

SPR

SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Creating Workforce Development Systems That Work: A Guide for Practitioners

Part I. Organizing and Governing One-Stop Systems

November 1, 1997

Prepared by:

Deborah Kogan, Project Director
Katherine P. Dickinson
Ruth Fedrau
Michael J. Midling
Kristin E. Wolff

Submitted to:

Dick Ensor, Government Officer's Technical Representative
U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
One-Stop Team
Room N-4700
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

DOL Contract No. F-4957-5-00-80-30
Task Order #3

This project has been funded with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration under Contract No. F-4957-5-00-80-30. The contents of this report do not necessarily represent the views or policies of the Department of Labor.

PREFACE

Creating Workforce Development Systems That Work: A Guide for Practitioners has been prepared by Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to relate the findings and lessons learned from the experiences of the first-round One-Stop Implementation States in a format that will be useful to state and local One-Stop practitioners from systems at different levels of maturity. The guide describes common One-Stop system-building goals and summarizes strategies used by states and local One-Stop sites to further each of these goals.

The practitioners' guide has been prepared in three parts for insertion into loose-leaf binders. At the end of each chapter, we have included a resources section that includes materials developed by practitioners in the early One-Stop implementation states. We encourage readers to add to these resources by collecting and inserting additional materials over time.

Two companion volumes may be of interest to the reader. *Final Report: Creating Workforce Development Systems That Work* summarizes findings from SPR's process evaluation of the initial implementation experiences of the first nine One-Stop implementation states and fourteen local sites within those states. A separately bound *Appendix to the Final Report* includes individual case study profiles of the One-Stop implementation experiences of the 9 states and 14 local sites included in the study. Each of these documents is available in electronic format on the USDOL Technology Training Resource Center (TTRC) Web site at <http://www.ttrc.doleta.gov>.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the states and local One-Stop systems and centers that participated in the One-Stop evaluation study. They endured our nearly endless questions, provided useful information, and shared their enthusiasm about the transformations underway in their workforce development systems as well as their frustrations with the difficulties they encountered along the way. We would also like to thank those One-Stop employers and individual customers who participated in on-site focus groups that provided us with information about the customer's perspective on the changes underway.

We also would like to thank the members of the One-Stop Team within the U.S. Department of Labor, whose members in both the national and regional DOL offices have been extremely helpful in supporting and guiding this research and technical

assistance effort. Particular thanks are due to Norm Lance and Dick Ensor for their assistance as Government Officer's Technical Representatives on this effort. We express our thanks and appreciation to Maria Remboulis, who was a key member of the SPR project team during its first year.

CONTENTS

PART I. ORGANIZING AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

INTRODUCTION.....	A-1
1. GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS: THE STATE ROLE.....	1-1
2. BUILDING LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS.....	2-1

PART II. BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

3. DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE PHYSICAL FACILITIES	3-1
4. CREATING AN EFFECTIVE ONE-STOP INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE.....	4-1
5. BUILDING STAFF CAPACITY	5-1
6. FINANCING ONE-STOP SERVICES	6-1
7. MARKETING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS	7-1
8. MEASURING ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE AND PLANNING FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	8-1

PART III. DESIGNING AND DELIVERING ONE-STOP SERVICES

9. PROVIDING TRANSFORMED ONE-STOP SERVICES TO INDIVIDUAL CUSTOMERS.....	9-1
10. PROVIDING TRANSFORMED ONE-STOP SERVICES TO EMPLOYERS	10-1

PART I
ORGANIZING AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

INTRODUCTION..... A-1

 OVERVIEW OF ONE-STOP INITIATIVE..... A-1

 ONE-STOP PROCESS EVALUATION A-2

 OVERVIEW OF THE PRACTITIONERS’ GUIDE A-4

 ADDITIONAL RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ONE-STOP SYSTEM BUILDING..... A-6

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF ONE-STOP INITIATIVE

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has undertaken an initiative to promote the transformation of workforce development services into a system of One-Stop Career Centers. The overall objective of the One-Stop initiative is to unify the “patchwork” of fragmented categorical programs into a single workforce development system. Specific objectives of the federal One-Stop initiative include:

- *Universal access.* The design and delivery of core workforce development services universally accessible to all individual and employer customers, regardless of their eligibility for specific categorical programs.
- *Customer choice.* The transformation of the bureaucratic maze of categorical workforce development programs into a customer-driven system that allows job-seeker and employer customers to select services appropriate to their individual needs and interests.
- *Service integration.* The integration of the planning, design, and delivery of services across multiple funding streams and agencies to create a system of services that is seamless from the customer perspective and minimizes duplication of effort.
- *Outcome accountability.* The development of new system-level accountability mechanisms to ensure that the system is driven by efforts to improve outcomes for worker and employer customers.

Although experimentation with One-Stop models has been underway in some states and local areas for over a decade, DOL promoted widespread One-Stop planning and implementation of these systems by awarding a series of One-Stop planning and development and implementation grants to states. By the end of Fiscal Year 1995, the U.S. Department of Labor had awarded 3-year implementation grants to 16 states, 18-month grants for the development of local One-Stop Learning Laboratories to 10 local areas, and 12-month planning and development grants to 27 states to support the creation of interagency partnerships and plans for One-Stop career center systems.

The One-Stop Career Center initiative is continuing to expand, both within existing implementation states—as local partnerships start up additional One-Stop career centers—and through the designation of new implementation states. In January 1997, DOL announced that another 17 states would receive One-Stop implementation

grants by July 1997, bringing the total number of implementation states to 33. When fully operational, One-Stop career centers in these states should serve 80% of the nation's civilian labor force. In addition, activities to further the goals of the One-Stop initiative have been undertaken even among the 21 states and territories that have not yet received formal One-Stop implementation assistance from the federal government.

During Program Year 1997, DOL is continuing to support the development of One-Stop systems in each of the One-Stop implementation states that has not yet completed its three-year implementation grant cycle as well as in the 21 states and territories that are still in the planning and development stages of One-Stop system-building. Staff in DOL Regional Offices will be responsible for awarding One-Stop planning and development grants and One-Stop implementation grants to these 21 jurisdictions.

To receive One-Stop implementation funds, states and local sites must demonstrate that their new systems will include the state and local agencies responsible for the following Department of Labor programs: (1) the Employment Service; (2) Unemployment Insurance; (3) federal employment and training programs for economically disadvantaged youth and adults under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Title II; (4) dislocated worker services funded under JTPA Title III, the Trade Adjustment Assistance/Trade Readjustment Allowance (TAA/TRA), and Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services; (5) the Senior Community Service Employment Program funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act; and (6) Veterans Employment Services, including separate funding streams for all veterans and disabled veterans.

In addition, the Department of Labor also encourages states and local areas to involve a wide variety of additional workforce development and human services agencies in the coordinated planning and consolidated delivery of services. Examples of these additional partners include vocational rehabilitation and other programs for individuals with disabilities; adult basic education and literacy programs; secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs; welfare-to-work programs targeted to recipients of time-limited cash assistance for families with dependent children (TANF), Food Stamps, and state-funded general assistance programs; and economic development agencies.

ONE-STOP PROCESS EVALUATION

In July 1995, the Department of Labor funded Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to document and assess the initial implementation experiences of state and local One-Stop systems in the first nine states that had received One-Stop implementation grants. The Evaluation of the One-Stop Career Center System had three major objectives:

- Assessing the progress of the initial nine implementation states in planning One-Stop systems and developing policies to support the implementation of these systems.
- Assessing the implementation of local One-Stop centers operating in a wide range of environments.
- Identifying the key factors that have facilitated or impeded efforts by emerging One-Stop systems to meet the four federal objectives as well as the individual objectives of state and local areas.

To accomplish these evaluation objectives, we conducted a qualitative evaluation that included extensive site visits to collect information about One-Stop planning, design, implementation, and preliminary outcomes in the 9 states receiving first-round implementation funds and in 14 local sites within those states.

Exhibit A-1 summarizes the key features of the local sites that were included in the evaluation sample. We selected two local sites in five states, and one local site in each of the remaining four states. The sample was chosen to represent One-Stop systems that were operating in varying local contexts. For example, we selected four sites located in rural areas, four in urban areas, four in suburban areas, and two in urban or suburban areas that drew customers from surrounding rural areas as well. The sites were also selected to represent a variety of potential organizational models: eight sites represented consortia between numerous partner agencies; four sites represented joint leadership between two partner agencies, and two sites represented other organizational arrangements.

