

2. BUILDING LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

INTRODUCTION

In most states, the detailed design and day-to-day management of One-Stop services occurs at the local level. The initiation of local One-Stop systems begins with the formation of a partnership of workforce development agencies, whose managers agree that their agencies share common goals and will mutually benefit from increased collaboration. The acknowledgment that local job seekers and employers will also benefit from a transformed service delivery system is often necessary to inspire the local planning and implementation process. The change process itself often requires careful planning, the gradual development of trust between managers and staff of the partnering agencies, and a willingness to compromise. In this chapter we discuss how local partnerships have been formed and the different organizational structures that have been developed to oversee One-Stop systems and provide One-Stop services.

GOALS FOR ONE-STOP ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

Each of the case study sites faced several distinct challenges, including the following:

1. Building effective local partnerships.
2. Organizing One-Stop career centers into local systems.
3. Forming effective local governance structures.
4. Staffing day-to-day One-Stop operations.

Overcoming each of these challenges became an important goal for the case study sites.

GOAL 1. BUILDING EFFECTIVE LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS

In building local One-Stop partnerships, the case study sites were influenced by a number of different factors, including their previous relationships with other workforce development agencies, their state's requirements for participation by different agencies, and their ability to develop collaborative relationships with parallel welfare-to-work and school-to-work system-building efforts.

History of Collaboration

None of the case study sites undertook the development of an integrated One-Stop system in a vacuum. In most cases, previous experience collaborating or coordinating with other local workforce development agencies was critical to the willingness of local workforce development agencies to form One-Stop partnerships. As described in Exhibit 2-1, factors that were influential in the formation of One-Stop partnerships in a number of case study sites included: (1) a history of collaboration between the local agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, and UI services, which was the result of strong state leadership or previous experience coordinating services targeted to dislocated workers; (2) a strong history of collaboration between workforce development programs, welfare-to-work programs, and social service delivery systems; (3) a general tradition of interagency collaborative approaches to community problems; and (4) an interest in revitalizing the local Employment Services. In local areas with one or more of these kinds of histories, partnership formation around One-Stop system development occurred more easily than in sites without histories of collaboration.

Indiana is a good example of how a history of collaboration influenced One-Stop partnership formation. For the past decade, Indiana had encouraged the co-location and integration of service delivery systems for JTPA, ES, and UI, which prepared local agencies for participation in local One-Stop partnerships. In both sites that we visited, ES, UI, and JTPA already had a long history of co-location and collaborative service approaches when they were designated the core on-site partners in the development of One-Stop centers. This history enabled the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, and UI to make substantial progress in implementing integrated staffing arrangements.

Similarly, previous collaboration in serving dislocated workers was decisive in making the ES, UI, and JTPA agencies willing to consider forming local One-Stop partnerships in New London, Connecticut, and Baltimore, Maryland. In Connecticut, the local ES and JTPA agencies had worked together in the late 1980s and early 1990s to create a series of jointly operated “transition centers” for dislocated workers. As a result, they developed increased familiarity with each others’ services and started thinking of each other as allies in meeting customers’ needs. Similarly, partnerships between ES and JTPA agencies in Baltimore grew out of coordinated efforts to develop “customer-driven” services for dislocated workers, as well as early intervention services for UI applicants under the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services system. As a result of these experiences, local agencies in Baltimore had already

Exhibit 2-1
Examples of Initiating One-Stop Partnerships

Connecticut	As a result of collaborating in the development of transition centers for dislocated workers in the early 1990s, local ES/UI and JTPA agencies have developed increased familiarity with each other's services and started thinking of each other as allies in meeting customers' needs.
Indiana	The state of Indiana has been moving toward the integration of JTPA, ES, and UI services within One-Stop centers since 1984. Thus, there is an extended history of co-location and local partnership development among these core program partners. The inclusion of additional programs within local One-Stop partnerships is more recent and it has been more challenging to develop a model for integrating staff from additional partner agencies (including adult and vocational education program entities) into the operation of local One-Stop centers.
Iowa	The planning and development of a One-Stop center in Des Moines builds on the pre-existing co-location of many workforce development partners and programs in a single facility in downtown Des Moines. However, prior to the One-Stop initiative, agencies were more interested in coordination of separate programs than they were in collaboration or consolidation of services. Preparing the One-Stop Implementation Grant application was the catalyst for thinking about the potential for integration of services.
Maryland	Local One-Stop partners in Baltimore began planning for the development of an integrated menu of employment and training services that would transcend agency and program boundaries nearly a year before the state of Maryland received its One-Stop Implementation Grant. Initial discussions of how to integrate services focused on the transformation of services to meet the needs of dislocated workers. Previous Job Service and JTPA service models were not varied enough to meet the diverse needs of the dislocated worker population. Coordinated efforts by local Job Service and JTPA partners to develop "customer-driven" services for dislocated workers as well as early intervention services for UI recipients under the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Program were catalysts in the movement to reengineer and consolidate local workforce development services.

Exhibit 2-1 (Continued)

Maryland, continued	After receiving an ES Revitalization grant in the fall of 1994 to create a “Resource Area” for individual customers, the Columbia center was in an ideal position to become a local One-Stop pilot. Local respondents believed that being a pilot site was a “luxury” that afforded them numerous opportunities, including the chance to try out new equipment, system features, and processes. Moreover, being directly involved in statewide One-Stop design and implementation and, in general, “having the state’s ear” were cited as both fortuitous and beneficial.
Minnesota	<p>One-Stop implementation in Anoka County has been built on a strong foundation of collaboration among workforce development and social service providers at both at the state and local level. In Anoka County, the first steps toward a consolidated workforce center came in 1988, when the Anoka County Board of Commissioners and the Anoka County Private Industry Council (PIC) integrated welfare employment and training programs with JTPA and other employment and training initiatives within the Anoka County service delivery area (SDA). In 1991, a large group of workforce development and human service agencies relocated to a new shared physical facility—the Anoka County Human Service Center.</p> <p>Anoka County also has a decade-long history of developing innovative interagency collaborative approaches to community problems. The experience of Anoka County with the Minnesota Parents’ Fair Share (MNPFS) in the mid-1980s is one early example of forming “fusion teams”—bringing together diverse county, state, and non-profit agencies to work toward a common goal. These and other collaborative management approaches have provided a model that has guided the development of Anoka’s Workforce Center.</p>

Exhibit 2-1 (Continued)

Ohio	Local planning for improved system coordination and integration in Wood County began in 1994, when representatives from a number of local agencies met to develop applications for Governor’s Reserve Funds for JTPA Special Projects and OBES-sponsored UI Collaboration Grants to establish “one-stop shops” for dislocated workers. Wood County agencies also built on their experiences developing an inter-agency human resources case management network for individuals receiving assistance from the welfare system. As part of this case management system, a variety of human service-related agencies had begun meeting on a monthly basis to foster mutual referrals and overall coordination efforts. In addition, JOBS and Wood County JTPA were co-located in what is now the Wood County Employment Resource Center. In that partnership, they provided “whatever services were needed” to welfare and JTPA -eligible clients. As a result of these collaboration efforts, these two agencies began to develop closer ties with OBES-funded programs, since it became obvious that job search and employment services were an essential element of the services to promote client well-being and self-sufficiency.
Texas	The Arlington Center traces its history to a 1992 study conducted by United Way which identified unemployment, underemployment, and skills deficits among Arlington adults. In response to this study, local officials and community leaders formed a multi-agency team in the summer of 1993, with the goal of developing plans for a locally-based integrated workforce development system.
Wisconsin	Key partner agencies, each representing major funding streams, had been working collaboratively for several years prior to the opening of the Center. JTPA/Title III experiences were credited as providing the opportunity for some of the initial forays into coordinated service delivery (e.g., through rapid response teams that included participation from a number of different local agencies).

recognized the need to consolidate local workforce development services nearly a year before the state received the One-Stop implementation grant.

In several other case study sites, previous experiences collaborating to serve welfare recipients created fertile ground for the development of expanded One-Stop partnerships. For example, the One-Stop partnerships in Anoka County, Minnesota, grew out of a 1988 decision by the county board of commissioners and the JTPA private industry council (PIC) to integrate welfare employment and training programs with JTPA. Similarly, in Wood County, Ohio, the One-Stop Employment Resource Center grew directly out of previous co-location and service consolidation between JTPA and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program for AFDC recipients. As a result of their ongoing collaboration efforts, the two programs began to develop closer ties with the ES when it became obvious that job search and employment services were an essential element of services to promote customer self-sufficiency.

A decade-long community tradition of developing interagency approaches to solve community problems was also influential in Anoka County. For example, in the mid-1980s, this community developed “fusion teams,” which brought together diverse county, state, and non-profit agencies to work toward a common goal, as part of a “fair share” program to encourage non-custodial parents to pay their share of child support expenses.

