

**RAPID RESPONSE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR
TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)
AND WELFARE TO WORK (WtW)
Contract No. 233-01-0067**

**WEST-CENTRAL HUB MIDWINTER LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
Task Order No. 2
January 7 –10, 2002
Adam’s Mark Hotel
Dallas, Texas**

The ACF West-Central Hub held its Midwinter Leadership Conference January 8-10, 2002, and program-specific pre-conference meetings on January 7, 2002. The primary outcome of the TANF Directors’ Meeting on January 7 was to have increased understanding in Central Office and among the States about the nature of performance measurement as it occurs now at the State and local levels. Information acquired at this and similar meetings in other Hubs will be analyzed to develop and provide more strategic technical assistance products. The objective of the Tribal meeting was to review important activities in each of the ACF programs administered by Tribes. Special focus was placed on the subjects of Child Support Enforcement and TANF interface, fatherhood and reauthorization.

The plenary and workshop sessions for the Midwinter Leadership Conference, January 8-10, 2002, were designed to address the Administration’s key priorities: Fatherhood/Healthy Marriages, Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and Positive Youth Development. The main outcome from these sessions was to have provided participants with the most up-to-date information in these subject areas to enable State and local agencies and Tribal organizations to develop programs and to enhance existing programs. These sessions also facilitated collaboration in these subject areas across program lines at the State and local levels.

Rapid Response funds were used in select conference sessions to pay for travel, including transportation lodging, and M&IE, for up to 16 outside speakers and honoraria for two speakers. Arrangements were also made to have available certain audio-visual equipment for some of the speakers.

Summaries of the various sessions that utilized Rapid Response funds are as follows:

TANF Directors’ Meeting (January 7, 2002)

Primary sessions at the TANF Directors’ Meeting on Monday included the following:

- High Performance Bonus and Changes in Reporting for FY 2002 (Jim Chandler, RO),
- Where Are We Now? Careful and Realistic Reactions to Economic Changes and Promoting Family Stabilization (Jack Tweedie, NCSL),
- TANF Management Roundtable (Andrew S. Bush and Grant Collins, OFA),
- Building Bridges Between TANF Agencies and Community-Based Organizations (Clarence Carter, OCS).

High Performance Bonus Update

On Monday, January 7th the West Central HUB scheduled a pre-Mid Winter Conference Day for State TANF Directors, beginning at 9:30am.

The first session was a discussion of the High Performance Bonus program. We discussed the completed years of FY 1999, FY 2000 and FY 2001. In the Job Entry category the States of the West Central HUB were awarded \$50,774,713 of the \$160 million available, almost 32 percent, for FY 1999 and FY 2000 combined. FY 2001 awards have not been announced as yet.

We then discussed the much-changed requirements for FY 2002 and FY 2003. All States must declare which of the HPB measures they are competing in by February 28, 2002. We expect all States to declare competition for all HPB measures. We will again have the four Work Measures, but only 70% of the \$200 million per year will be awarded in this category. The new measures for FY 2002 and FY 2003 are:

1. Food Stamp Participation Measure – 10% will be awarded,
2. Participation in the Medicaid/SCHIP Program Measure – 10% will be awarded,
3. Percent of affordable, high quality Child Care services provided to eligible children – 5% will be awarded, and
4. Measure of Family Formation and Stability based on percentage of children residing in married-couple families will be awarded 5% of the bonus money.

We discussed the deadlines for submitting data and the need for submitting the data on a timely basis. The case listing will be matched against the New Hires database in Washington, D.C. to determine the Work Measures and the States must submit Medicaid/SCHIP data. All other measures will be developed from existing reports by our Central Office staff in Washington.

Where Are We Now: Careful and Realistic Reactions to Economic Changes and Promoting Family Stabilization

Presenter: *Jack Tweedie, National Conference of State Legislators*

Mr. Tweedie discussed some of the sweeping changes implemented as a result of the passage of the PRWORA of '96, which eliminated the AFDC program and instituted the TANF program. There was a short discussion on the States' ability to design a TANF program to their individual State requirements. As a result of this devolution of responsibility for the TANF program operations to a local level, the TANF recipient rolls have declined by more than 50% since 1994 when the program was operated as the AFDC program under national guidelines with little flexibility.

Mr. Tweedie mentioned that more families are working but have not moved out of poverty. TANF "leaver" studies show that two-thirds of the families are better off than they were under

AFDC, but the studies also show that two-thirds of the families that leave TANF are still struggling to make ends meet.

Mr. Tweedie outlined some “key” issues that will have to be addressed in any TANF program. Those “key” issues are:

- how to reach the “hard-to-serve” (i.e., those with substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health and depression)
- the design of new programs and services
- evaluating various program outcomes and disseminating promising practices

Forty-nine States have reached or are about to reach the five-year time limit. States must begin to consider how they will implement exemptions or extensions. They must also work to find solutions to the recidivism back to the welfare rolls.

Another consideration is the policy that designates who will be included in the twenty percent exemption.

