assessments of incumbent workers, and employer subsidies for hiring or training targeted workers.</p>

assessment of the skills of incumbent workers, and customized training for incumbent workers or new hires.

Guidelines on the Co-Location and Integration of Services

State guidelines about how different partners should be involved in the operation of One-Stop centers varied substantially. At one extreme, states required or strongly encouraged staff of DOL-mandated One-Stop programs to be co-located within the same physical facility (e.g., Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Texas). At the other extreme, Maryland and Ohio emphasized the importance of “well-articulated referral linkages,” but left it up to the local partners to decide whether they would be co-located or not, and if co-located, whether they would integrate services across program boundaries. In between these two extremes were states like Iowa and Wisconsin, that strongly recommended co-location of staff from all mandated DOL programs and development of integrated service approaches, but which recognized that local conditions might make this infeasible for some local One-Stop systems.

States also provided differing guidelines to local One-Stop centers about how to further the federal goal of integrating One-Stop services. As summarized in Exhibit 1-9, state guidelines for integration of services ranged from encouraging coordinated services to strongly encouraging fully integrated services.

Two states—Ohio and Maryland—deferred to local discretion in the design of integrated services. These states took a non-prescriptive approach, requiring only improved coordination among local One-Stop partners. Local One-Stop systems in these states were encouraged to design their own local models for the delivery of One-Stop services. Local models could range from a “no wrong door” approach, without co-location of partners, to a fully-integrated approach with integrated staffing and an integrated menu of One-Stop services. For example, in Maryland, the minimum requirements for certification as a One-Stop center are: (1) the availability of required universal information services, including the state’s automated JobNet system, at a service site hosted by one of the local One-Stop agency partners, and (2) the provision of a staff person trained as a resource information specialist to help customers access the information in the resource library and automated information system.

**Exhibit 1-9
State Guidelines on Service Integration**

Connecticut	<p>Connecticut encourages JTPA, ES, and UI staff to play coordinated service roles within One-Stop centers. To be certified, local centers must describe their approach to integration of services and programs. Although unified intake is not mandated, the state supports local development and implementation of common forms and reforming systems across programs.</p> <p>Ultimately, the state anticipates that services will be integrated across a number of different related public-sector programs, including business services, labor exchange, economic development, education, human services, and training programs.</p>
Indiana	<p>Indiana requires co-location of staff providing services under JTPA, ES, UI, Veterans Employment Services, and Older Worker programs under Title V of the Older Americans Act. Local service delivery areas must develop integrated service contracts between the agencies responsible for JTPA and ES/UI services. These contracts are designed to support cost-allocation plans that enable centers to cross-staff the functions of reception, UI registration, job placement, and career counseling.</p>
Iowa	<p>State guidelines call for the integrated design and delivery of basic services, such as reception, orientation, assessment, and access to career information. Technology is seen as key to integrating the delivery of information services.</p>
Maryland	<p>The key feature of service integration within One-Stop centers as required by the state of Maryland is the delivery of a standardized and integrated menu of core information services via the state’s automated JobNet system. However, individual local sites may chose whatever level of service integration they want in their local One-Stop system designs, ranging from separate electronically-linked partners, to multi-service centers with coordinated but separate operations by on-site partners, to integrated staffing roles and services across program partners.</p>
Minnesota	<p>Each local workforce council must develop a plan for the integration of services across ES, UI, and JTPA partners, which must be co-located within One-Stop centers. The state requires cross-training of staff and requires centers to “promote integration” of intake, eligibility determination, assessment, case management, and delivery of services to profiled workers.</p>

Exhibit 1-9 (Continued)

Ohio	To encourage service integration, Ohio requires certified One-Stop centers to provide all customers with universal registration, cross-trained staff, and access to uniform self-service tools. Full co-location of all partners is not required.
Texas	Texas has mandated the development of integrated intake, eligibility determination, and coordinated case management and counseling as required universal One-Stop services.
Wisconsin	In its Job Center standards, Wisconsin calls for unified procedures for intake, assessment, case management, area-wide planning, and the provision of labor market information and job search training and assistance.

Both states encouraged staff from all local partners to increase their familiarity with the services available from other programs, so that they could better coordinate cross-program referrals.

A second group of states, including Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin, designed more ambitious guidelines for the integration of universal One-Stop services. These states required local centers to plan for unified procedures for intake, assessment, and case management services across all local One-Stop partners. These states also encouraged or required One-Stop centers to develop unified designs for providing labor market information, job search training and assistance, and the delivery of services to profiled UI claimants (i.e., those identified as likely to encounter difficulty in finding a new job). However, in their detailed guidance to local sites, these states often recommended that local partners deliver integrated services by having each partner specialize and “do what it does best,” rather than by creating integrated service delivery teams with pooled staff from multiple agencies.

A third group of states enthusiastically encouraged cross-staffing and consolidating One-Stop services across different local partners. Connecticut and Indiana encouraged and supported efforts by local One-Stop partners (particularly JTPA, ES, and UI partners) to cross-train staff to provide services to customers eligible for several different categorical programs. For example, all JTPA, ES, and UI staff in the Indiana’s pilot One-Stop center in Indianapolis were cross-trained to take UI applications, assist with job placement services, and provide career counseling to all One-Stop customers.