Breadth of Local Partnerships

Local case study sites varied substantially in the numbers and types of agencies included in local One-Stop partnerships and in the roles played by different partners. In most cases, a distinction was made between *core partners*, which participated both in planning the local One-Stop system and in delivering One-Stop services, and *supporting partners*, which participated in overall planning and coordination meetings, but which often played a less active role in delivering services to One-Stop customers. The number of different agencies involved in planning and overseeing local One-Stop system development ranged from 5 agencies in Baltimore to 25 agencies in Anoka County, Minnesota.

Exhibit 2-2 summarizes the breadth of the local One-Stop partnerships across the case study sites. Exhibit 2-3 describes the specific agencies involved in the local partnerships in selected sites. In many cases, the breadth of the partnerships was strongly influenced by the state’s One-Stop certification requirements. However, some

Exhibit 2-2

Exhibit 2-3
Examples of the Breadth of Local One-Stop Partnerships

Connecticut	<p>In the New London One-Stop center, “managing” partners include the state Department of Labor (which administers the ES and UI programs) and the local Workforce Development Board (which administers local JTPA-funded services).</p> <p>Additional planning partners include the state Department of Economic and Community Development, the state Department of Social Services, and the state Department of Higher Education, a regional economic development corporation, the local technical college, a non-profit service provider with a history of providing services to welfare recipients, and a proprietary agency with a history of providing service to dislocated workers.</p>
Indiana	<p>Core partners at the Eastside Center of the Indianapolis Network for Employment and Training (iNET) include the state Department of Workforce Development (which administers UI, ES, and Veterans Employment Services) and the Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana, which is the contracted service provider for the delivery of JTPA-funded services.</p> <p>Supporting partners at the Eastside Center include the Central Indiana Council on Aging (which administers Title V Older Workers services), Job Corps, the Family Social Services agency (which operates welfare-to-work programs at one of the One-Stop centers), and the local provider of vocational rehabilitation services. Local respondents noted that the weakest aspect of its current partnerships is the lack of active involvement in planning and service delivery by education agencies, including school-to-work and vocational education systems.</p>
	<p>In the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center, supporting partners also include the local branch of the technical college system, the county mental health services, the local small business development center, an organization serving migrant farmworkers, and an agency operating anti-poverty programs. Coordination between on-site partners and these supporting partners is informal in nature.</p>

Exhibit 2-3 (Continued)

<p>Iowa</p>	<p>Core partners at the Creston Workforce Development Center include the Job Service division of the Iowa Workforce Development Department (responsible for ES, UI, and Veterans Employment Services as well as welfare-to-work services), the local JTPA administrative entity, the state division of vocational rehabilitation, and a state-funded older worker program.</p> <p>Additional supportive partners represented on formal and informal planning groups include the state welfare agency, the local community college, the extension campuses of several state post-secondary educational institutions, and the local primary and secondary school systems.</p> <p>The Des Moines Workforce Development Center involves active participation by eight core partners (represented on the Partners' Group), including the state agency responsible for ES, UI, and Veterans Employment Services; the local JTPA Title II administrative entity; the designated JTPA Title III administrative entity, the local community college, the state division of vocational rehabilitation (VR), the agency operating Title V programs for older workers, a non-profit agency that is funded by the state VR agency to serve individuals with serious barriers to employment, and the administrator of several Job Corps centers in the state.</p> <p>Supplementary partners that also have an on-site presence at the center include the area agency on aging, a for-profit agency serving individuals with disabilities, and a state-funded program that matches welfare recipients to volunteer mentors.</p> <p>Affiliated agencies include the state welfare agency, the state department for the blind, and several county agencies funded by the welfare agency to provide intensive case management services to individuals with serious barriers to self-sufficiency.</p>
<p>Maryland</p>	<p>The local planning team responsible for developing the Baltimore One-Stop network plan included representatives of the entities responsible for the major funding streams—the local community college, the ES and UI agency, and the JTPA administrative entity—as well as the key JTPA service providers for Title II and Title III. The JTPA agency also provided a strong link to the mayoral administration.</p> <p>Agencies with staff housed on-site at the Baltimore Eastside Center include primarily the staff employed by the JTPA administrative entity, supplemented by 4 state Job Service staff. A nurse assistant funded by the city health department has office hours at the center once a week.</p>

Exhibit 2-3 (Continued)

<p>Maryland, continued</p>	<p>Four primary partners involved in planning and overseeing the Columbia Career Center include the JTPA administrative entity, the local office of the ES and UI agency, the local community college, and the local economic development authority, which operates a “business resource center.”</p> <p>Two additional supporting partners include the local welfare agency and a private non-profit service provider that offers on-site workshops to JTPA-eligible customers.</p>
<p>Massachusetts</p>	<p>If a totally integrated funding stream had been achieved, the Hamden County career centers would have “leapfrogged” the difficult process of building local partnerships by establishing a single career center operator responsible for all workforce development services. At present, however, the operator of FutureWorks Career Center is functioning as a broker of services in an environment in which a number of different service providers are still operating.</p> <p>Agencies with which FutureWorks coordinates include public and private workforce development agencies, community-based organizations, education and training providers, and its “sister” One-Stop center (with which it maintains a friendly competitive relationship).</p>
<p>Minnesota</p>	<p>In 1995, after four years of co-location and increasingly collaborative planning, the county’s JTPA administrative entity, the local ES/UI office, and the Division of Rehabilitation Services (DRS) joined together to form the “Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County.” In June, 1996, the Anoka County Income Maintenance Department and Child Care Assistance became co-located partners within the Workforce Center. State Services for the Blind (SSB) is also considered an official partner although it does not have staff housed at the Center.</p> <p>In addition, the core public agency partners in the Anoka County Workforce Center are co-located with twenty other human services and education providers in a clean and modern building known as the Anoka County Human Service Center. One observer has termed this a “center around the center,”—a Workforce Center housed within a larger social service complex in which a range of services are available, including educational, counseling, income maintenance, and various support services.</p>

Exhibit 2-3 (Continued)

Ohio	<p>Full-time partners at the Wood County Employment Resource Center include the JTPA and welfare-to-work program staff. Additional partners, which station staff at the center at least one half-day per week include the agencies responsible for ES, UI, Title V of the Older Americans Act, and the county vocational school.</p> <p>Supporting partners include vocational rehabilitation, United Way, a local child care agency, a veterans assistance center, and local social service organizations.</p>
Texas	<p>Key partners in the Arlington Career Center that also provide on-site services include the JTPA administrative entity, the state agency responsible for ES, UI and the vocational rehabilitation program, the local junior college, a non-profit JTPA-funded training provider, a local school district, the Title V older worker program, and the county welfare agency.</p> <p>Additional supporting partners include additional local school districts, human service agencies, and the continuing education division of the University of Texas.</p>
Wisconsin	<p>What has emerged as the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center is the product of several years of discussions among key staff from the participating local partners, including the Wisconsin Job Service, the WOW Private Industry Council, the Waukesha County Technical College, the Waukesha County Department of Health and Human Services, the Waukesha County Economic Development Corporation, and Partners for Education, Inc. The active involvement of the County Executive is also credited with providing the leadership that helped the participating partners see beyond their individual concerns to a common mission and customer service approach.</p> <p>In addition two non-profit and one for-profit service provider agencies are considered core partners at the center.</p>

sites developed extremely broad partnerships on their own initiative, while others did not involve any partners that the state did not require be involved.

With the exception of the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield, Massachusetts—which was operated by a single private for-profit entity chartered by the regional employment board to deliver One-Stop services—the case study sites all had both the JTPA and ES/UI agencies as core partners.

The number and types of additional local partners varied substantially from site to site.

- *Community or technical colleges* were core partners in seven sites and supporting partners in another five sites. The roles played by these partners varied from site to site. In several sites, community colleges provided on-site education services. In other sites, community college staff visited One-Stop centers periodically to provide information and referral to education and training programs. In yet other sites, community colleges simply received referrals or funding support from on-site partners to train One-Stop customers.
- Agencies responsible for operating *older worker programs* were core partners in four sites and supporting partners in another four sites. In most sites, designated staff from older worker agencies provided on-site services to One-Stop customers who qualified for assistance from these programs. In several sites, Title V participants played important service roles within centers, by serving as receptionists or resource aides.
- *Secondary educational institutions* were core partners in one site and supporting partners in another four sites. Secondary institutions were usually involved in (1) developing plans about how youth could use One-Stop information services on-site or through remote access, and (2) coordinating school-to-work and One-Stop activities. In several sites, these educational institutions provided adult basic education or English language training services on site.
- *Vocational rehabilitation agencies* were core partners in three sites and supporting partners in another three sites. In the three sites in which they were considered core partners, vocational rehabilitation staff provided on-site services to One-Stop customers on a part-time or full-time basis. Additional local partners specializing in services to individuals with disabilities were also on-site service providers in several sites. For example, the human resources center within which the Anoka County (Minnesota) Workforce Center is housed also houses an agency providing sheltered work for individuals with developmental disabilities.