States should establish job retention and career advancement goals to move recipients into higher paying and more long-term jobs. Currently, 1/3 of TANF recipients work, 1/3 are not working, and 1/3 are transitioning back and forth between work and welfare. States should look at new programs but always question their effectiveness.

Expanding services for the working poor must consider such issues as:

- cost
- eligibility
- fairness (how will the program look to those that stay off welfare but have basically the same economic condition)
- child care, transportation, education, and job training

Terry Trujillo from New Mexico, Peggy Butcher from Oklahoma and Cathie Pappas from Utah pointed out some program policy in their States to address the previous issues. Sergio Lugo from ACF in Denver stated that better client benefits are obtained when the welfare agencies work closely with the State Departments of Labor. Grant Collins from ACF in Washington, D.C. said that welfare agencies need to explain to clients that employment retention and advancement are the goals of TANF, not just obtaining a job. The clients’ case manager should continue to work with the client/employer after employment is obtained.

The session continued with a discussion related to the reauthorization of TANF in a declining economy as well as some observations. Mr. Tweedie asked, “What will happen in a national recession?” Recently unemployment has increased in twenty-two States. Forty-four States have revenues that are below expectations. Two-thirds of States have instituted budget cuts or freezes or are drawing down reserve funds. Sixty percent of parents that have left the welfare rolls are employed. The national TANF caseload decline has stopped. NCSL will be notifying various State legislatures of recent increases (above 1%/month) in their caseloads. Some of the caseload

increase was not due to the economic condition but was related to changes in the TANF eligibility requirements.

Mr. Tweedie ended the session by mentioning the Administration's focus on marriage and family formation. He indicated that a key indicator of the success of these initiatives would be the outcomes of the families and children. He closed by saying that support at the State level will determine the level of success of these initiatives.

TANF Management Roundtable Discussion

Andrew Bush (Director, Office of Family Assistance) and Grant Collins requested that the West-Central Hub schedule a meeting of TANF Directors from the 11 states in order to hold a discussion on monitoring and performance management at the state and local levels. Similar meetings are planned for all the ACF Hubs.

Mr. Bush said that while working in New York City, he always emphasized the importance of strong local management. He wants to focus on how to build better programs. He is a big believer in state flexibility. These meetings are great opportunities to learn what states do. He said the TANF program can be seen as a series of 54 experiments, with additional variation at the county level in some states.

OFA wants to improve the quality of technical assistance offered to the states. The amount of funds is small, so they want to be more selective and strategic in using the funds. After gathering information at this series of meetings, OFA managers will be in a better position to make decisions about technical assistance needs. OFA also wants to find constructive ways to involve the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) and the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL).

Before the meeting, ACF staff distributed a list of discussion topics to the state program managers. The discussion topics, or questions, are stated at the beginning of each of the following sections of this report.

Topic 1. How do you monitor the effectiveness of your TANF program? What indicators or information do you use, especially with reference to the purposes of TANF? (How do you know you have a best practice, and how do you look across sub-state agencies?)

New Mexico. Federal performance (work participation) rates only indicate the percentage of clients who are in some kind of work activity. NM is more interested in changes in behavior. All contractors report monthly on earning rates, number of entered employments and places of employment. NM pays contractors to seek out jobs that pay more than minimum wage.

Grant Collins. Do you use the previous year's benchmark?

New Mexico. We can only go up. We are looking at sanction rates and taking corrective action. Contractors make home visits to sanctioned clients and to those who have 12 months left on their time limit. The state agency (Income Support Division) handles eligibility and referrals, while the contractors work with clients on self-sufficiency.

Texas. The Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) is responsible for the employment-related activities for TANF clients and for the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and Food Stamp Employment and Training programs. TWC contracts with 28 local workforce development boards (LWDBs), who in turn contract with service providers. Performance targets are spelled out in state legislation. Some are process-oriented, but key measures are made part of the contracts with Boards and their contractors. TWC operates one integrated reporting system, which also interfaces with the Department of Human Services (DHS) computer system. The database contains comprehensive information on enrollments, sanctions, activities, and employment.

Utah. Utah staff refers to their monitoring report as the "ultimate report." The system shows individual performance levels by case. Information is sorted by case, worker, office, and region. While federal participation guidelines are very prescriptive, Utah has a less stringent definition of success.

Grant Collins. States who receive High Performance Bonus awards cannot always explain how it happened.

Texas. The state legislature also specifies the HPB elements. Texas doesn't know how other states are performing.

Jack Tweedie (NCSL): What happens to people after they leave the rolls?

Utah. Information systems are linked to the employment database.

Texas: Do states link with the Food Stamp and Medicaid records? Texas and New Mexico do. The local boards have used Welfare-to-Work funds, which are drying up. Now they will need to track former recipients using TANF funds. Diane Rath, Commissioner, added that five Texas agencies are building from a 1-year to a 5-year follow-up.

Topic 2. How do you get your local offices to alter practices and improve service?

Utah involves local managers in committees that develop policy, and they meet monthly. Utah also has state and regional councils that oversee functioning at the Department of Welfare Services across multiple programs.