GOAL 4. PROMOTING COORDINATION OF ONE-STOP SYSTEM-BUILDING EFFORTS AMONG STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERS

In addition to disseminating their state’s vision of One-Stop systems through written guides, the staff of state One-Stop project teams have developed a number of informal mechanisms to promote state–local information exchanges and coordinate state and local One-Stop implementation efforts. (See Exhibit 1-10.) Among the most frequently used are the following mechanisms:

- Convening local One-Stop center managers for regular meetings designed to share information between state and local staff, identify emerging implementation problems, and promote networking and sharing of best practices among local One-Stop practitioners.

Exhibit 1-10
Examples of State Coordination Efforts

Connecticut	<p>Three full-time staff in a One-Stop project office within the Connecticut Department of Labor act as brokering agents for the system as a whole. Project staff help local sites through the process leading to certification.</p> <p>The state convenes local JTPA and ES/UI office managers for statewide quarterly management team meetings. These meetings are used to promote peer networking and to alert state staff of potential implementation problems.</p>
Indiana	<p>The state has designated a local Department of Workforce Development agency employee to be the One-Stop program director in each region. These staff report on local system-development efforts to the state agency's field operations director.</p> <p>The state conducts monthly conference calls between state and local One-Stop staff and holds a face-to-face meeting at least once every six months. State specialists in ES, UI, and Veterans Employment Service issues provide individualized support to local career center staff as needed. At the time of the evaluation site visit, the state planned to develop a state-local management team that will share information and review the implementation process.</p>
Iowa	<p>To support local One-Stop design and implementation efforts, a member of the state One-Stop project team was designated as a liaison to local sites. The state has developed a newsletter as a way to share information among state and local One-Stop partners.</p>
Massachusetts	<p>During the One-Stop implementation phase, the state Career Center Office has emerged as the primary facilitator of communication and coordination between the state and regional employment boards and between the state and individual career center operators.</p>
Maryland	<p>During the first year of One-Stop planning and early implementation, the state lead agency issued monthly One-Stop newsletters and disseminated them to local One-Stop staff. During the second year of the One-Stop implementation grant, several new coordination mechanisms were being developed, including (1) the establishment of state liaisons to serve as facilitators and consultants to local centers; and (2) the convening of monthly meetings between local resource area specialists and state staff responsible for designing and maintaining the automated CareerNet system.</p>

Exhibit 1-10 (Continued)

<p>Minnesota</p>	<p>During the summer of 1996, key state officials toured the state for two months inviting local partners to detail their One-Stop vision and discuss obstacles. Issues teams with membership by both state and local representatives have discussed the respective roles and responsibilities of the state and local areas in One-Stop planning and implementation.</p> <p>Job Service and JTPA directors meet quarterly. As a result of these quarterly meetings, they have agreed on a statewide system of benchmarks for certifying local workforce centers.</p>
<p>Ohio</p>	<p>The state project manager disseminates the reports prepared by the state task groups to local work groups and vice versa. A monthly newsletter called “The One-Stop Link” is also used to share information between state and local partners.</p> <p>The state convenes a periodic “partners helping partners” conference to promote exchange of information about best practices among local One-Stop staff.</p>
<p>Texas</p>	<p>The state One-Stop project team has convened regional forums to communicate about One-Stop issues with local staff. The team channels information from local sites to members of state-level task groups responsible for designing different aspects of the One-Stop system. Informal and interactive meetings are the rule.</p> <p>The state project team conducts formal bi-annual benchmarking visits to each center and obtain regular progress reports, both formal and informal, on the progress of One-Stop implementation.</p>
<p>Wisconsin</p>	<p>Wisconsin has designated local liaisons to facilitate communication between the state and local One-Stop centers.</p> <p>Informational memoranda are circulated to members of local collaborative planning teams.</p> <p>Statewide and regional meetings and conferences are used to discuss One-Stop implementation issues.</p>

- Assigning specific state staff as local site liaisons, responsible for helping local One-Stop sites through the process leading to state certification, and providing individualized support and consultations.
- Designating a state employee as the on-site local One-Stop program manager within each local region, responsible for brokering and coordinating among local partners and reporting progress to the state One-Stop project team.
- Holding monthly telephone conference calls to keep state and local One-Stop staff aware of each others' activities.
- Distributing a state newsletter to keep local areas informed about One-Stop development issues and progress, during the initial planning stages.

The staff in the study states have usually been careful to define their various roles as those of partner, counselor, advisor, and facilitator, rather than those of dictator, monitor, auditor, or imposer of sanctions. In most cases, states and local partners have attempted to develop new relationships suitable to their shared responsibility for a workforce development system that is funded from both state-administered and locally-administered program resources.

ANALYSIS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN GUIDING LOCAL ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

In their decisions about how to organize and guide One-Stop system development, the study states have been influenced by their organizational histories, including the previous relationships among different state workforce development agencies and between state and local systems.