- State or local agencies responsible for *income maintenance programs* were core partners in three sites, and supporting partners in another five sites. In the centers in Anoka County, Minnesota, and Waukesha County, Wisconsin, entire income-maintenance units of the county social services departments were co-located at the One-Stop center. In other sites, welfare agencies were represented by staff responsible for welfare-to-work services or staff offering supportive services to welfare recipients.
- *State or local economic development agencies* were core partners in two sites and supporting partners in another site. In Columbia, Maryland, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, and New London, Connecticut these agencies played particularly important roles in the delivery of services to business customers.
- *Local community-based organizations and organizations providing services* under JTPA or welfare-to-work programs were core local One-Stop partners in five sites and supporting partners in another 6 sites. Although some sites considered only public agencies to be core One-Stop partners, others, including Baltimore and Indianapolis, also considered the primary JTPA service provider agencies to be core One-Stop partners.

Additional types of agencies that were local partners in One-Stop centers in only a few sites included local mental health agencies, an organization serving migrant farmworkers, social service organizations, a city health department, and a child care assistance agency.

Coordination with School-to-Work Initiatives

As described in Exhibit 2-4, a number of the case study sites had collaborated effectively with the local planning groups responsible for the school-to-work initiative by the end of the first year of One-Stop operations. Two sites had particularly strong linkages between One-Stop and school-to-work systems. In Anoka County, Minnesota, the One-Stop center is the administrator of a \$650,000 five-year school-to-work implementation grant, received in collaboration with five local independent school districts, a community college, and a technical college. As the hub for school-to-work implementation, the One-Stop center partners will coordinate collection and dissemination of career and labor market information to school-to-work partners. In Connecticut, the regional workforce board responsible for the local One-Stop system containing the New London center is also undertaking a five-year school-

Exhibit 2-4
Integrating One-Stop with School-to-Work and Welfare-to-Work Systems

Connecticut	<p><i>School-to-work.</i> The New London region began its 5-year federally funded School-to-Work grant in June 1996 as a collaboration between the state’s Department of Education and the Regional Workforce Development Board. Under the Workforce Development Board’s plan, the One-Stop will act as a “clearing house” for the school system by furnishing career information to schools and providing businesses with a single point for recruiting new workers.</p> <p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> At the time of the site visits, there was still no formal agreement between the agencies charged with social services and workforce development on delivering welfare-to-work services.</p>
Iowa	<p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> JOBS is the largest single program at the Des Moines Workforce Development Center. The state’s welfare reform model (initiated in 1994 under federal waiver authority) is currently the dominant model for enhanced services for center customers. This model—which emphasizes “work first” imposes sanctions on individuals who fail to sign a family investment contract. It offers significant incentives for employment, including transitional cash benefits for the first four months of employment or transitional child care and medical assistance for one year after employment is obtained.</p> <p><i>School-to-work.</i> The Des Moines center has arranged with several area high schools to offer a “Workforce for Teens” career awareness course to young people about to enter the labor market. The course is taught at the center for local high school credit.</p>
Indiana	<p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> In anticipation of federal legislation mandating a welfare-to-work program, the Indianapolis PIC requested and received a grant from the Rockefeller and Mott Foundations to develop creative mechanisms to address the local service needs of welfare-dependent populations. A representative from the welfare-to-work program was scheduled to be outstationed at the Eastside center.</p> <p><i>School-to-work.</i> Staff at the Lawrenceburg center participate in outreach into local high schools and technical schools and communicate with teachers to enhance career education opportunities for students in grades 8 and 9. The center also houses staff responsible for the JTPA Summer Youth Employment Program, as well as a program to provide youth offenders with employment or training opportunities.</p>

Exhibit 2-4 (Continued)

<p>Maryland</p>	<p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> In Baltimore, welfare recipients are served in specialized centers. Two of these centers are operated by a key One-Stop partner—the Mayor’s Office of Economic Development (MOED)—under contract to the county’s Department of Social Services. Although housed at different locations than the full-service One-Stops, the specialized welfare-to-work centers are part of an electronic network intended facilitate individual customer referrals between all service sites. CareerNet hardware and software were also being installed in both of these specialized centers during the first phase of Baltimore’s One-Stop implementation initiative.</p> <p><i>School-to-work.</i> The Baltimore Career Center Network intends to coordinate with School-to-Work planning teams to develop ways to make the CareerNet technology accessible to youth at the career centers. Youth-related initiatives in Baltimore, which include the JTPA-funded Summer Youth Employment Program, the Youth Fair Chance initiative in East Baltimore, and Baltimore’s School-to-Work initiative—called Career Connections—are coordinated at the agency level (e.g., within MOED, which oversees both youth and adult JTPA services), as well as through overlapping memberships on the local School-to-Work advisory board and the Private Industry Council. Integration of youth services with the One-Stop initiative—through the installation of CareerNet automated services at youth service sites and the encouragement of youth to use the full-service career centers—was a high priority for MOED.</p>
<p>Minnesota</p>	<p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> In June 1996, 26 Income Maintenance Department intake staff and 9 Child Care Assistance staff joined as partners of the Workforce Center. They were to be joined in 1997 by the remainder of the approximately 100 Income Maintenance staff working with ongoing cases. The timing of the integration of Income Maintenance and Child Care Assistance staff into the Workforce Center is viewed as particularly appropriate, because new state welfare reform measures stipulate that as of July 1997, all TANF recipients with children aged 3 or over will be required to begin looking for work within ten days after finishing a 30-day group orientation.</p> <p><i>School-to-work.</i> The Workforce Center will administer a \$650,000, five-year school-to-work implementation grant, which they received in collaboration with five local independent school districts, a community college, and a technical college. The Workforce Center is to act as the “hub” for Anoka County’s school-to-work implementation, serving to bring parties involved in school-to-work together. The Center will also coordinate collection and dissemination of career and labor market information through electronic linkages and written materials. At the time of the evaluation visit, the Workforce Center was in the process of hiring a full-time school-to-work coordinator.</p>

Exhibit 2-4 (Continued)

Texas	<p><i>School-to-work.</i> Workforce boards in Texas have broad-ranging responsibility for school-to-work and welfare-to-work programs. In Arlington, the school district is an active One-Stop partner and currently manages a JTPA contract that tries to get out-of-school youth back into the school system. The district also collaborates with groups such as Arlington Youth Services and the Boys and Girls Club in coordinating school-to-work programs.</p> <p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> As of May 1996, the Texas Department of Human Services had stationed a full-time JOBS counselor at the Lake Jackson Center. DHS respondents were enthusiastic about the co-location agreement, seeing it as a way to expose welfare customers to the “professional” atmosphere of the Center, and to ease the transition from welfare to work.</p>
Wisconsin	<p><i>School-to-work.</i> Partners for Education, an active on-site partner at the Waukesha Center, is charged with creating partnerships between education and business. The center intends to sponsor job fairs and career expos for youth, and is in the process of developing relations with area schools. The center’s library has more than 100 titles of “Enter Here” videos on different occupations geared for youth going directly to work after high school, as well as information on four-year colleges and career exploration software for young people.</p> <p><i>Welfare-to-work.</i> Income maintenance workers for all “abled-bodied” individuals are co-located at the center. At the time of the site visit, welfare-to-work services were provided by an on-site service provider under contract to the welfare department. It is expected that the center will continue to be the primary provider of welfare-to-work services under welfare reform.</p>

to-work project. In collaboration with the state department of education, the One-Stop center will act as a clearinghouse for career information and as a single point of contact for employers seeking new workers.

Although the school-to-work and One-Stop systems were less fully integrated in Waukesha County, Wisconsin, school-to-work and One-Stop funding were carefully coordinated to support the development of a joint Community Career Center, which was designed to serve both youth and adults. In addition, the local One-Stop partnership included a non-profit organization called Partners for Education, which encourages collaboration between One-Stop agency partners, schools, and employers in developing linkages between school and work for young people.

Coordination with Welfare-to-Work Initiatives

Exhibit 2-4 also summarizes the coordination linkages between One-Stop and welfare-to-work systems. At the time of the site visits, the relationships between welfare-to-work and One-Stop agency partners were in a state of flux as a result of the expected passage of welfare reform block grants. Perhaps the biggest question affecting future local One-Stop partnership development is whether welfare agencies will assume control of welfare-to-work transition services and, if so, whether they will delegate some or all of the responsibility for serving welfare-dependent individuals to the One-Stop service delivery system.

At the time of the site visits, the agency responsible for JTPA or ES/UI was the official operator of welfare-to-work services in six of the 14 case study sites.¹ In another five case study sites, welfare-to-work services were provided on-site at One-Stop career centers by additional local partners.²

GOAL 2. ORGANIZING ONE-STOP CENTERS INTO LOCAL SYSTEMS

To ensure statewide geographic coverage, most states have created a number of different service delivery areas within which to design and implement local One-Stop systems. There is significant variation, however, in how many One-Stop centers are planned for each service delivery area and how One-Stop centers within the same

¹ Des Moines and Creston, Iowa; Baltimore, Maryland; Arlington and Lake Jackson, Texas; and Waukesha, Wisconsin

² Springfield, Massachusetts; Anoka County, Minnesota; Indianapolis and Lawrenceburg, Indiana; and Wood County, Ohio.

service area relate to each other. There is also significant variation in the extent to which local systems have co-located local service delivery partners at a single One-Stop facility, or, as an alternative, linked multiple service sites electronically to achieve an integrated service delivery system.