Qualitative and quantitative data on state and local One-Stop designs, planning, early implementation experiences, and preliminary outcomes were collected through intensive site visits to the nine states receiving first-round implementation grants and to 14 local One-Stop sites within these states. Site visits were conducted during the 12-month period between October 1995 and September 1996. During site visits, SPR field staff conducted structured discussions with a wide range of state and local respondents responsible for developing One-Stop policy, building the infrastructure to support

**Exhibit A-1
Key Features of Local Sites Included in the One-Stop Evaluation**

State	Name/Location of Local Site	Location/Type and Geographical Service Area	Delivery Sites/Options within Planning Area (e.g., SDA)	Lead Agency
CT	New London Connecticut Works Center (New London, CT)	Urban site, also serves surrounding suburban and rural areas.	1 full-service center currently operating, another planned; 1 satellite office; remote terminal access.	Partnership between state labor department & regional workforce development board
CT	Willimantic Connecticut Works Center (Willimantic, CT)	Rural area with small towns.	1 full-service center.	Partnership between state labor department & regional workforce development board
IN	iNET Eastside Workforce Development Center (Indianapolis, IN)	Urban setting; single-county service area.	3 full-service centers; 1 satellite office; Internet access.	Consortium of state workforce development department, local PIC, and JTPA service provider.
IN	Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center (Lawrenceburg, IN)	Rural area in multi-county SDA.	3 full-service centers, 2 satellite offices in SDA; 1 mobile unit; 800 number.	Jointly operated by state dept. of workforce development and SDA.
IA	Creston Workforce Development Center (Creston, IA)	Rural area in 7-county SDA.	1 full-service center; access through other county offices.	Consortium (including ES, JTPA, Voc. Rehab., and community college).
IA	Des Moines Workforce Development Center (Des Moines, IA)	Central city site within 8-county SDA.	1 full-service center; satellite offices in each county; 2 kiosks.	Consortium (including ES, JTPA, Job Corps, Voc. Rehab., and community college).
MD	Eastside Career Center (Baltimore City, MD)	Urban site serving Baltimore City.	1 of 3 full-service centers, with a variety of neighborhood and special service sites.	Partnership involving JTPA and Job Service.
MD	Columbia Career Center (Columbia, MD)	Suburban site; serves single county in two-county SDA.	1 full-service center in each county.	Consortium (Job Service; JTPA; community college; UI).

Exhibit A-1 (Continued)

MA	FutureWorks Career Center (Springfield, MA)	Single county service area; Serves a combined urban, suburban, and rural area.	2 competing full-service centers; remote electronic access.	FutureWorks is operated solely by a private, for-profit New Jersey-based corporation.
MN	Minnesota Workforce Center-Anoka County (Blaine, MN)	Single county service area; Suburban area, also serving urban & rural customers.	Local One-Stop system consists of 1 full-service center, 14 staffed service locations (referral agmts), 5 staffed service locations with electronic linkages.	Consortium of multiple partners.
OH	Wood County Employment Resource Center (Bowling Green, OH)	Two county service area. Wood County has small towns and rural areas.	Local One-Stop system consists of 3 full-service centers & 2 satellite offices in SDA, with electronic linkages.	Toledo Area PIC and JOBS program.
TX	Arlington Career Center (Arlington, TX)	Large metropolitan county service area with urban, rural, and suburban areas.	7 planned full-service centers in county; 3 satellite offices; kiosk in public location.	Joint lead agencies (JTPA and ES/UI).
TX	Lake Jackson Career Center (Lake Jackson, TX)	Suburban site within 13-county Gulf Coast region.	Within multi-county area there will be 8 full-service centers; kiosks in numerous other public locations.	ES is lead agency for ES/UI and JTPA programs.
WI	Waukesha Workforce Development Center (Pewaukee, WI)	Suburban area within 3-county service delivery area (center serves 1 county).	3 full-service centers in three-county SDA; 1 satellite office.	No single lead agency; nine partner agencies, each with lead in functional area.

One-Stop systems, and administering and delivering One-Stop customer services. We also observed One-Stop career centers in operation.

To supplement our discussions with One-Stop agency partners, we also spoke with selected representatives from public agencies and organizations that coordinate with One-Stop services in the operation of parallel initiatives such as school-to-work or welfare reform, as well as with representatives of agencies that were not yet involved in state or local One-Stop systems. At the local level, we also conducted discussions with diverse groups of One-Stop career center customers—including both employers and individual job seekers and students—to learn about their experiences using the new workforce development systems in their local areas. On-site data collection was supplemented by reviews of written materials including state and local One-Stop implementation plans, periodic progress reports submitted to DOL, materials developed to support various aspects of One-Stop system building, and preliminary information about customer satisfaction and customer outcomes.

Using the information collected about state and local study sites, SPR completed a *Final Evaluation Report: Creating Workforce Development Systems that Work* in August 1997. This report is intended primarily for workforce development policy-makers, planners, and program administrators. Individual case-study profiles for each of the 9 One-Stop states and 14 local sites visited are included as a separately-bound *Appendix* to the *Final Evaluation Report*. It should be noted that the One-Stop systems included as case examples in the evaluation have no doubt matured substantially since the evaluation visits were conducted. However, even though the detailed descriptions of individual sites may no longer be accurate, the general patterns of One-Stop system development described in this report should still be of interest to One-Stop planners and practitioners in other sites.

OVERVIEW OF THE PRACTITIONERS' GUIDE

The current report—*Creating Workforce Development Systems that Work: A Guide for Practitioners*—is intended to relate the findings and lessons learned from the experiences of the first-round One-Stop Implementation States in a format that will be useful to state and local One-Stop practitioners from systems at different levels of maturity. The Guide describes common One-Stop system-building goals and summarizes strategies that states and local One-Stop sites have used to further each of these goals. To illustrate each of the strategies, we have provided brief descriptions of One-Stop states and local areas that have used these strategies.

For practitioners new to the One-Stop initiative, we hope that the *Practitioners' Guide* will serve as a primer, providing a general overview of the different organizational and service design and delivery approaches that can be used to further One-Stop system goals in differing state and local circumstances. The guide is also intended to (1) provide information about how specific states have addressed different system building challenges, (2) disseminate useful examples of written materials developed by different states to support One-Stop implementation efforts, and (3) support states and local sites in their efforts to “network” with peers who have addressed similar challenges.

For practitioners who already have experience with One-Stop implementation efforts, we hope that the *Practitioners' Guide* will serve as a useful reference tool, summarizing the range of variations possible in One-Stop systems and describing the different system-building challenges faced by states and local areas that have selected different implementation strategies.

The *Guide for Practitioners* is organized into three major sections. The section on *Organizing and Governing One-Stop Systems* consists of two chapters, including:

- Guiding One-Stop Systems: The State Role.
- Building Local Partnerships and Governing One-Stop Systems.

A second section on *Building the Infrastructure to Support One-Stop Systems* includes chapters describing each of the major infrastructure systems needed to support One-Stop operations, as follows:

- Developing Appropriate Physical Facilities.
- Creating an Effective One-Stop Information Infrastructure.
- Building Staff Capacity.
- Financing One-Stop Services.
- Marketing One-Stop Systems.
- Measuring One-Stop Performance and Planning for System Improvements.

The third section on *Designing and Delivering One-Stop Services* addresses issues related to the essence of the One-Stop system-building initiative—how to improve the responsiveness of public workforce development services to the needs of customers. Separate chapters address the following:

- Providing Transformed One-Stop Services to Individual Customers.
- Providing Transformed One Stop Services to Employers.

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT ONE-STOP SYSTEM BUILDING

During the spring of 1998, Social Policy Research will be conducting regional orientation and training sessions based on the One-Stop Practitioners' Guide. The objectives of these sessions will be to familiarize practitioners with how to use the Guide as a system-building tool, as well as to provide information about other valuable One-Stop system-building resources. The training materials developed in conjunction with these regional One-Stop system-building orientation sessions are also intended to help link practitioners to additional One-Stop system-building resources developed by federal agencies and consortia, state consortia, national One-Stop work groups, individual state and local One-Stop projects, and expert consultants. DOL Regional Office staff will be supplied with information about these planned sessions as it becomes available.

1. GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS: THE STATE ROLE

INTRODUCTION	1-1
GOAL 1. FORM BROAD ONE-STOP PARTNERSHIPS	1-3
Strategy 1. Develop Interagency One-Stop Work Groups to Promote Collaborative One-Stop Planning	1-3
Strategy 2. Create a Consolidated State Agency to Take Responsibility for Multiple Workforce Development Programs	1-5
GOAL 2. CREATE EFFECTIVE STATE-LEVEL GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES.....	1-8
Strategy 1. Develop Policy Boards to Provide Overall One-Stop Guidance	1-8
Strategy 2. Develop Interagency Task Groups to Plan Specific Aspects of One-Stop Systems.....	1-11
Strategy 3. Create a One-Stop Project Management Team to Coordinate State Efforts and Support Local System Development.....	1-13
GOAL 3. GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL ONE-STOP PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES	1-15
Strategy 1. Specify Required Local One-Stop Partners.....	1-16
Strategy 2. Establish Guidelines for Local Policy Boards.....	1-18
Strategy 3. Establish Guidelines for Local Center Management	1-21
GOAL 4. DEVELOP AND COMMUNICATE A STATE ONE-STOP VISION TO GUIDE LOCAL SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.....	1-22
Strategy 1. Collaborate With Local Staff to Develop One or More Prototype Centers.....	1-23
Strategy 2. Disseminate Information About the One-Stop Vision and One-Stop Services.....	1-24
GOAL 5. DEVELOP STATE GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL ONE-STOP SERVICES	1-26
Strategy 1. Require or Encourage Specific Services for Job-Seekers.....	1-26
Strategy 2. Specify Required Services for Employers	1-29
Strategy 3. Establish Guidelines for the Co-Location and Integration of One-Stop Services	1-31

GOAL 6. PROMOTE COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION AMONG
STATE AND LOCAL ONE-STOP PARTNERS..... 1-33
RESOURCES..... 1-34

1. GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS: THE STATE ROLE

INTRODUCTION

The One-Stop initiative depends on the inter-related and simultaneous transformation of workforce development systems at the federal, state, and local levels. Each level of government involved in this system-change initiative must exhibit leadership, the ability to innovate, and a willingness to compromise if the initiative is to succeed in transforming the workforce development services available to individuals and firms. The One-Stop initiative provides the opportunity for state and local One-Stop partners to develop new relationships suitable to their overlapping responsibilities for state- and locally-administered program resources.

States have the opportunity to guide a number of different aspects of One-Stop system building, including the development of organizational structures for One-Stop planning, service delivery, and governance; the design of customer-driven services; and investment in the information technology and supportive infrastructure required to operate effective One-Stop systems.

States can guide the *organization and governance* of state and local One-Stop systems by:

- Negotiating partnerships among relevant state and local entities and securing commitments to coordinate interagency planning, budgeting, and service delivery.
- Developing state-level governance structures to provide policy guidance and day-to-day administration of One-Stop systems.
- Providing guidelines for local One-Stop policy development and system administration.

States can guide *the design and delivery of customer services* by:

- Generating and disseminating a state vision of how One-Stop systems should be organized, how services should be transformed, and how One-Stop centers should fit together into a statewide system.
- Developing guidelines for local One-Stop systems to follow in developing their own One-Stop designs and implementation plans.

- Promoting communication and coordination among state and local One-Stop partners during the system-building process, through such practices as brainstorming possible solutions to implementation difficulties and sharing best practices.

States can also play an important role in *guiding the development of the infrastructure* needed to support One-Stop operations by:

- Preparing automated user-friendly information products for use by business and individual customers of One-Stop systems.
- Designing and developing the information infrastructure needed to support the delivery of information products to customers and the exchange of information among One-Stop agency partners.
- Designing performance measurement systems to assess system accomplishments and guide system improvements.

In this chapter of the Practitioners' Guide, we describe the different strategies states can use to provide effective leadership in One-Stop system organization and governance and the design and delivery of One-Stop customer services. A separate section of the Practitioners' Guide describes how states have assisted in developing the infrastructure systems needed to support One-Stop operations, including appropriate physical facilities, integrated information systems, capacity building efforts, financing, marketing, and performance assessment.

GOALS AND STRATEGIES TO GUIDE THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

States have the opportunity to guide three different aspects of the organization and governance of One-Stop systems. First, they can assist in building broad partnerships among the state and local entities involved in workforce development services. Second, they can develop state-level structures to govern and manage One-Stop systems. Third, they can provide guidelines for local areas to follow in developing their own One-Stop governance and management structures. In this section, we describe different strategies that states can use to provide leadership in these three areas.

GOAL 1. FORM BROAD ONE-STOP PARTNERSHIPS

Each of the first-round One-Stop implementation states found that it was important to involve a wide range of state agencies in planning for One-Stop system transformation. Agencies that states will need to involve, at a minimum, include the agencies responsible for the five mandated DOL-funded programs:

- Employment Services (ES)
- Unemployment Insurance (UI)
- Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS)
- Older worker programs funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act
- Titles II and III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

Additional state agencies that states will probably want to try to involve in One-Stop planning include the agencies responsible for adult basic education, vocational rehabilitation, welfare reform, and family and social services. Many states have also involved the state agencies responsible for overseeing post-secondary education (particularly community and technical colleges), elementary and secondary education, and business and economic development programs.

States can use several different approaches to ensure that a wide range of workforce development programs and services are involved in One-Stop partnerships. One common organizational strategy is to build state-level interagency work groups to promote collaboration by different state and local agencies in One-Stop planning and oversight. Another strategy is to consolidate authority for multiple workforce development programs within a single state agency.

Strategy 1. Develop Interagency One-Stop Work Groups to Promote Collaborative One-Stop Planning

States following this strategy usually begin by developing work groups to promote interagency discussion about the design of One-Stop systems. In many states, these work groups involve middle- and upper-level managers of the relevant state agencies in frank and informal discussions about how they can collaborate to improve customer services. These interagency work groups are usually distinguished from formal policy boards that have official responsibility for overseeing state workforce development policy. In contrast to formal policy boards, work groups are expected to do the “real work” of inventing a new workforce development service system that will minimize

duplication of effort across partner agencies and encourage the emergence of integrated services at the local level.

Often interagency work groups include representatives from both state-level and local-level One-Stop partner agencies. This arrangement is based on the understanding that some workforce development and education programs—such as ES and UI—have a strong tradition of state-level administration while others—such as JTPA and primary and secondary education programs—have a strong tradition of local control.

Interagency work groups are particularly helpful during the early stages of One-Stop planning. Although their participatory decision making processes can be slow, interagency work groups make it possible to give a large number of agencies a voice in planning state One-Stop systems.

Interagency work groups may continue to play an active role during the early stages of One-Stop implementation. Some states find that these groups play a useful role as an informal “executive committee” overseeing the implementation process. Other states may find that interagency work groups become less necessary after the initial planning process has been completed.

Examples of Developing Interagency Work Groups

Example #1—Using a Work Group to Promote Collaboration During One-Stop Planning. The early stages of the state One-Stop planning process in Iowa depended on an interagency planning process to achieve broad interagency collaboration. Over six major state agencies with responsibilities for workforce development programs were represented on a Workforce Development Management Team. Members included representatives of the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES/UI, welfare, education, vocational rehabilitation, and other programs.

As implementation plans matured, however, the state-level organizational model for the workforce development system shifted from an emphasis on interagency collaboration to an emphasis on state agency consolidation. As a result, a consolidated Workforce Development Department emerged as the lead agency responsible for One-Stop planning and implementation. **State of Iowa.**

Example #2—Using a Work Group to Promote Broad Participation During One-Stop Implementation. In Minnesota, a Workforce Center System Issues Team consists of key managers within the lead One-Stop agency as well as a cross-sectional representation of state and local Workforce Center partners. Although the Department of Economic Security (MDES) takes the lead in developing the Workforce Center System, other state agencies, including the Department of Human Services and the Department of Children, Families, and Learning, are partners in this endeavor. The Issues Team—which usually meets twice a month—has served as the hub of state and local communication and coordination and as a vehicle for identifying and resolving issues related to One-Stop implementation. **State of Minnesota**

Strategy 2. Create a Consolidated State Agency to Take Responsibility for Multiple Workforce Development Programs

Consolidating authority for multiple workforce development programs within a single state agency is another approach that can be used to facilitate collaboration across the programs involved in One-Stop partnerships. A number of states have already consolidated their administration of the Employment Service (ES) and Unemployment Insurance (UI) programs as part of their efforts to achieve service integration at the local level. In addition, a number of states already administer the ES and UI programs and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs from within the same state agency, although administration is often assigned to different agency divisions.

In response to the One-Stop goal of promoting coordinated planning and service delivery, states may want to undertake further consolidation of state-level agencies and administrative responsibilities for workforce development programs. Some states have simplified administrative responsibilities by housing all DOL-funded programs within a single state agency or department. In other states, even more ambitious consolidation efforts have been undertaken to merge the responsibility for all workforce development programs—including ES, UI, JTPA, school-to-work, welfare-to-work, vocational rehabilitation, and post-secondary education—within a consolidated state agency.

Achieving the goals of simplified administration and coordinated service delivery requires extended internal discussions and negotiations among the members of the newly consolidated agency's management team. In the short run, agency consolidation may be extremely demanding for state-level staff and may divert attention from the task of guiding local One-Stop implementation. However, in the long run, agency consolidation may very well make it easier to improve cross-program coordination and collaboration.

States that create consolidated agencies with responsibility for welfare-to-work as well as other workforce development programs face perhaps the most dramatic challenge—that of creating policies and an agency culture that will simultaneously further the “work first” philosophy of welfare reform and the customer-service philosophy of the One-Stop initiative.