Sites with an extensive history of collaboration between the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, and UI were clearly at an advantage when they began planning One-Stop systems. For example, Indiana and Wisconsin each had a ten-year history of increasing collaboration between the JTPA, ES, and UI agencies in workforce development planning and service delivery prior to the One-Stop initiative. This history clearly facilitated efforts to develop strong coordination of JTPA ES, and UI services within local One-Stop centers. During the early 1990s, staff from Connecticut's JTPA, ES, and UI programs had worked together to develop "transition centers" for dislocated workers. This recent experience had transformed the managers of these two programs from distant and cautious strangers into familiar allies and prepared the way for increased collaboration between the JTPA, ES, and UI programs under the One-Stop initiative.

Histories that include strong welfare/workforce development program linkages have assisted several states in developing broad One-Stop partnerships that incorporate responsibility for welfare-to-work initiatives. In both Iowa and Texas, One-Stop initiatives were initially developed as strategies to reduce welfare dependency. As a result, the service approaches encouraged by state and local One-Stop partnerships have tended to integrate the delivery of welfare-to-work services into the rest of the One-Stop system. Similarly, in Wisconsin, where welfare-to-work issues have received substantial attention from state and local One-Stop planners, the One-Stop system has been designated as the delivery system for welfare-to-work services.

Past collaboration with additional workforce development programs has also helped to strengthen involvement by these programs within state and local One-Stop systems. For example, in Minnesota, the Vocational Rehabilitation program has been part of the agency that administers ES, UI, and JTPA for 20 years. As a result, vocational rehabilitation is integrated into local One-Stop systems throughout the state.

One-Stop implementation states were also influenced by the traditional balance between state control and local autonomy in the relation between state and local workforce development entities. For example, Ohio and Texas were both characterized by strong local autonomy—not just for workforce development programs, but across all areas of government. This tradition, developed in response to the strongly differentiated needs of dense urban areas and sparsely populated rural areas, caused these states to provide for substantial local discretion and autonomy in the design and oversight of local One-Stop systems. In contrast, Maryland took advantage of a tradition of strong state leadership in workforce development programs to develop a relatively standardized design for One-Stop services statewide. However, the state recognized the importance of the city of Baltimore as another strong player in state–local relations and welcomed Baltimore’s complementary leadership role in developing a wide range of staffed One-Stop services to supplement the state’s automated menu of services.

During the initial stages of One-Stop planning and implementation the study states have accomplished the following:

- Formed broad state interagency partnerships.

- Developed participatory task forces and work groups that have permitted each partner agency to have a voice in the detailed design and implementation of their state's One-Stop system.
- Created state policy groups responsible for overseeing the detailed design and implementation of local One-Stop career center systems.
- Developed broad policy groups that are coordinating the welfare-to-work, school-to-work, and One-Stop initiatives (some states only).
- Designated state management teams responsible for furthering their state's One-Stop goals and objectives, and staffed these teams with individuals who possess the specialized skills necessary to support state and local system development.
- Developed guidelines for One-Stop system development that are clear enough to communicate the federal and state One-Stop vision and flexible enough to promote local innovation and support local diversity within and across local One-Stop systems.

Among the challenges currently facing a number of the study states are the following:

- *How to maintain active participation by all state One-Stop planning partners over time.* In some states, initial participation by a large number of state agencies in One-Stop planning has been replaced by the day-to-day administration of One-Stop systems by a single lead agency. To maintain the benefits of broad partnerships, a number of states are considering how to involve all state partners in ongoing planning and oversight of the One-Stop system.
- *How to balance the desire to encourage local innovation and local "ownership" of One-Stop systems with the need to weave local One-Stop centers into a coherent state One-Stop system.* A number of states started out during the earliest stages of the One-Stop initiative by encouraging individual pilot sites to invent One-Stop systems "from scratch." Thereafter, states felt they needed to systematize the different One-Stop approaches and develop state guidelines for the second generation of local One-Stop sites. A number of states are still working out an appropriate balance between requiring statewide consistency and encouraging local innovation.
- *How to continue to support expansion of the One-Stop system to new local sites, some of which may be considerably less enthusiastic about the benefits of service integration than the earlier One-Stop sites.* Most states encouraged the local areas with the most advanced ideas and practices to participate during the first phase of local implementation. They are now grappling with how to create a statewide system by

encouraging One-Stop development in local areas that may need substantially more help building partnerships and designing integrated services.

The next steps each state needs to take in guiding One-Stop system development depend on the current status of its system development. States that have made substantial progress in building partnerships involving the DOL-funded programs but have not yet accomplished “buy-in” from or coordination with a wider range of school-to-work and welfare-to-work partners plan to broaden state and local partnerships to include a larger set of workforce development programs and agencies. States that have concentrated on building a few strong One-Stop pilot sites during the first stage of One-Stop implementation plan to support dissemination of One-Stop systems and centers to additional service areas, and, within service areas with only one operating center, to additional centers.

Across all states, state One-Stop policy makers are beginning to think about what the ongoing state role should be in guiding One-Stop systems after the system-building process has been completed and all local One-Stop centers have gained initial certification.

This page intentionally left blank.

Insert blank page here when making double-sided copies.