Autonomous Centers Versus Interdependent Networks

Exhibit 2-5 provides examples of how the different case study sites have organized One-Stop centers into local systems. Several of the case study sites were planning to develop only a single One-Stop career center in the sampled service delivery area. For example, the Creston, Iowa, center is planned to be the only full-service center serving a largely rural seven-county area. Similarly, Des Moines is the site of the only planned full-service center in its eight-county service delivery area. To reach customers throughout their service areas, some sites with a single full-service One-Stop center planned to create close coordination linkages (including shared electronic information networks) with additional “satellite” sites maintained by staff from local partner agencies—such as stand-alone offices offering ES and UI services. They also tended to encourage customers to use telephones and computers with modems to access automated information services from off-site locations and visit self-service information kiosks in additional community locations.

The challenge of serving a multi-county service delivery area was addressed in other sites by developing multiple One-Stop career centers. Some sites established several autonomous full-service One-Stop career centers within a single service delivery area.³

For example, in the Southeast Connecticut workforce development area, there will eventually be two full-service One-Stop centers. However, even though they will be overseen by the same regional workforce development board and local One-Stop management committee, each center will be responsible for developing its own cadre of local partners, its own menu of services, and its own local management team. Similarly, in the two-county service delivery area containing the Columbia, Maryland, Career Center, each county-level workforce development system has its own planning committee and operates largely independently of the other.

³ Several of these sites also planned additional ways for customers to access One-Stop services, including self-service community locations (for example, in schools or libraries) and on-line access to automated information services from the customer’s home or business.

Exhibit 2-5
Examples of Organizing One-Stop Service
Delivery Systems: Networks, Centers, Satellites

<p>Connecticut</p> <p><i>Autonomous Centers with Satellite Service Locations</i></p>	<p>Eventually, there will be two full-service One-Stop centers within the Southeast Connecticut service delivery area. Each of these centers will be overseen by the same regional workforce development board and local One-Stop management committee. However, each center will be responsible for developing its own service plan and will have its own day-to-day management structure. Customers may also access automated services at additional community locations.</p>
<p>Indiana</p> <p><i>Local Network</i></p>	<p>The Indianapolis Employment and Training Network (iNET) consists of three One-Stop centers, all of which are operated by the same two core agency partners (the state agency responsible for ES and UI agency and the local JTPA service provider). Services at each center vary somewhat depending on the clientele at each center. For example, the center located closest to many low-income neighborhoods has more on-site and off-site service linkages to programs targeted to economically disadvantaged groups. A regional One-Stop Director convenes the Center managers on a regular basis to facilitate coordination across centers.</p>
<p>Iowa</p> <p><i>Autonomous Center with Satellite Service Locations</i></p>	<p>The Creston Workforce Development Center is the only full-service One-Stop center serving a seven-county largely rural area. Center staff provide workforce development services throughout the region by traveling regularly to satellite or “itinerant” locations hosted by a variety of social service agencies.</p> <hr/> <p>The Des Moines Workforce Development Center is the only designated One-Stop center in an 8-county service delivery area.</p>

Exhibit 2-5 (Continued)

<p>Maryland</p> <p><i>Local Network with Satellite Service Locations</i></p>	<p>The Baltimore One-Stop network combines co-location of staff with the implementation of integrated staff functions and delivery of an integrated menu of services in full-service centers with a “no wrong door” approach that links participating service providers throughout the city. When fully developed, the system will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three <i>full-service career centers</i> offering a comprehensive menu of staffed and self-service options, open to the general public as well as individuals qualifying for targeted services. • A number of <i>specialized centers</i> offering a more limited set of services. Examples of specialized centers include free-standing Job Service offices with limited ES/UI services, centers specializing in youth services, and centers specializing in services to welfare-dependent families. • A network of satellite “village centers” staffed by community-based organizations that will conduct outreach to residents of targeted low-income neighborhoods, provide counseling on education and employment, and refer interested residents to services available in other network locations. <p>Under the previous system, the Urban League had operated a center serving JTPA Title IIA and dislocated worker participants and the AFL-CIO had operated the local center for dislocated workers. Under the new One-Stop design, each of these contractors will be responsible for managing a full-service center that serves a universal customer population. The Eastside Center, however, is staffed by the JTPA administrative entity.</p>
<p><i>Autonomous Centers with Satellite Unstaffed Service Locations</i></p>	<p>The Columbia Maryland Career Center is one of two planned centers in its two-county service delivery area. Although the state requires a single planning and management team to oversee each SDA, this SDA has formed two planning and management teams (one for each county) and operates two largely independent county-level workforce delivery systems.</p> <p>The local One-Stop system plan calls for the establishment of several additional unstaffed “career information centers” within service sites operated by One-Stop partners.</p>

Exhibit 2-5 (Continued)

<p>Massachusetts</p> <p><i>Autonomous Competing Centers</i></p>	<p>The FutureWorks Career Center is one of two One-Stop career centers chartered by the Hampden County Regional Employment Board. Hampden County residents may receive services from FutureWorks, located in the City of Springfield, or from CareerPoint, a second One-Stop career center located about six miles away in Holyoke.</p>
<p>Minnesota</p> <p><i>Autonomous Centers with Satellite Service Locations</i></p>	<p>The state requires each of the 17 local service delivery areas to develop a plan for integrating services through Workforce Development Centers. Most service delivery areas will have multiple full-service One-Stop centers as well as satellite centers.</p>
<p>Ohio</p> <p><i>Autonomous Centers with Satellite Service Locations</i></p>	<p>The Lucas and Wood counties service delivery area included two One-Stop centers at the time of the evaluation site visit. Since the time of the site visit, a third center has also received official designation from the state as a One-Stop career center. Additional service sites operated by the various employment, training, and human service agencies and organizations participating in the local One-Stop initiative are also considered part of the local One-Stop system. In the Lucas and Wood County One-Stop system, all core partners are required to out-station staff at the designated One-Stop centers at least part-time. Partners also maintain “home sites” at their own facilities.</p>
<p>Texas</p> <p><i>Local Network</i></p>	<p>The Arlington Career Center is one of seven One-Stop centers in Tarrant County that are administered by two different organizations. A single workforce development board has recently been formed to provide unified policy oversight over what used to be two distinct JTPA service delivery areas. An electronic communications network links all centers and office of the local policy board. The partners in the Tarrant County Career Center network have adopted a flexible network approach to the provision of One-Stop services, with each of the seven full-service Career Centers in the County offering a different configuration of co-located and “no wrong door” linkages to comprehensive services for Center customers.</p> <p>Because the physical facility selected for the Arlington Career Center did not lead to full co-location of multiple agency partners, the One-Stop model that has evolved draws on the combined features of “co-location” and “no-wrong-door” approaches. The service approach emphasizes sharing staff across multiple agencies and local service sites, including part-time and full-time out-stationing of staff from a variety of partner agencies at the Arlington Career Center.</p>

The Hampden County Regional Employment Board in Massachusetts also created two largely autonomous centers by chartering two different entities to operate “competing” One-Stop career centers within its service delivery area. This is part of an overall strategy for increasing the choices available to local customers by encouraging friendly competition among career center operators. Located only about eight miles from its “sister” career center, the FutureWorks Career Center has differentiated itself from the other center by developing different services oriented to a different clientele.

In contrast to the sites that developed largely autonomous One-Stop centers, several of the local case study sites developed highly interdependent One-Stop networks. The sites that created interdependent One-Stop networks were all located in urbanized areas with a highly diverse customer base. The most striking examples of these networks include the Tarrant County, Texas, system containing the Arlington Career Center; the Indianapolis Employment and Training Network; and the Baltimore Career Center Network.

Some sites established multiple One-Stop service sites to address the different needs of different customer groups. For example, when fully developed, the Baltimore One-Stop network will include:

- Three *full-service career centers* offering a comprehensive menu of staffed and self-service options, open to the general public as well as to individuals qualifying for targeted services.
- A number of *specialized centers* offering a more limited set of services. Examples of specialized centers include free-standing Job Service offices with limited ES and UI services, centers specializing in youth services, and centers specializing in services to welfare-dependent families.
- A network of satellite “village centers” staffed by community-based organizations that will conduct outreach to residents of targeted low-income neighborhoods, provide counseling on education and employment, and refer interested residents to services available in other network locations.

Similarly, each of the three One-Stop centers within the Indianapolis Employment and Training Network vary their service offerings somewhat depending on the clientele at each center. For example, the center located closest to many low-income neighborhoods has more on-site and off-site linkages to programs targeted to economically disadvantaged groups.