Examples of State Agency Consolidation

Example #1—Consolidating Authority for ES, UI, and JTPA Programs Within a Single Agency. In Iowa, the formation of the new Department of Workforce Development in July 1996 brought together DOL-funded programs that had been housed previously in three different agencies—the departments of Employment Services, Economic Development, and Human Rights. Programs administered by the new agency include JTPA Titles II and III, Employment Service, Unemployment Insurance, Veterans Employment Services, and the state-funded Volunteer Mentor Program.

After agency consolidation, many One-Stop activities were converted from an interagency process to an internal process within the new Workforce Development Department. This facilitated coordination among DOL-funded programs but increased uncertainty about how to involve the separate state agencies still responsible for the welfare, vocational education, and education programs. **State of Iowa**

Example #2—Creating a Consolidated State Administrative Structure to Oversee One-Stop Operations.

The consolidated Indiana Department of Workforce Development has primary responsibility for overseeing most of the programs mandated for inclusion in local One-Stop career centers, including JTPA, ES, and UI. This state agency promotes integrated field operations for the ES and UI programs and requires local coordination with JTPA administrative entities in the delivery of customer services. Local ES and UI managers report to an overall state Director of Operations who works for the state's One-Stop Project Manager.

Vocational and technical education and workforce literacy programs are now housed within the same state agency, but have not yet been included in the emerging integrated structures for state workforce development program administration and local One-Stop service delivery. **State of Indiana**

Example #3—Creating a Consolidated Agency Responsible for Workforce Development, School-to-Work, and Welfare-to-Work Programs.

In June 1996, The Texas Workforce Commission was created to take responsibility for workforce development programs previously administered by seven different state agencies. Among the key programs for which the new agency was responsible were ES, UI, JTPA, literacy programs, welfare-to-work programs, apprenticeship training, and school-to-work planning.

The state hopes that this organization will make it easier to develop unified information systems, intake procedures, service delivery designs, and reporting and accountability systems across different workforce development programs. It also hopes that the consolidated agency structure will make it easier to attend simultaneously to the workforce development needs of the general public and the interests of targeted customers who require intensive education and training services. **State of Texas**

GOAL 2. CREATE EFFECTIVE STATE-LEVEL GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES

States have found it useful to develop several different types of state-level One-Stop governance and management structures. Each of these structures is designed to perform one or more of the following functions: (1) provide policy direction, (2) oversee the planning and design of different aspects of the state's One-Stop system, and (3) provide day-to-day support for local One-Stop system development. The strategies described below are generally used in combination. That is, a state will often designate a policy-level board, an interagency task group of high-level agency managers, and a staff-level project management team that work together to guide One-Stop system development.

Strategy 1. Develop Policy Boards to Provide Overall One-Stop Guidance

States require one or more policy bodies to guide and oversee their workforce development systems. A number of states have created an official state human resources investment council (SHRIC) to coordinate policies for a large number of different human resources and workforce development programs and services.

Some states use these broad policy boards to oversee the details of One-Stop system building, including providing guidance on implementation issues such as the designation of One-Stop service area boundaries, developing detailed criteria for the certification of local career centers, and determining whether individual centers are ready for certification. One advantage of using a broad policy board to guide One-Stop system development is that such a board is more likely to view the One-Stop workforce development initiative as part of a larger system of related human resource investments (e.g., along with education, family and social services, welfare reform, and business development).

Other states have found it more helpful to separate the functions of providing broad workforce development policy and overseeing the details of One-Stop system building. States using this strategy usually create two different policy bodies with differing levels of responsibility. The first level often consists of a broad policy board that provides overall guidance on welfare-to-work, school-to-work, workforce development, and economic development topics. These broad policy boards usually play a key role in developing the early vision and overall framework for the state's one-Stop system. A second level—consisting of a more specialized board, a standing

committee of the broad policy board, or an informal advisory council—is more narrowly focused on overseeing the details of One-Stop implementation. States choosing this strategy have found that they are able to receive more detailed ongoing attention to One-Stop implementation issues from the specialized One-Stop advisory board than they would be able to get from the broad workforce development policy board. This is perceived as extremely helpful, as long as there is good communication between the two levels of policy makers.

At both levels, One-Stop policy boards often include representatives of employers, labor organizations, elected officials, and individual job seekers, as well as the state and local agencies involved in the delivery of secondary and post-secondary education, social and family services, and workforce development programs.

Examples of One-Stop Policy Boards

Example #1—Using a Broad Human Resource Investment Council to Oversee One-Stop System Development. The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness, created in 1993, is charged with planning, developing, and evaluating an integrated workforce system. The Council, which replaced five different previous state advisory committees and councils, is responsible for making overall recommendations to the governor about workforce development, and school-to-work and welfare-to-work initiatives.

Because the One-Stop initiative in Texas has been interpreted as covering the broadest possible range of workforce development programs, the Council also oversees the details of One-Stop implementation, including identifying local workforce development areas and boundaries, developing criteria for certification, and approving local workforce development board plans. In addition, the Council has assessed the needs of a variety of customer groups and has established statewide goals and core performance measures for the workforce development system as a whole. **State of Texas**

Example #2—Using A One-Stop Standing Committee to Oversee the Details of System Development.

In Ohio, the major policy body for state workforce development programs and issues is the Governor’s Human Resources Investment Council (Council), which was formed in 1993. The full Council is responsible for overseeing the delivery of cost-effective services in the areas of economic development, education, and human investment with particular attention to promoting coordination and avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort across multiple programs and funding streams.

To oversee specific One-Stop development issues and to provide the advocacy needed to move this important program forward, the Council has established a One-Stop Standing Committee. This committee encourages state agencies to develop coordination agreements to further One-Stop implementation, reviews the work of the statewide interagency work teams, and is responsible for making recommendations to the Council about the certification of local One-Stop systems. **State of Ohio**

Example #3—Using Several Levels of Policy Boards to Guide One-Stop System Development.

Indiana has developed three different policy boards relevant to the integration of workforce development systems and services. First, the Indiana Policy Council, which has representation from both workforce development and human service agencies, is a body developed to support interagency and cross-program collaboration by “removing interagency barriers that inhibit the efficient delivery of services.” Second, to address workforce development and welfare reform issues and oversee individual workforce development programs, the state created a consolidated Human Resources Investment Council in 1993.

Third, rather than involve the SHRIC in the details of One-Stop design and implementation, the state has created a separate One-Stop Advisory Council. The One-Stop Advisory Council—formed in mid-1995, after Indiana received the One-Stop Implementation Grant award—is made up of representatives of various stakeholders in One-Stop development, including the SHRIC, the JTPA service delivery areas, affected state agencies (e.g.,

Workforce Development, Family and Social Services Administration, Commerce, and Education), the community college system, labor unions, the state chamber of commerce, and employers. At their meetings, members of the Advisory Council are given reports on One-Stop implementation progress, brainstorm implementation issues, and provide input on One-Stop policies. Their recommendations are not binding on the state or local One-Stop partners. **State of Indiana**

Strategy 2. Develop Interagency Task Groups to Plan Specific Aspects of One-Stop Systems

A number of states have created interagency task groups or subcommittees to develop detailed plans for different aspects of One-Stop design and implementation. Examples of planning tasks assigned to work groups include the following:

- Designing governance structures for state and local One-Stop systems.
- Designing a One-Stop performance-measurement system.
- Developing guidelines for local One-Stop service design and delivery.
- Planning and developing an electronic information infrastructure and automated self-access services upon which local One-Stop centers can draw.
- Developing a unified marketing approach for the state's One-Stop system.

Interagency task groups have a particularly important role to play during the initial stages of One-Stop system planning. During this period, task groups may meet weekly or bi-weekly. Effective task groups provide all state agency partners with an opportunity to influence the state's One-Stop design and to identify and address potential operational problems before they occur. States often find that it is useful to involve local-level representatives in interagency task groups along with state-level agency representatives to ensure that the state's One-Stop plan will have "buy in" from both state and local staff.

After individual interagency task groups complete their initial planning assignments, they often circulate written recommendations to members of related task groups and to the rest of the state and local One-Stop practitioner community for

discussion. An iterative planning process is often required to ensure that plans for system-building in different functional areas—such as capacity building and marketing—are mutually supportive. Once interagency task groups have had a chance to reconcile the plans developed by different task groups, recommendations are often forwarded to the state’s One-Stop policy board for approval before they are implemented.

During the later stages of One-Stop implementation, some states find that an internal management team within the lead One-Stop agency can take over responsibility for detailed oversight of most One-Stop system design and operational issues. Other states have found that it is useful to have interagency task groups continue to meet over time as well as to form additional interagency task groups to address new system-building issues as they arise. During the implementation phase, the frequency of task group meetings may decline.

Examples of Interagency Task Groups

Example #1—Using Interagency Task Groups to Plan Integrated Functional Systems. During the period of One-Stop planning and early implementation, Connecticut convened interagency committees to design the operational details for the state’s One-Stop system in different functional areas, including performance measurement, marketing, physical facilities, labor market information, capacity building, facilities, employer services, and the certification of local centers.