Although their services are sometimes differentiated to respond to their specific customers' needs and interests, the different One-Stop centers within interdependent networks usually share a single management structure, or if they have independent management, they share a common service philosophy and guidelines propounded by a shared local system-level policy or advisory board.

Partners Co-Located in One-Stop Centers

As illustrated in Exhibit 2-6, all but two of the case study sites had staff from four of the five mandatory DOL-funded partners on-site at the One-Stop center on a full-time basis, and most sites also had on-site representation from either a staff member or an intern representing the Title V Senior Community Service Program.

The two exceptions to this pattern were the Arlington (Texas) Career Center and the Wood County (Ohio) Employment Resource Center. In Arlington, facility constraints had prevented the full co-location of the ES/UI and JTPA partners at the time of the site visit. However, one full-time person performing ES and UI duties was housed at the Arlington Career Center during the period of the evaluation visit. The local ES and UI office was located in a separate facility only a block away making ES and UI services readily available to One-Stop career center customers. At the Wood County center, co-location of all mandatory partners was limited to one afternoon a week when all partners outstationed staff at the center to provide information, perform intake, and refer customers to all services provided by local partners. At other times, services provided by the JTPA and welfare-to-work programs were available on-site, while other partners could be reached through referral to or electronic linkages with their home offices.

Beyond the mandatory DOL-funded partners, sites varied in the extent that services from additional partners were available on-site.

- Ten of the 14 sites had arranged for the partners responsible for welfare-to-work services to offer these services at least part-time at the One-Stop center.⁴

⁴ Elsewhere we have indicated that six ES/UI or JTPA agencies operated welfare-to-work programs directly and that five sites made arrangements for other One-Stop partners to provide welfare-to-work services on-site at One-Stop centers. However, in the Baltimore Career Center Network, the JTPA agency operates welfare-to-work services at three specialized service sites, rather than at the One-Stop centers that serve the general public.

**Exhibit 2-6
On-Site Partners and Programs**

	ES	UI	JTPA	VETS	Title V	Welfare -to- Work	Voc. Rehab.	ABE/ GED	Income Maint.	Econ. Dev.
New London, CT	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓
Willimantic, CT	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		
Creston, IA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Des Moines, IA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Indianapolis, IN	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Lawrenceburg, IN	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Baltimore, MD	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
Columbia, MD	✓	✓	✓	✓						
Springfield, MA	✓	✓		✓		✓				
Blaine, MN	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Bowling Green, OH	*	*	✓	*	*	✓		✓		
Arlington, TX	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	✓	✓		
Lake Jackson, TX	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Pewaukee, WI	✓	**	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓

* Available on a weekly or "on-call" basis.

** UI claims are taken by telephone in Wisconsin. There is a virtual UI presence because a telephone is available at the One-Stop office to file UI claims.

All on-site partners are listed at the time o

- Six of the 14 sites offered ABE/GED classes directly at the One-Stop center. In five of these sites, the provider was a community college or local secondary education entity. In the sixth site, the JTPA provider provided on-site ABE/GED classes for JTPA-eligible customers.
- Five of the 14 sites had arranged for the partners responsible for vocational rehabilitation services to provide these services on-site at the One-Stop center, at least part-time.
- Three of the 14 sites had arranged for the co-location of welfare agency staff responsible for income maintenance and/or supportive services for welfare clients at the One-Stop center.
- Two sites had full-time on-site economic development partners that participated in the delivery of services to employer customers.

Sites that could not arrange for some partners to be co-located on a full-time basis often arranged for periodic visits to the center by staff from additional agency partners. For example, at the New London (Connecticut) center, counselors from local technical colleges and post-secondary schools visited the center on a monthly basis to hold informational sessions and enroll customers in classes. The Arlington (Texas) Career Center schedules staff from the county emergency assistance and older worker programs to be present at the center on a part-time basis. In addition, some centers stationed core ES/UI and JTPA staff on a part-time basis at remote service sites operated by other agencies.

Coordinated Referrals to Off-Site Partners

Many local sites also developed coordinated referral linkages to supporting partners that were not co-located in the center. Exhibit 2-7 describes the services provided by off-site service providers as well as those provided on-site at selected case study sites. Services available through referral to off-site partners most often included (1) business services offered by community colleges or local economic development agencies, (2) education and training services available from local secondary and post-secondary education and vocational training programs, (3) vocational rehabilitation and welfare-to-work services from partners not co-located at the One-Stop center, and (4) family, health, and social services available from a variety of public and private community agencies.

Exhibit 2-7
Examples of On-Site and Off-Site Service Partners

Connecticut	<p>At the New London <i>Connecticut Works Center</i>, on-site services were provided by staff funded by ES, UI, JTPA, the state economic development agency, and a proprietary service provider that delivers group workshops. Plans were underway for the on-site delivery of support services to welfare-to-work participants by staff from the state Department of Social Services.</p> <p>Off-site services were available to One-Stop customers through coordinated referrals to local school districts, adult education programs, the next-door office of the regional economic development corporation, the Department of Social Service’s welfare-to-work contractor, and a education and career telephone “hotline” operated by the State Department of Higher Education.</p> <p>Staff that visited the center on a monthly basis included counselors from local technical colleges and post-secondary schools.</p>
Indiana	<p>At the Eastside Indianapolis Career Center, on-site services are provided by staff funded by the ES, UI, and JTPA programs. In addition, several staff provide Veterans Employment Services. A Title V Older Workers program participant serves as the center “hostess.”</p> <p>At the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center, on-site services are provided by staff funded by ES, UI, JTPA, Title V Older Workers, and the local vocational rehabilitation agency, which stations a representative at the center several days a week. In addition, a full-time ABE/GED instructor teaches classes at the center.</p>
Maryland	<p>At the Columbia Career Center, on-site services are provided by staff from the following agencies: the agency responsible for ES and UI, the JTPA administrative entity, a JTPA-funded service provider, and the local community college (evening basic education classes). Customers are assisted in obtaining services off-site from local educational institutions and a business resource center operated by the local economic development agency.</p>

Exhibit 2-7 (Continued)

Minnesota	<p>Services available within the Workforce Center are provided by staff from ES, UI, JTPA, and the division of Rehabilitation Service. Additionally, related services provided by co-located partners within the larger human resources center include sheltered work for individuals with developmental disabilities, ABE/GED services provided by a consortium of six school districts, and counseling on educational opportunities provided by staff from a local educational opportunity center.</p> <p>The Anoka Workforce Center is currently beginning what one respondent described as “the next level of integration” of the welfare system with the workforce development system. In June 1996, 26 Income Maintenance Department intake staff and 9 Child Care Assistance staff joined as partners of the Workforce Center. As soon as a new fourth floor of the Human Service Center is completed in 1997, the remainder of the approximately 100 Income Maintenance staff—those working with ongoing cases—will also be housed within the Workforce Center.</p>
Ohio	<p>On-site services include intake, information, and referral on local workforce development programs available from all One-Stop partners, as well as more complete menus of JTPA and welfare-to-work services. An on-site ABE/GED class is provided by a local vocational school. An on-site job club, mandatory for JOBS clients, is also available to the general public.</p> <p>Off-site services include those available from ES and UI (on days the representatives responsible for ES and UI are not present at the center), referral to community-based organizations, and referral to off-site training for categorically eligible customers.</p>
Texas	<p>On-site services provided by staff stationed at the center on a full-time basis include JTPA-funded services, ES, UI, welfare-to-work case management, vocational rehabilitation services, as well as adult-basic education classes, ESL classes, and computer and clerical training. Staff stationed at the center on a part-time basis offer county emergency assistance and access to older worker programs.</p>
Wisconsin	<p>Services provided by on-site partners include ES, income maintenance, welfare-to-work services, enhanced services to JTPA-eligible customers and welfare recipients, and services to employers, including customized training.</p> <p>The on-site community career center operated by the technical college is designed to serve both youth and adults.</p>

GOAL 3. FORMING EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES FOR ONE-STOP CENTERS

Given the diverse paths leading to the formation of One-Stop centers, it is not surprising that there is also a diversity of governance and management structures within centers and One-Stop networks. For most of the cases in our sample, however, governance and management of One-Stop centers occurred at three distinct substate levels:

- *Policy and advisory bodies.* In the majority of study sites, policy or advisory bodies were established to oversee the direction of One-Stop centers in local areas.
- *Center and network management.* Centers and networks of One-Stop centers had adopted different approaches to management, ranging from a single administrator to a team management approach.
- *Operations teams.* In many centers, particularly those that were actively integrating services to customers, management staff, supervisors, and front-line staff formed teams or committees focusing on specific aspects of One-Stop operations.

Each of these levels is described below.

Policy Governance and Advisory Bodies

All local One-Stop systems were governed by some kind of policy or advisory body. These policy bodies often took the form of interagency steering committees for One-Stop systems and comprised agency heads, private businesses, local elected officials, economic development entities, educational institutions and organizations, social services agencies, and other community-based organizations.