For example, the Performance Measures Committee was responsible for developing plans for a comprehensive performance and accountability system that included plans for customer satisfaction surveys and quarterly “report cards” on statewide and local Center performance. The facilities committee oversaw the development of standards for facility design and participated in planning for individual Connecticut Works career centers.

The State of Connecticut

Example #2—Involving State and Local Staff on Interagency Task

Groups To Identify and Address Implementation Issues. The state of Minnesota offered state and local partners an active consultation role in the development of state policies and procedures. Local representatives were included on One-Stop Issues Team subcommittees that developed recommendations for the state's One-Stop certification process. During the first year of One-Stop implementation, these sub-committees were charged with (1) identifying current issues in their respective One-Stop subject areas; (2) determining which issues were best handled by the state or by local areas; and (3) determining the respective state and local roles in planning and implementation. **The State of Minnesota**

Strategy 3. Create a One-Stop Project Management Team to Coordinate State Efforts and Support Local System Development

Once One-Stop plans have been approved by the appropriate state-level policy board(s), many states delegate day-to-day responsibility for supporting One-Stop implementation to a project management team within the designated One-Stop lead agency. This agency is usually the state agency responsible for administering the federal ES, UI, and JTPA programs. It is also usually the agency that has been designated to receive the state's federal One-Stop implementation grant.

Although the One-Stop management team is usually housed within the lead agency, states have generally found that it is important to encourage management team members to think of themselves as advocates for the One-Stop partnership as a whole, rather than as representatives of a single agency. For this reason, the individuals assigned to One-Stop project teams are often recruited from a number of different state agency partners. They also tend to be carefully selected so that they possess (1) familiarity with and enthusiasm about the goal of integrated workforce development services and (2) expertise in a number of One-Stop system-building issues—such as interagency and state-local collaboration, integrated service design, financing and cost-accounting issues, and information technology.

States often refer to the members of the state One-Stop project team as “brokering agents” for the One-Stop system as a whole. As brokering agents, these individuals help support partnership building at the state and local level, share information, and mobilize the technical assistance and financial resources needed to keep the overall state One-Stop system-building effort “on track.” Specific responsibilities commonly assigned to the members of the state One-Stop project teams include:

- Coordinating the various activities of interagency work groups, specific task groups, and policy boards involved in One-Stop planning and management.
- Collecting and disseminating information about One-Stop implementation, including facilitating communication among state agency partners, between state and local partners, and among local partners.
- Disseminating information about state guidelines for the formation of local One-Stop policy boards, the design of One-Stop services, and the certification of local One-Stop systems and centers.
- Providing technical assistance and problem-solving support to local One-Stop implementation sites.

Examples of One-Stop Project Management Teams

Example #1—Creating An Autonomous One-Stop Management Team.

The Career Center Office is the staff-level unit created by the MassJobs Council in early 1995 to support the implementation of the statewide career center system. Among the chief day-to-day responsibilities of the eight staff assigned to this office are the creation of an integrated funding stream to support the operation of local career centers, providing capacity building and technical assistance to Regional Employment Boards and career centers, as needed, and coordinating the development of the state-level technology-based systems to support local One-Stop operations. The staff in the Career Center Office are employees of the MassJobs Council and are not housed with or assigned to any other state agency. **Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

Example #2—Housing A One-Stop Management Staff Within the State

Lead Agency. In Indiana, a small state One-Stop team acts as a central staff clearinghouse for communications about One-Stop implementation. Agency partners with planning or field responsibility for One-Stop development have frequent contacts with the five members of the One-Stop team, which is led by the agency's deputy commissioner for program development. Formed in March 1995 and staffed by individuals selected based upon their broad skills, knowledge, and experience, the One-Stop team coordinates and oversees One-Stop plans in the areas of labor market information, integrated information systems, the development of new customer products, quality of services, and financial management procedures.

Members of the state One-Stop team each have their own task assignments and areas of expertise. However, they also work well together, keeping each other informed about all aspects of state and the local One-Stop implementation issues. **State of Indiana**

GOAL 3. GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL ONE-STOP PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

States have important choices to make about the balance between state guidance and local discretion in designing and overseeing One-Stop systems. Some states provide for direct state-level participation in planning and overseeing each One-Stop career center. Other states delegate much of the responsibility for local One-Stop system design and oversight to regional workforce development policy boards.

To influence local governance and management structures, most states establish guidelines on (1) what entities should be included within local One-Stop partnerships and (2) what structures should be used to govern and manage local One-Stop systems and individual centers. Below, we describe different strategies that states have used in guiding local partnerships. State staff usually find that they are more successful in influencing local One-Stop implementation efforts if they define their role as partner, advisor, or facilitator of local system development efforts, rather than as monitor or auditor.

Strategy 1. Specify Required Local One-Stop Partners

Most states develop guidelines that specify which agencies must be involved in the preparation of local One-Stop plans. Other states specify what programs must be accessible to customers through local One-Stop career centers. To meet the requirements of federal One-Stop implementation grants, states must require, at a minimum, that One-Stop centers involve the agencies responsible for Employment Services (ES), Unemployment Insurance (UI), Veterans Employment Services (VETS), Titles II and III of the Job Training Partnership (JTPA), and Older Worker programs supported under Title V of the Older Americans Act. States play an important role in clarifying what types of interagency collaborations these partners should develop. These types of collaborations include the following, ranging from least-integrated to most-integrated:

- Sharing involvement in planning the overall regional workforce development system.
- Implementing coordinated customer referrals and sharing client-level information across programs.
- Physically co-locating service provider staff funded by the involved programs.
- Sharing responsibility for the design and delivery of selected job-seeker and employer services.

States also frequently require local One-Stop systems to involve additional agencies in One-Stop planning and/or the delivery of One-Stop services. These agencies include those responsible for the following programs:

- *Cash assistance and welfare-to-work programs.* Most One-Stop implementation states require local areas to include the agency responsible for welfare-to-work programs as a local One-Stop planning partner. (However, the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 has introduced uncertainty in many states as to how income maintenance and workforce development agencies will share the responsibility for helping families to move from welfare to work.)
- *Vocational rehabilitation programs.* States often require centers to ensure that One-Stop customers will “have access to” vocational rehabilitation services through participation in One-Stop planning, co-location of service providers, or coordinated interagency referral procedures.

- *Post-secondary education programs.* A number of states also call for community or technical college systems to be included in the One-Stop planning process. These states view post-secondary educational institutions as valuable partners in providing education and training services to individual customers as well as customized training to business customers.
- *Other programs.* Some states also require or highly recommend participation in local One-Stop planning and service delivery by adult basic education agencies, agencies responsible for secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs, and school-to-work system partners.

As described in the next chapter of the Practitioners' Guide, local areas have developed dramatically different partnerships in response to state guidelines. Some local areas include only the required partners. Others take advantage of the discretion permitted to local One-Stop systems to add additional partners beyond the required agencies. As a result, the number of local planning and service delivery partners resulting from similar state guidelines may range from one or two agencies to more than ten active local agencies.

Examples of State Guidelines for Local One-Stop Partnerships

Example #1—Encouraging Broad Local Partnerships. Ohio has established a hierarchical classification of local One-Stop partners, consisting of (1) mandated partners, (2) optional or desirable partners, and (3) encouraged partners. The mandated One-Stop partners in each local area include the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, Veterans Employment Services, UI and Title V of the Older Americans Act. Local areas must also involve agencies responsible for three of four “optional or desirable” program areas, including (1) welfare reform and welfare-to-work programs, (2) vocational education, (3) adult basic education and literacy programs, and (4) two-year colleges (vocational technical schools and community colleges).

Additional “encouraged partners” include the agencies responsible for (1) vocational rehabilitation, (2) school-to-work transition programs, (3) the Ohio Industrial Training Program—a state-funded program that awards grants to private employers to upgrade the skills of their current workers, and (4) other community programs that provide support services, such as day care, transportation, and housing assistance to disadvantaged residents.

State of Ohio

Example #2—Requiring a Small Core Group of Initial Local Partners.

The state of Maryland requires local One-Stop planning teams to include representation from three mandatory “core partners,” which are believed to provide the preponderance of workforce development services and represent key funding streams: the Job Service (which is co-located with UI throughout the state), the JTPA administrative entity, and the local community college. In the future, additional “coordinating” partners—including the agencies responsible for vocational rehabilitation, welfare-to-work, secondary education, and economic and business development—may take on a more active role in the delivery of local One-Stop services. **State of Maryland**

Strategy 2. Establish Guidelines for Local Policy Boards

States also influence the establishment and powers of the policy boards responsible for overseeing local One-Stop systems. Many states are concerned about ensuring that (1) local One-Stop policy boards represent a broad range of local stakeholders, including employers, educational institutions, and local elected officials, in addition to agencies responsible for state and local workforce development programs, (2) policy boards are not controlled by any single One-Stop partner agency, and (3) the total number of local policy boards concerned with employment and training issues does not increase unnecessarily. States have developed several different approaches to respond to these concerns.