As described in the previous chapter on the states' roles, states varied in their guidance about the bodies that should govern local One-Stop systems. Some states allowed sites to use existing governance structures, usually JTPA private industry councils (PICs), as governance boards for local One-Stop systems (although many of these states required the PICs to expand their membership). Other states required that sites establish new governance structures for local One-Stop systems, often referred to as Workforce Development Boards. In many cases, these new boards grew out of local or regional planning committees established during the planning phases of One-Stop implementation to represent all stakeholders in the new system.

In cases where PICs served as the governing bodies for the local One-Stop system, their role was different than the role they played in JTPA. In JTPA, PICs often both provided oversight and delivered services to customers; in the One-Stop system, the boards were encouraged (as in Indiana) or required (as in Texas) to separate their oversight and service delivery roles.

The local and regional governance bodies usually had the following responsibilities: (1) ensuring that local One-Stop centers and One-Stop systems were implemented in accordance with the local and state agreements, (2) ensuring that performance standards were achieved for specific outcomes, (3) overseeing the management of One-Stop systems, (4) assisting in the development of agreements among local partners and approving those agreements, and (5) providing local budget oversight. Some local boards were also responsible for certifying One-Stop centers or “chartering” One-Stop center operators, using criteria established by the state. Examples of the responsibilities of these governing bodies are detailed in Exhibit 2-8; below we describe several examples.

Texas’s One-Stop strategy emphasizes local initiative and control in planning and operating One-Stop systems. This strategy is formally codified by state legislation, which established a framework for decentralized planning through local Workforce Development Boards. These boards are to be composed of representatives from workforce development providers as well as business, labor, education, and community-based organizations. Workforce Development Boards, when fully operational, will be responsible for the design and operation of One-Stop centers in service delivery areas that comprise one or more prior JTPA service delivery areas. In areas where they have begun to operate, boards have assumed many of the planning, monitoring, evaluation, and fiscal functions for local workforce programs.

In Massachusetts, which has instituted a competitive model for service delivery, Regional Employment Boards “charter” local One-Stop center operators. These charters are revocable if center operators fail to meet identified performance benchmarks. Center managers and staff work closely with Boards on policy and procedural issues, local economic development initiatives, and efforts to identify emerging community needs and strategies to address these needs. The board responsible for the Springfield One-Stop center was one of the first in the state to engage in a competitive bidding process for operating One-Stop centers, seeking “inventive partners” rather than vendors who would carry out specific pre-defined

Exhibit 2-8
Examples of Policy Bodies

Connecticut	<p>Oversight and administration of career centers are shared by the Regional Workforce Development Boards and the Connecticut Department of Labor (CTDOL).</p> <p>In New London, a management committee is charged with establishing center policy. This committee consists of representatives from the Board, CTDOL, and five other organizations</p>
Iowa	<p>Although not in place at the time of the site visits, state legislation has called for the creation of regional advisory boards to (1) advise state agencies and Workforce Development Boards about regional workforce development needs, (2) assist in decisions about the state award of grants or contracts for the delivery of regional workforce development services, and (3) monitor the performance of local service providers. Regional Advisory Board members will be appointed by the governor and will include elected officials as well as business, labor, and education representatives.</p>
Indiana	<p>The state of Indiana’s plan for policy oversight of local One-Stop systems calls for increased coordination between PICs and local officials, economic development entities, educational institutions and organizations, county-based providers of social services, and other community-based organizations.</p> <p>Because of the Eastside Center’s status as a joint state-local pilot project to create a model center, its Advisory Committee consists of public and private sector representatives from both the state and the local level. In Lawrenceburg, no final decision had been made regarding the designation of a governing board at the time of the site visit.</p>
Maryland	<p>Baltimore’s One-Stop planning team has 14 members. Representatives include the PIC chair and three other employer representatives, Job Service, the Mayor’s Office of Employment Development—which is the local administrative entity for the JTPA program—the local community college, the Urban League, and the AFL-CIO.</p>

Exhibit 2-8 (Continued)

Massachusetts	A network of Regional Employment Boards governs and oversees the state's One-Stop career centers. Career centers are responsible to the boards for meeting the terms of their charters, which are revocable if center operators fail to meet identified performance benchmarks.
Minnesota	In Anoka County, a local workforce council consists of private-sector, Job Service, rehabilitation services, social services, and local technical and community colleges representatives. In addition, a Human Service Advisory group—consisting representatives of the many agencies that are co-located—holds regular monthly meetings.
Texas	The Lake Jackson center is overseen by a regional partnership that includes the administrative entity for a multi-county SDA, the regional Office of the Texas Workforce Commission, and the Houston Regional Office of the Texas Department of Human Services. The Houston-Galveston Area Council acts as the grant recipient and fiscal agent for the partnership.
Wisconsin	The state had planned to establish local Human Resource Investment Boards to oversee One-Stop systems, but this proposal met with resistance in Waukesha and other local area because these proposed governing bodies were being planned after local planning teams had been established to manage One-Stops.

services. The private Employment and Training Institute (ETI) was awarded a charter to operate the Springfield center.

In one study site, Wisconsin's Waukesha County, the proposed creation of a new governance body was met with substantial resistance. Initially, the local One-Stop center was guided by a collaborative planning team that had responsibility over a three-county SDA. The state's planned framework for local One-Stop governance called for establishing local "Human Resource Investment Boards." Representatives from local partner agencies, however, were opposed to what was perceived as another layer of bureaucracy and were concerned about the potential destabilizing effect this mandated structure could have on the current collaborative process, which partners believed worked exceptionally well. In the face of local opposition, the state has postponed establishing these formal local governance boards.

Center and Network Management

One-Stop partners formed a variety of structures to manage their One-Stop systems. These ranged from having a single director with overall authority for policy and management within a center to shared management of the center among numerous partners. These variations in management structures are discussed below and summarized in Exhibit 2-9.

Single Manager

Some centers have a director from a single agency who coordinates all of the activities in the center. For example, the Creston, Iowa, Workforce Development Center is managed by the JTPA director. This director is responsible for overall management of the shared physical facility and day-to-day operations of the center, and serves as the primary liaison between the various state agencies, departments, and programs represented at the center. The director was selected collaboratively with the state's regional Employment Service manager. Further, the director coordinates closely with the Employment Service office manager in administering the center's day-to-day functions.

Many sites with a single director found that establishing an interagency management workgroup, composed of members from several agencies, promoted a cohesive service delivery structure. These interagency management teams provided a forum for joint planning and resolution of issues, including problems in sharing space and equipment, working out staff duties and schedules, and how to best coordinate

Exhibit 2-9
Examples of One-Stop Center Management Structures

Connecticut	In all centers in the state, the Job Center director has been designated the director for the entire One-Stop center, although there is still a clear division of management responsibility for center operations by categorical programs and funding streams.
Iowa	The Creston Center is managed by the SDA director, who coordinates with the Job Service office manager in administering the Center's day-to-day functions. At the Des Moines center, the "partner's group" includes senior staff from all eight core partners at the center and is responsible for joint administration of the Center.
Indiana	In Indianapolis, the day-to-day operation of each center is co-managed by a "partnership of equals" of the Department of Workforce Development (which is responsible for UI and ES services) and PIC contractor, which is responsible for JTPA services.
Maryland	In Baltimore day-to-day management and operation of the Center are the responsibility of the two co-located partners, JTPA and Job Service, although responsibility for the self-service equipment resides with the Job Service, who occupied the center before being joined by the JTPA unit.
Massachusetts	The FutureWorks center in Springfield is managed by an executive director, who is assisted by a management team that includes managers of the center's four functional divisions.
Minnesota	Day-to-day governance of the Workforce Center in Anoka County is provided by a steering committee that directs, coordinates, and oversees center operations. The steering committee is co-chaired by the directors of four agencies within the center.
Ohio	Co-managers from the Wood County Department of Human Services and the Toledo Area PIC are responsible for day-to-day management and operations of the Wood County center.

Exhibit 2-9 (Continued)

Texas	After the Arlington Job Training Center was established as a One-Stop Career Center, governance functions were assumed by a “Site-Based Management Committee,” which is currently chaired an employee of county’s JTPA administrator. This committee, comprised of 24 committee members and 15 ex-officio members, includes broad representation from on-site service providers and other agencies participating in local One-Stop planning and policy development.
Wisconsin	The Waukesha center is guided by a collaborative planning team that consists of Job Service, the PIC, the administrative entity for the JOBS program, and the local technical college. The day-to-day operation is overseen by a management team consisting of top-level representatives from six of the key partner agencies at the center.

services to individuals and employers. For example, in Lake Jackson, Texas, the center formed a management team that included the center manager; supervisors for UI, ES, JTPA, and JOBS; and the local Veterans Employment Services representative. This committee was jointly responsible for day-to-day administration, staffing, and scheduling. In Arlington, Texas, a site-based management committee met on a regular basis to coordinate center activities, share information on service provision, and establish long-range planning goals for the center.

Dual Managers

In some cases, partly to avoid the perception that there was one “lead” agency, representatives of two key partners were designated co-managers. For example, in Indianapolis, each center within the city’s network was co-managed by designated staff from the two agencies responsible for UI/ES services and JTPA services as a “partnership of equals.”

The co-managers in the Wood County, Ohio, One-Stop center were the directors of the welfare-to-work agency and the JTPA agency. These co-managers jointly oversaw the scheduling and operation of the center, assisted in resolving conflicts among partners, and carried out the action plans approved by the center’s governance council. Each co-manager also had specific responsibilities. The welfare-to-work co-manager chaired the center’s interagency team while the JTPA co-manager was in charge of the financial aspects of the center.

Team Management

In other cases, no one person had overall management authority for the center; rather management and oversight was conducted by a committee of partners, each of whom was also individually responsible to their respective agency for program-related duties.

In Anoka County, Minnesota, for example, day-to-day management of the center was provided by a steering committee that directed, coordinated, and oversaw center operations. The steering committee was co-chaired by the directors of four agencies within the Center: JTPA, ES/UI, Rehabilitation Services, and the county’s income maintenance division. Meetings of the steering committee, which were held every three weeks, were attended by about twenty supervisory staff and directors from all agency partners at the center. The steering committee made recommendations to its Workforce Council on issues of service improvement, provided input in the preparation of the

center's budgets and service coordination plans, oversaw customer satisfaction and outcome measurement, and maintained ongoing communication with front-line staff on a variety of policy, funding, and operational issues.

The One-Stop center in Des Moines, Iowa, was also managed by an interagency team. This team provided the administrative structure for the consolidation of core services. Management functions were shared among senior staff from each of the eight core agencies that belonged to the "partner's group" at the center.

Operations Teams

To facilitate coordination, most One-Stop centers formed operations teams to develop operational procedures for the center (see Exhibit 2-10). In some cases, these teams were formed to conduct a specific task. Such teams were common in the planning period, as centers needed to develop new collaborative procedures to conduct their business. In some sites, however, task-specific teams continued to be formed whenever a new issue arose that needed a coordinated resolution.

For example, at the Eastside Baltimore Career Center, one operational team was charged with planning for the development of a resource library. In Springfield, Massachusetts, a "career development" team coordinated with resource room staff to identify providers of training for specific career areas. Staff in Waukesha, Wisconsin, formed an interagency workgroup to address problems that employers were having in finding a pool of qualified apprenticeship applicants.

Many One-Stop centers also established on-going operational committees with responsibilities for coordinating specific operations. For example, at Anoka County's Workforce Center several "operations committees," composed of front-line and supervisory staff, have been formed to coordinate the various common service functions, including intake, information services, assessment and career planning, job search, training, and case management. In Willimantic, Connecticut, a work team composed of local front-line staff meets regularly to coordinate scheduling, and another team, composed of counselors from different partner agencies, meets to coordinate assessment for customers from a variety of backgrounds. In Springfield, Massachusetts, a "No Excuses" team was charged with improving the customer focus of services and using customer feedback in its continuous feedback process.

Exhibit 2-10
Examples of Operations Teams

Connecticut	In Willimantic, there are a number of committees and work teams comprised of local front-line staff. These teams meet to share ideas on improving the integration and delivery of services to customers. Two of the most active committees are a Workshop Committee, which decides what workshops will be offered at the Center, and an Assessment Team, which coordinates assessment methods.
Iowa	The Creston Center is relatively small so all staff attend weekly planning meetings to increase their familiarity with the range of services offered at the center as well as off-site. In Des Moines, inter-agency groups include a customer service and an assessment committee, both of which are charged with furthering the integration of services to individuals.
Indiana	At the Indianapolis Eastside Center, two cross-agency functional units are responsible for services for individual customers: reception and intake and skills identification and development.
Maryland	At the Eastside Baltimore Center, one interagency operations team was developing plans for the resource library.
Massachusetts	In the Springfield center, the Career Development team coordinates with another team, Community Relations, to identify providers of training for specific career areas. Other specialized work teams are formed as needed to develop or improve services to individuals.
Minnesota	Interagency committees, consisting of front-line and supervisory staff, coordinate all common service functions, including intake, assessment and career planning, job search, training, case management, and universal services.
Texas	In Arlington, teams of front-line staff meet regularly to discuss current service practices across partner agencies and opportunities for improved coordination or integration of services.
Wisconsin	An “Integrated Services to Job Seekers” Committee is one of a variety of interagency committees that has been formed at the Waukesha Center. This committee is responsible for coordinating all services to individuals.

GOAL 4. STAFFING ONE-STOP CENTERS TO FACILITATE SERVICE COORDINATION

Centers also needed to develop staffing arrangements that supported the One-Stop approach. As shown in Exhibits 2-11 and 2-12, centers adopted several different approaches to coordinating staffing arrangements.

Some sites integrated staff for the reception desk and perhaps the resource area, but maintained separate staffing of all other functions. Partners in these centers provided cross-training to staff about each other's programs to facilitate referrals, but the separate programs continued to operate independently.

For example, the center in Lake Jackson, Texas, adopted a "coordination rather than consolidation" approach to staffing. Although the ES and UI functions had been integrated prior to the One-Stop initiative, JTPA services—also provided by Texas Workforce Commission staff under contract to the local PIC—were delivered by staff assigned to a separate career services unit.

Other centers integrated service staff to a far greater extent. These centers developed functional groups that were cross-staffed by staff from partner agencies. These work teams served customers from many different programs in services that were common to those programs.

For example, several years before the One-Stop initiative, staff at the center in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, suggested that the office be organized by job function rather than by individual program. They identified that most partner programs had job functions for reception, assessment, case management, job development, and employer services; and so they organized functional teams in each of these areas. The development of integrated staff assignments has evolved gradually over time and has been facilitated by the long job tenure of most center staff.

In sites where the majority of staff worked for one agency or organization, functional staffing was not very difficult, involving only cross-training. For example, at Baltimore's Eastside Center, most of the 30 staff are employees of the Mayor's Office of Employment Development, who are joined by three staff from the Employment Service. It was relatively easy to reorganize staff into several functional units that included a clerical pool, a program development unit, an employment development unit, a job service unit, and a customer services unit.

Exhibit 2-11
Approaches to the Integration of One-Stop Services

Connecticut	<p>At the New London <i>Connecticut Works</i> Center, the agency responsible for ES and UI and JTPA partners share in the staffing of customer reception services and the supervision of self-access services in the career services center and the resource library. Core services to business customers are cross-staffed by employees of the ES/UI and JTPA agencies. Enhanced services to business customers will be shared by these core partners as well as staff out-stationed from the state department of economic development.</p>
Indiana	<p>At the Eastside Indianapolis Workforce Development Center, staff have been cross-trained to provide a range of services and to be flexible in carrying out their duties. The goal of the Center is to provide “seamless” services to customers. Rather than being organized according to their categorical program or agency affiliation, Center staff are organized into three cross-agency and cross-program functional units: customer reception and intake, skills identification and development, and employer relations and placement.</p> <p>Although Center staff each receive formal supervision from the manager of their own program (JTPA, ES, or UI), integrated planning and coordination of Center services takes place on a regular basis. Cross-functional teams from JTPA, ES, and UI programs meet regularly to work on ways to improve customer service, assisted in this by a supervisor who acts as facilitator.</p>
Iowa	<p>Although there is increasing coordination between staff of partner agencies in the Creston center, the only functions that have been integrated to date are customer reception, the management of the consolidated physical facility, and the provision of self-service automated information and training services in the Resource Room. With the exception of the reception staff and an administrative assistant/MIS liaison, both of whom are engaged in Center-wide operations, staff have not been cross-trained or assigned to perform integrated job functions across programs.</p> <p>In response to the federal goal of <i>Integrated Services</i>, the core partners in the Des Moines WDC are currently working on plans to integrate the common functions of customer reception, testing/assessment, job placement, and employer services. The integration of these functions is viewed as a strategy to reduce duplication of effort across partners.</p>

Exhibit 2-11 (Continued)