Some states have established flexible guidelines for the establishment of local One-Stop policy boards. For example, some states allow local areas to use adapted local JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) to govern local One-Stop systems, as long

as all local One-Stop stakeholders are represented. However, local policy boards are often cautioned to separate their JTPA administrative responsibilities from their new roles in One-Stop system planning and policy making. Another first-round One-Stop implementation state (Maryland) called for the establishment of small informal local One-Stop planning teams to avoid creating yet another layer of workforce development policy boards.

Another approach is for states to require local areas to develop new policy boards specifically to oversee the design and operation of integrated workforce development services. These boards are often assigned responsibility for overseeing the development of the One-Stop system as a whole as well as for overseeing a number of individual categorical programs. States that already have created regional human resource investment boards with broad responsibilities usually give these policy boards responsibility for overseeing local One-Stop system development. Other states call for the establishment of new policy boards to guide local One-Stop system development. These boards may be considered merely “advisory” to state policy boards or may be given substantial authority for selecting local workforce development service providers and certifying and overseeing the operation of local One-Stop centers.

Examples of State Guidelines for Governing Local One-Stop Systems

Example #1—Establishing Flexible Guidelines for Local One-Stop Governance. Minnesota has developed criteria to assess whether local workforce councils (usually created by expanding JTPA Private Industry Councils) include representation from all appropriate stakeholders. The state has not specified a particular size or structure for local workforce councils. Once established and approved, local workforce councils may develop two-year service plans and select operators for local One-Stop services, within state guidelines. (State guidelines require that the local Job Service (ES) agency must be the operator responsible for the delivery of job-listing and job-matching services to job-seeker and employer customers.)

State of Minnesota

Example #2—Giving Local Areas a Choice of Governance Structures.

Texas has encouraged the formation of local workforce development boards made up of representatives from the business, labor, and education sectors, as well as community based-organizations and the general public. Although the state expects that local workforce boards will become the most prevalent system of local governance, local areas retain the option to maintain distinct advisory and governing bodies such as Private Industry Councils (PICs), Job Service Employer Committees (JSECs), Quality Workforce Planning Committees (QWFPCs), or other multi-agency management teams. At the time of the evaluation visit, 12 out of 28 workforce development areas in the state had completed applications for the certification of local workforce development boards and seven had been certified.

If local areas decide to form workforce development boards, they must separate the responsibility for administering local services from the delivery of services. Once certified, local workforce development boards become responsible for planning, contracting, overseeing, and evaluating local service providers. The maintenance of federal standards for categorical programs is the joint responsibility of local boards and the state workforce commission. **State of Texas**

Example #3—Mandating the Use of Broad Human Resource Planning Boards to Govern Local One-Stop Systems.

In 1988, the state of Massachusetts enacted legislation that created the MassJobs Council as the state human resource investment council and a network of Regional Employment Boards (REBs) with responsibility for governing and overseeing local workforce development services. Regional Employment Boards have been given considerable autonomy in developing local One-Stop systems that meet identified workforce development needs, selecting local career center operators, and overseeing the operation of local career centers. **Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

Strategy 3. Establish Guidelines for Local Center Management

States have tended to provide less-detailed guidelines for the day-to-day management of local One-Stop career centers. Some states have called for the development of a participatory management structure that permits all local One-Stop partners to have a voice in determining center goals and in overseeing center facilities and day-to-day operations. While some states call for “management by committee,” others require local partners to designate a center director. Still other states have allowed all decisions about center management to be made at the local level.

During the process of local partnership building, some states have supported local system development by offering the services of state One-Stop staff as consultants on local team-building and governance issues. Other states have arranged for local One-Stop participants to receive training on partnership, communication, and conflict management skills from independent third-party consultants or trainers, as described in Chapter 5 on *Building Staff Capacity*.

Examples of State Guidelines for Career Center Management

Example #1—Requiring Local Management Committees that have Participation by Local ES/UI and JTPA Managers. One state calls for all centers to establish local management committees co-chaired by the local ES/UI director and the staff director of the regional workforce development board responsible for administering JTPA services. Additional management committee members may represent public or non-profit agencies. The management committee is required to select a center director. **State of Connecticut**

Example #2—Requiring at Least One Core Agency Partner to “Host” Each Full-Service One-Stop Center. Co-location of local partners and co-administration of local One-Stop centers is not required in Maryland. Each One-Stop center must be “hosted” by one of three core local partners (i.e., the agencies responsible for the ES and JTPA programs and the local community college). Additional partners may be co-located in the same physical facility and may participate in shared center management. **State of Maryland**

Example #3—Requiring Participatory Management. Iowa calls for centers to allow all local partners to participate in decisions about the center mission, goals, resources, and facility. Local centers may be administered by a management team using consensus-based decision-making or by a center manager designated by the management team. **State of Iowa**

GOALS AND STRATEGIES TO GUIDE THE DESIGN AND DELIVERY OF ONE-STOP SERVICES

To guide the design and delivery of One-Stop services to individual and employer customers, states need to address three different system-building needs. First, they need to develop and communicate a state vision of how One-Stop services should be organized and how existing services should be transformed to improve customer satisfaction and customer outcomes. Second, states need to develop specific guidelines for local One-Stop systems to follow in developing their own One-Stop service designs. Third, states need to promote communication and coordination among state and local One-Stop partners during the system-building process. In this section, we describe different strategies that states can use to provide leadership in these areas.

Typically, lead state One-Stop planners provide leadership to local system builders by informing partners of the concept of integrated workforce development services and soliciting their ideas on how to “make it work” in their local area. States then attempt to maintain local commitment and sustain local efforts by keeping partners informed of continuing developments and changes as the state and local sites move to embrace integrated design and delivery of workforce development services.

GOAL 4. DEVELOP AND COMMUNICATE A STATE ONE-STOP VISION TO GUIDE LOCAL SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION

A number of One-Stop implementation grant states have identified their most important functions as providing a coherent state vision that can guide the development of local One-Stop services and communicating that vision to local areas. Achieving an effective balance between state guidance and local discretion in the design and delivery

of One-Stop services is a key issue in most states. Strategies used by different states to develop and disseminate a state vision of One-Stop services are described below.

Strategy 1. Collaborate With Local Staff to Develop One or More Prototype Centers

States often begin the One-Stop planning process with abstract descriptions of the four federal goals of universal access, customer choice, integrated services, and outcome-driven systems. To discover what the One-Stop initiative means in practice, states sometimes find it useful to work with one or more pilot sites in applying the One-Stop principles in the redesign of specific workforce development service systems. In states using this strategy, early collaboration between state One-Stop policy makers and pioneering local sites enables state staff to develop a more detailed One-Stop vision and prepares state staff to guide additional local sites through the process of One-Stop system transformation.

Examples of State-Local Collaboration in the Development of Pilot Centers

Example #1—Developing a Single Prototype One-Stop Center. Indiana state policy makers based their subsequent One-Stop implementation efforts on experience gained from a joint state–local prototype project to re-engineer the delivery of customer services at the iNET Workforce Development Center on Indianapolis’ Eastside. The Eastside Center project embodied a number of new concepts for the delivery of customer services, including an attractive physical facility, customer access to self-assisted technology-based information systems, staff integration, and a focus on customer satisfaction.

State of Indiana

Example #2—Funding the Development of Several Pilot Centers Through a Competitive Process. Texas adopted a phased approach to One-Stop planning and implementation. During the first phase beginning in early 1995, five pilot areas were chosen to receive implementation grant funds. Another seven pilot sites were selected in mid-1995. Because it selected pilot sites that showed local initiative in developing One-Stop

systems, this state has been able to benefit from the exchange of information both up and down the communication chain in the refinement of its state One-stop vision. **State of Texas**

Example #3—Using the Experiences of Early One-Stop Pilot Sites to Inform the Development of State One-Stop Guidelines. Prior to planning for a statewide system of One-Stop career centers under its federal One-Stop implementation grant, Wisconsin had provided a limited number of state-funded system-building grants to selected local pilot sites. Thus, a number of pilot sites already had a three- to five-year history of implementing integrated workforce development systems by the time the federal One-Stop implementation grant was received by this state. The experiences of the early pilot sites were distilled into clear but flexible guidelines—referred to as “process standards” and “functional standards”—that additional sites were asked to follow in developing their own One-Stop systems. **State of Wisconsin**

Strategy 2. Disseminate Information About the One-Stop Vision and One-Stop Services

After receiving One-Stop implementation grants, a number of states have found it useful to undertake high-visibility public relations and educational campaigns to disseminate the state’s vision of One-Stop services to potential state and local One-Stop partners. Activities to further these objectives can include:

- Statewide retreats at which attendees are informed about One-Stop systems and encouraged to discuss their fears about system transformation.
- Tours of real or simulated One-Stop service sites.
- Dissemination of state guidelines with detailed criteria for the development of different aspects of One-Stop services (e.g., criteria for delivering core and enhanced job-seeker and employer services).
- Development of curricula to train One-Stop staff for transformed administrative and service delivery functions in a One-Stop context.

**Examples of How to Disseminate Information
About the State's One-Stop Vision**

Example #1—Using Statewide Conferences to Disseminate the State's One-Stop Vision. In Texas, four regional capacity building forums were held in September and October, 1995, on such themes as the state's One-Stop framework, managing the change process, and customer satisfaction. As part of its efforts to further promote its vision of One-Stop Career Centers, the Workforce Commission also sponsored a statewide "Texas Career Center Conference" in May 1996 that was attended by approximately 1200 participants. The conference had the dual purpose of introducing the new state Workforce Commission and promoting the state's vision of One-Stop Career Centers to the larger public. Capacity-building efforts directed toward local workforce development staff included a "simulated career center" in which agency partners showcased their vision of a One-Stop Center in operation. This simulated career center was designed to help conferees understand how a non-program-based case management system could serve multiple target populations. **State of Texas**

Example #2—Designing and Conducting Training Sessions to Orient Local Service Delivery Staff to One-Stop Principles. The state of Maryland has placed a premium on capacity building initiatives to support statewide One-Stop implementation and continued progress. One key training area that received emphasis during the first year of local One-Stop implementation was an *Orientation for Local Staff* that focused on "managing change" and the state's "inverted pyramid" approach to service delivery in a One-Stop environment. **State of Maryland**

Example #3—Having Key Administrators Explain the State's One-Stop Vision to Local Staff. Because system transformation at the local level is viewed as the first priority of the One-Stop initiative, Minnesota has involved top lead agency officials in communicating the state's One-Stop vision to the local representatives of the partner workforce development programs. Key agency commissioners conducted a two-month long tour of

all planned One-Stop areas in the summer of 1996 to prepare local sites for One-Stop implementation efforts. At each of the 27 stops on the state tour, state officials asked local partners to detail their local visions and progress in planning One-Stop centers and to describe any obstacles that they had encountered. The tour was viewed as a great success in convincing local staff that the state's commitment to One-Stops came from the highest levels of agency leadership. **State of Minnesota**

GOAL 5. DEVELOP STATE GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL ONE-STOP SERVICES

Most states have developed written guidelines and descriptive evaluation criteria to explain what local One-Stop services should look like. Often these guidelines are used to communicate what is necessary for a service site to receive official certification as a state One-Stop career center. Guidelines are also used by some states to describe the selection criteria for local One-Stop systems or centers interested in receiving One-Stop implementation grants from the state.

Strategy 1. Require or Encourage Specific Services for Job-Seekers

As described elsewhere in this guide, most states encourage local One-Stop centers to develop a tiered structure of services. The first tier of services consists of services that customers can access with a minimum of staff assistance; these are commonly referred to as “self-service” options or “self-access” services. A number of states require local One-Stop centers to offer a menu of self-access services to all individual customers. The self-access services that states most commonly require all local One-Stop centers to provide include the following (listed in order of declining frequency):

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

- Self-assessment tools, such as self-administered career interest or aptitude inventories.
- Employer profiles, including descriptive information on local firms.

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

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

Additional staffed services that some states require all One-Stop centers to provide to all customers include the following:

- Assistance with job search, job matching, or job development needs.
- Basic needs assessment and counseling to help customers identify relevant services.
- Case management upon request.

A few states encourage local One-Stop centers to offer additional enhanced services to all customers on an as-needed basis. Enhanced services that are encouraged, but not required, in these states include group workshops on pre-employment, vocational exploration, job search, and other skills. Although the practice is not yet widespread, a number of One-Stop centers are exploring the feasibility of charging individuals a user fee to receive enhanced services if they are not eligible to receive such services under a categorical funding stream.

Examples of State Guidelines for Job-Seeker Services

Example #1—Requiring Automated Self-Access Services. Maryland has designed a One-Stop service system that is built around identical automated core One-Stop services. The state provides each licensed One-Stop center with these services including software and hardware to support a job-finding cluster, a career-exploration cluster, and a customer-development cluster. Local agencies hosting One-Stop centers must provide a resource area specialist to staff the resource room containing the automated core services.

State of Maryland

Example #2—Requiring a Broad Menu of One-Stop Services Including Both Self-Access Services and Staffed Services. Texas has identified six core services to be available at local workforce development centers: (1) labor market information; (2) common intake and eligibility determination; (3) independent assessment and the development of individual service strategies; (4) coordinated and continuous case management and counseling; (5) individual referral for services including basic education, classroom skills training, on-the-job training, and customized training; and (6) supportive services. The state's guidelines do not specify how local centers should ration staffed services (e.g., by individual eligibility for specific categorical programs versus by individual need for services).

State of Texas

Example #3—Encouraging Local One-Stop Centers to Provide Selected Staffed Services to all Customers. Providing good information to One-Stop career center customers is viewed by the state of Indiana as the most important family of One-Stop services. The availability of high quality information through a variety of technology-based mediums is expected to make One-Stop services accessible to a wide base of job-seeker customers. According to the One-Stop vision promoted in Indiana, however, the goal of

universal access is not to be realized through self-service options alone. Core services, available to all customers of One-Stop career centers, must also include staffed services such as counseling, assessment, facilitated labor exchange, referral, and case management. **State of Indiana**

Strategy 2. Specify Required Services for Employers

To date, states have tended to offer less detailed guidance to local areas about the delivery of One-Stop services to employers. This may be because the initial attention of the One-Stop implementation states and local sites has been focused on redesigning job-seeker services. However, some states have emphasized the importance of providing a wide range of One-Stop services to business customers and have developed detailed blueprints describing required core services and recommended enhanced services for employers.

Using the designs developed by these states as examples, states might require One-Stop centers to provide universal employer services that include the following:

- *Labor exchange services*, such as job listings, job matching, job development, applicant recruitment, applicant screening and referral.
- *Information about and referral to economic development services and other government-funded programs* to assist qualifying firms in hiring or training workers.
- *Employer access to a skill-based job-seeker pool for review*, using America's Talent Bank or a state-initiated talent bank.
- *Information relevant to business needs*, including labor market information and information about regulations for government programs.
- *Business management and consulting services*, to be provided through referral to agencies with expertise in this area.
- *Seminars on topics of interest to local employers*.

Employer services that states might require local One-Stop centers to provide to employers that qualify for special programs include the following:

- *Downsizing support to employers and their workers* for firms planning large-scale layoffs, to be provided through linkages to the state's dislocated worker unit and state or local rapid response teams.
- *Information and financial assistance* with customized training, manufacturing and technology assistance, or apprenticeship training programs.

Services that some states encourage local One-Stop centers to develop as fee-based services for employers include customized testing and screening of applicants, customized analysis of labor market information, assessment of the skills of the current workforce, and customized training for existing workers or new hires.

Examples of State Guidelines for Employer Services

Example #1—Requiring a Broad Range of Employer Services. To qualify as a One-Stop center in Connecticut, the following business services must be available: (1) *labor exchange and recruitment services*, including job listings, job matching, recruitment and screening of applicants and post-referral follow-up of applicants; (2) *workplace consultation services*, including assistance to employers to help them maintain or attain competitiveness in the marketplace; (3) *workforce development services*, including assistance with customized training, manufacturing and technology assistance, and apprenticeship training programs; and (4) *downsizing supports* to employers and their workers. **State of Connecticut**

Example #2—Specifying Required Employer Services in Detail. Centers in Minnesota must offer the following services to all employers: (1) an employer library and employer seminars, (2) a skill-based job-seeker pool for review by employers, (3) information from agencies specializing in different types of disabilities about how to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, (4) provision of available labor market information, (5) referral to economic development services, (6) information about and referral to customized training supports and other employer subsidies, (7) provision of other universal employer services such as job development, access to the statewide job bank, resume-matching services, hiring advice, and information on government regulations for such programs as workers

compensation, equal opportunity, and unemployment insurance. One-Stop centers must also provide fee-based or eligibility-based services to employers, including case management services from a designated account representative, employer-requested testing of job candidates, provision of business data and customized analysis of labor market information, customized employee training, skills assessments of incumbent workers, and employer subsidies for hiring or training targeted workers. **State of Minnesota**

Strategy 3. Establish Guidelines for the Co-Location and Integration of One-Stop Services

Most states offer guidelines about how local partners should participate in the delivery of One-Stop services. A number of states require or strongly encourage staff of local partner agencies—particularly DOL-mandated program partners—to be co-located within a single One-Stop facility. Whether or not they require co-location, most states call for participating programs to agree on procedures to refer clients between and among agencies, exchange client-level information, and provide coordinated case management to customers served by more than one agency.