<p>Maryland</p>	<p>At the Eastside Career Center, the local JTPA staff have invited their ES and UI partners to join Center operations through selective co-location of staff and participation in an integrated interagency service design process and the development of an integrated staffing plan for the delivery of services to Center customers. This strategy has resulted in the development of additional One-Stop services, including a redesigned Information Session, locally-initiated computer-assisted training options, a series of cross-staffed workshops and seminars for job-seeker customers, and the beginnings of a consolidated system of account executives and services oriented to the needs of employer customers.</p>
	<p>At the Columbia Career Center, the automated <i>CareerNet</i> system offers high-quality, integrated core services to all system users, irrespective of their eligibility for categorical programs. Beyond these core services, the achievement of the federal objective of <i>Integrated Services</i> is currently predicated upon generally informal cooperation and coordination among primary and other partner entities. Customers eligible for categorical programs are referred to the partner entity best suited to provide needed services.</p>
<p>Massachusetts</p>	<p>Because it has been fashioned “of a whole cloth,” rather than piecemeal, the Center has been immune to the culture clash commonly experienced by staff in One-Stop Centers formed through the consolidation of multiple public agencies and departments. Although the internal organization of services provided by ETI at the FutureWorks Career Center follows a fully-integrated design, not all public workforce development funds were reallocated nor all categorical program responsibilities reassigned to the One-Stop career centers. The most notable program/funding streams not yet consolidated into One-Stop career center operations at the state level are JTPA Title II funds for services to economically disadvantaged individuals and Title III funds for dislocated worker services.</p>
<p>Minnesota</p>	<p>The Anoka County approach to consolidation and integration of One-Stop services tends to maintain a clear “division of labor” among programs, so that individual agencies are still responsible for certain functions. Cross-agency planning and oversight committees ensure that the overall service system is coordinated by providing the opportunity for all partners to have substantial input into the design and participate in the oversight of these various functions.</p>

Exhibit 2-11 (Continued)

Ohio	<p>At the Wood County Employment Resource Center, partners have emphasized the importance of referring customers to the appropriate agency or organization. Part-time co-location is viewed as a tool to ensure that appropriate referrals are made as well as an opportunity to provide direct customer services. Representatives of all the mandatory programs are on-site at least once a week—on Wednesdays for a minimum of four hours; on other weekdays they may be contacted for appointments at their home sites. Representatives of additional non-mandatory program partners also visit the One-Stop site, but less frequently. They may also be reached at their home sites for appointments.</p> <p>Mandatory and other partners serving customers at both ERCs have been cross-trained. This allows them to assist customers in accessing One-Stop information services, to understand more about the eligibility requirements for their partner agencies, and to make good referrals.</p>
Texas	<p>Service integration among Center partners who are not co-located is expressed through close coordination of activities among partners, resulting in personalized services to Center customers. In general, physical proximity allows for frequent face-to-face and telephone contact between staff of the Arlington Center and nearby ES and UI staff, and for coordination of services on behalf of individual customers. Among staff co-housed at the Arlington Center, while cross-training among staff from different agencies is still in an early stage, there are plans to cross-train staff to facilitate integration of core services and case management functions.</p>
Wisconsin	<p>As stated in a memorandum of understanding that was signed by the partner agencies nearly two years before the facility was operational, each agency agreed to take the lead on a different specialized function within the Center. This agreement has fostered a sense of cohesion and partnership, while acknowledging and capitalizing on specific expertise and minimizing duplicative efforts.</p>

Exhibit 2-12
Examples of Staffing One-Stop Centers

Connecticut	Many of the Center's services targeted to all customers are cross-staffed, although categorically-funded programs are not.
Iowa	At the Creston center, job assignments follow programmatic, rather than functional, lines. Except for the receptionist and an administrative assistant, both of whom are engaged in center-wide operations, staff have not been cross-trained or assigned to perform integrated job functions across programs.
Indiana	<p>In Indianapolis current staff assignments focus on duties that cut across program lines and stress the functional competencies that the various programs have in common. ES and UI staff, who have been cross-trained, are often rotated throughout most of the front-line office positions, including reception and intake, UI claims taking, and job matching.</p> <p>In Lawrenceburg, staff are organized by job function. All staff rotate in front-line positions and staff keep track of which programs they are working on so that they can bill their hours to the correct program.</p>
Maryland	<p>At Baltimore's Eastside Center, all staff share a number of common One-Stop staff assignments, in addition to their particular job duties. The integrated staff assignments, shared among all center staff, include: (1) helping customers in the resource room use the automated services and other resource materials, (2) teaching the center's group workshops and seminars, and (3) leading orientation sessions for new customers.</p> <p>Specialized functional units include a clerical pool, a program development unit, an employment development unit, the job service unit, and a customer services unit.</p> <p>In Columbia, ES/UI and JTPA employees are located on separate sides of the center with each performing different functions. No cross-staffing has occurred.</p>
Massachusetts	In the FutureWorks Career Center, all staff are assigned to one of four functional divisions: career development services, employer services, MIS/administrative services, and community relations and marketing.

Exhibit 2-12 (Continued)

Minnesota	Integration efforts have been focused on core agency practices in six major areas: intake, assessment and career planning, job search, training, case management, and employer services. Not all of these functions are cross-staffed by employees of the different agencies, however.
Ohio	In Wood County, at each of the One-Stop centers, ES and UI representatives have been cross-trained to assist customers in both of these programs.
Texas	In Lake Jackson, the ES and UI functions were integrated prior to the One-Stop initiative. The VETS program, although also administered by the Texas Workforce Commission, continues to be staffed separately from ES and UI functions. Under a “coordination rather than consolidation” approach services, JTPA services delivered through a separate career services unit.
Wisconsin	At the Waukasha Workforce Development Center, staff are situated in the building based upon function, so that “case management” staff are located in the same area, regardless of agency affiliation.

In centers involving a greater diversity of partners, however, coordinating and integrating staff functions was a more complex task. Partners needed to develop procedures to allow staff from different agencies to do similar work. Some centers developed consolidated job descriptions to reflect new work teams. For example, the center in Indianapolis developed common job descriptions for staff who worked in joint teams. This process involved negotiating with the unions about the specific job duties of the teams and the appropriate salary levels. Because the job descriptions were broader, the union was concerned that greater expertise was required and that salaries should therefore be higher.

Other centers retained the previous job descriptions and work rules from the separate programs. Although this required less initial investment, it frequently resulted in inconsistencies and some inequities within teams. In some cases, staff working in the same team but employed by different agencies had different job descriptions, salaries, holidays, and work hours.

Integrated work teams also posed a challenge in supervising staff employed by different agencies. To solve this problem, a few centers drew a distinction between “formal” and “functional” lines of supervisory authority. For example, in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, managers from all participating agencies entered into a written contract stating that managers from each agency retained formal supervisory responsibility for the individuals employed by each agency, but allowing individuals from other agencies to provide functional supervision of staff.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

As detailed in this chapter, One-Stop partnerships grew out of varied histories of collaboration among local workforce development partners. In general, centers in which local partners had a longer history of collaboration were much more likely to have developed arrangements for integrating or consolidating common service functions. Many sites, for example, profited greatly from previous experiences in coordinating JTPA, ES, and UI services as well as from existing partnerships with local education, social service, and community organizations.

Many centers have succeeded in achieving co-location—and in several cases, service consolidation—across a broad range of both core and supporting One-Stop partners. Important supporting partners—beyond the mandatory DOL-funded program partners—have often included community and technical colleges, secondary educational

institutions, vocational rehabilitation agencies, income maintenance providers, economic development agencies, and community-based service organizations.

Case study sites used a wide variety of organizational approaches to link One-Stop partner agencies into coherent local service systems. One approach, used successfully by sites that could locate and afford to build or refurbish appropriate integrated facilities, was the development of full-service One-Stop centers that permitted the co-location of multiple local partners. Local sites that achieved full co-location were often able to develop consolidated service functions, ranging from reception, intake, and the delivery of self-access services to more intensive services targeted to customers requiring additional assistance. Another approach, used by a number of sites, combined partial or part-time co-location of a staff from multiple One-Stop partners with the creation of coordinated system-level and client-level communication linkages to facilitate the coordination of services provided by local network partners from different service sites.

Policy and advisory bodies, both those that developed as a result of local planning for One-Stop and those mandated by states, also played an important role at all of the One-Stops in our sample. In many cases, local PICs or their successor workforce boards offered substantial input both in terms of establishing local One-Stop policies and providing broad oversight of One-Stop system operations. However, in some local areas (as noted above) the managers of local service delivery partners that had already negotiated One-Stop services and operational procedures viewed policy boards as an unnecessary new layer of bureaucracy.

Management structures for the day-to-day operation of One-Stop centers varied widely, from single center directors to participatory consensus-based management teams. Particularly in One-Stops with many core partners, the team management approach had the advantage of allowing partners to share responsibility for One-Stop operations. In smaller centers, or those with fewer core partners, having a single director was often viewed as the most efficient management strategy.

To address ongoing operational issues, several One-Stop centers formed operational teams that comprised both front-line and supervisory staff. These interagency teams helped shape One-Stop center policies and service designs for shared functions such as self-access services, resource areas, and job placement services, as

well as shared enhanced services such as assessment, counseling, and case management.

The One-Stop system will be faced with continuing challenges in promoting effective local partnership development and governance. Each One-Stop center and system appears to have developed staffing, partnering, and management arrangements that suited its local context and furthered its immediate One-Stop goals. However, as they mature and gain additional experience with collaborative service models, many of the study sites are attempting to forge broader and more effective relationships with a variety of partner organizations, particularly education and social service providers. They also are realizing the importance of coordinating One-Stop system-building efforts with related initiatives, such as welfare-to-work and school-to-work, so as to avoid duplication of effort.