There is wide variation in the guidelines states have developed for the integration of services by One-Stop partners. Minimally, all states require staff from local partner agencies to increase their familiarity with the services available from other programs.

Beyond increased awareness of services provided by partner agencies and programs, some states require only “coordinated service delivery” and ask local partners to describe steps they have taken to minimize duplication of effort across different programs. These states generally defer to local discretion in the design of integrated One-Stop services. Service delivery models developed by local One-Stop centers in these states can range from a “no wrong door” approach—without co-location of local partners—to a fully-integrated approach with integrated service teams and a fully integrated menu of One-Stop services.

Some states have designed more ambitious guidelines for the integration of core services for all One-Stop customers. Examples of integrated services that states may require or encourage include the following:

- Intake
- Assessment
- Case management services
- The provision of labor market information
- Job search training and assistance
- The delivery of services to profiled UI claimants (those identified as likely to encounter difficulty in finding a new job).

Some states recommend that local partners deliver integrated One-Stop services by having each partner specialize and “do what it does best.” Others encourage local One-Stop partners to create integrated service teams for shared service functions using pooled staff from multiple agencies.

Examples of State Guidelines on Co-Location and Service Integration

Example #1—Permitting Local Areas to Determine Their Own Level of Co-Location and Service Integration. The key feature of service integration required in all of Maryland’s One-Stop centers is the delivery of a standardized and integrated menu of core information services via the state’s automated CareerNet system. However, individual local sites may choose whatever level of service integration they want in their local One-Stop system designs, ranging from electronically-linked partners in different physical sites, to multi-service centers with coordinated but separate operations by on-site partners, to integrated staffing of services across program partners. **State of Maryland**

Example #2—Encouraging Local Areas to Develop a Plan for Integrated One-Stop Services. In Minnesota, each local workforce council must develop a plan for the integration of services across ES/UI and JTPA partner agencies, which are required to be co-located within One-Stop

centers. The state encourages cross-training of staff and requires centers to promote integration of intake, eligibility determination, assessment, case management, and delivery of services to profiled UI applicants. **State of Minnesota**

Example #3—Requiring Co-location and Development of Integrated Services Contracts. Indiana requires that staff providing services under JTPA, ES/UI, Veterans Employment Services, and Older Worker programs be co-located at One-Stop career centers. The state also calls for local service delivery areas to develop integrated service contracts between the agencies responsible for JTPA and ES/UI services. It is intended that these contracts will enable centers to cross-staff the functions of reception, UI registration, job placement and career counseling. **State of Indiana**

GOAL 6. PROMOTE COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION AMONG STATE AND LOCAL ONE-STOP PARTNERS

In addition to establishing criteria to guide local One-Stop service design, states have found it helpful to promote state–local and local–local information exchanges. Coordinated information exchanges benefit state One-Stop project teams by informing them about local accomplishments and best practices and making them aware of implementation difficulties that require attention. Information-sharing benefits local One-Stop staff by informing them about how different local areas have designed coordinated One-Stop services and how different sites have addressed similar implementation challenges.

Among the approaches frequently used to promote communication and coordination between and among state and local One-Stop partners are the following:

- Convening local One-Stop center managers and state project teams for regular information-sharing meetings designed to recognize local accomplishments, identify emerging implementation problems, and promote sharing of best practices among local One-Stop practitioners.
- Assigning specific state staff to be local site liaisons responsible for helping local One-Stop sites through the process leading to state certification and providing individualized system-building assistance.

- Holding monthly telephone conference calls to keep state and local One-Stop staff aware of each others' activities.
- Distributing a state newsletter to keep local areas informed about One-Stop issues and progress, especially during planning and early implementation of local One-Stop systems.

Examples of State Approaches to Promote Communication Between and Among State and Local One-Stop Partners

Example #1—Facilitating Two-Way Communication Between State and Local One-Stop Partners.

In Texas the state One-Stop project team convenes regional forums to communicate about One-Stop implementation issues with local staff. The project team channels information from local sites to members of the state-level staff groups responsible for designing different aspects of the state's One-Stop system. The state project team also conducts formal bi-annual benchmarking visits to each center and obtains regular progress reports, both formal and informal, on the progress of One-Stop implementation. **State of Texas**

Example #2—Facilitating Networking Among Staff from Different Local One-Stop Sites.

The state of Ohio convenes a periodic "partners helping partners" conference to promote exchange of information about best practices among local One-Stop staff. **State of Ohio**

RESOURCES

The following written materials have been drawn from the nine states included in the national process evaluation. Materials were collected at the time of the evaluation site visits.

EXAMPLES OF ESTABLISHING ONE-STOP WORK GROUPS AND PLANNING COMMITTEES

To illustrate how states have used interagency work groups to involve a number of different partner agencies in transforming workforce development systems, we have

included materials describing One-Stop work groups established in the states of Connecticut and Maryland.

Attachment 1-A. Connecticut's Framework for Preparation of Its One-Stop Career Center Implementation Plan

An early planning document from the State of Connecticut describes how an interagency Statewide One-Stop Career Center Planning Committee was established to oversee and coordinate efforts by eight other interagency committees that were assigned to develop different elements of the state's One-Stop Implementation Plan. Participants in the interagency planning process included the State Department of Labor (the lead state agency in the One-Stop initiative), regional Workforce Development Boards, and four additional state agencies. A chart illustrates the two-way interaction between state and local planning efforts, with local needs and strategies communicated to the state by local planning committees and statewide standards and practices communicated to local areas to guide local system development.

Attachment 1-B. Maryland's Plan for Second Year One-Stop Implementation Work Groups

Maryland chartered One-Stop work groups to develop and oversee the annual work plans for each year of the One-Stop implementation grant. Attachment 1-B describes the work groups assembled to guide the second-year implementation efforts. Work groups in Maryland included both state and local system experts.

EXAMPLES OF NEGOTIATING INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS

Interagency agreements are tools to formalize the partnerships formed between and among state agencies. We have included materials describing agreements in Connecticut and Indiana. Additional examples of local cooperative agreements are found in Chapter 2.

Attachment 1-C. Connecticut Works State Agency Partner Summary (March 1996)

Attachment 1-C describes a number of different interagency agreements under development in Connecticut at the state and local levels as of March 1996.

Attachment 1-D. Cooperative Agreement Between the Indiana Division of Disability, Aging, and Rehabilitation and the Indiana Department of Workforce Development (FY 1996)

Attachment 1-D is an example of a cooperative agreement between the Indiana agency responsible for most DOL-funded programs and the state agency responsible for employment programs for older individuals under Title V of the Older Americans Act.

Attachment 1-E. Description of Minnesota's Intra-agency Agreement for the Delivery of Vocational Rehabilitation Services at One-Stop Centers (1995)

In Minnesota, the division responsible for Vocational Rehabilitation services has been part of the state Department of Economic Security for twenty years. As a result, intra-agency negotiations resulted in agreements to deliver Vocational Rehabilitation services through One-Stop centers. Attachment 1-E reproduces an article from the state's One-Stop newsletter describing the nature of this agreement.

INFORMATION ON CERTIFYING LOCAL ONE-STOP CENTERS AND SYSTEMS

In a separate report, *Overview of State Certification/Chartering Criteria for One-Stop Career Centers*, SPR has detailed the required partners and programs for each of 12 first-round and second-round One-Stop implementation grant states. Attachments provide examples of state certification requirements in the states of Wisconsin and North Carolina. This report also includes attachments describing how several states monitor local progress in meeting state certification standards.

EXAMPLES OF DISSEMINATING THE STATE'S ONE-STOP VISION AND GUIDING THE DESIGN OF ONE-STOP SERVICES

Attachment 1-F. Materials Describing Connecticut's Vision for Reorganizing the Connecticut Labor Department: "Working With You for a Better Future" (1994)

In 1994, the state of Connecticut prepared materials to orient staff of the State Department of Labor and other agencies to its new vision of becoming a customer-driven, high-performance work organization. The materials included in Attachment 1-F illustrate how Connecticut sought to seek agency "buy-in" and assuage staff fears about the proposed organizational changes.

Attachment 1-G. Minnesota’s Framework for Job-Seeker and Employer Services

To guide the development of local One-Stop services, the State of Minnesota developed a framework that defines One-Stop job-seeker and employer services, describes whether services are to be provided to all One-Stop customers (“core services”) or limited to individuals eligible for targeted funding streams (“restricted services”). In addition, the Minnesota framework distinguishes between (1) services that must be provided in a standardized fashion at all workforce centers, (2) services that must be provided at all centers, but may be customized to fit local needs, and (3) services that may be provided at local discretion. Attachment 1-G describes how the Workforce Center in Anoka County (Blaine, Minnesota) indicated that it would provide each of the core and restricted services during its first year of operation.