Topic 3. What is the administrative and managerial relationship between the state and local offices?

Texas. The 28 Local Workforce Development Boards oversee performance of their contractors. TWC staff provides extensive technical assistance to the Boards. TWC's review team monitors the Boards. If a Board's performance is deficient, TWC will help them devise an improvement plan, and in some cases impose fiscal sanctions. TWC also can take a contract away. Andrew Bush: Would it be helpful to Texas to observe other states on a regular basis? Lela Dyson explained that she had participated in a national TA workgroup several years ago. The states

wanted funds to help address their own unique technical assistance plans jointly with ACF. For example, they wanted help in providing travel for local staff. That recommendation never was implemented. Diane Rath added that local boards do compete with each other. Sanctions imposed by TWC do focus the attention of board members and state legislators.

Texas DHS. The Food and Nutrition Service has state exchange funds. Texas is so large that travel from one local area to another within the state (Dallas to Houston) could be beneficial for TA.

Oklahoma. Outcomes are difficult to measure especially with services like transportation. One program in Oklahoma, Career Tech, tried performance for pay. The services cost more, but jobs were no better. Could the client have gotten the \$6 per hour job without the training?

Andrew Bush. How do you manage your providers?

New Mexico uses the threat of bringing employment services back in-house. Because New Mexico is a small state, ISD could do case management and administrative work with less expense and more accountability. Five years ago, New Mexico had no contracts. She said this is a new world, and contracts are beneficial most of the time.

South Dakota has 15 one-stops under one contract with the state Department of Labor. Work participation rates are driving performance indicators. The state does monitor a client after employment, a series of seven follow-ups for up to one year. Individual monitoring is stressed. Staff sees clients weekly or monthly at a minimum.

Topic 4. How do you monitor and interpret recent local caseload trends, and what are you seeing recently? Not addressed.

Topic 5. How do you monitor time-limit caseloads and how are you working with such cases? How do you monitor non-assistance caseloads?

New Mexico has a modified work participation agreement for clients who have some kind of limitation. The ultimate goal is full participation, but the state will count any activity designed to deal with the limitation, e.g., physical therapy for a broken leg. Everybody must participate in "primary activities" for 20 hours, which are not negotiable. Other "secondary activities" can be modified by the state's Incapacity Review Unit. Looking ahead, the state is concerned that people who reach the 5-year time limit may declare disability. New Mexico has never promoted a total exemption based on domestic violence. The state also works with "barrier buster" contractors, who are co-located with New Mexico Works staff.

Colorado has 64 counties. (TANF is county-administered.) County plans are adopted each year. Each is subject to an annual audit by the State Auditor's Office. Counties are assessed on beginning wage, wage progression, types of jobs, and recidivism. They have improved connectivity with other support services.

Andrew Bush said that performance indicators sometimes can prejudice services and asked how states assess progress of non-cash TANF clients.

Utah monitors the number of people served rather than their outcomes.

Texas DHS noted that GAO is conducting a survey on people who received TANF services rather than assistance. The state finds it difficult to identify and capture those who don't actually come in to the office. For example, how do you measure the effectiveness of a public information campaign on teen pregnancy?

Andrew Bush. When you look at performance, there are seven key themes: wages, wage progression, retention, job type, post-welfare service access, participation rate, and activity completion. How do you assess the quality of services?

Texas DHS and TWC both recently completed "mystery shopper" studies. DHS also has a tracking system for both complaints and compliments. DHS is working on their phone system and their local office structures to reduce language barriers.

Arkansas has conducted a "grand experiment" using savings from cash assistance to fund 62 TEA (Transitional Employment Assistance) Coalitions. Their state funding will end in March. Audit findings of these organizations showed that performance measures were nonexistent. Auditors found lax bookkeeping and a lack of local capacity-building.

Texas DHS. Contractors have widely varying levels of sophistication. Agencies should help contractors have a realistic understanding of expectations and of the problems they are likely to encounter in the low-income populations.

Andrew Bush. Certain types of indicators reflect good outcomes. What if you are comparing across populations? What if an activity is not helping? How do you measure progress after enrollment in an activity?

Oklahoma. Case management skills are lacking on the part of staff.

New Mexico. Contractors and case managers need to think like employers.

Grant Collins. Does any state monitor marriage and family formation?

Oklahoma has the impetus from the Governor, who announced 2 years ago that he wants to reduce the divorce rate by one-third over 10 years, and the commitment of state TANF funds. The state is developing relationship skills training and training DHS workers to make referrals. How does a worker fit this into the order of priorities? The overall divorce rate for the state would be one indicator. For the TANF population, you might look at a reduction in the poverty rate. The state maintains tight controls on contracts for public relations services.

Jack Tweedie commented that Arkansas has a good model. The legislature sets priority areas. TEA Coalitions set target measures and must report on them. Texas ties dollars to performance levels for LWDBs. TWC provides technical assistance when performance is low. Colorado mentioned a natural competition among counties.

Grant Collins. How do you manage time-limit cases?

Utah notifies the worker and the customer at 24 months and again at 36 months. They must meet to review status. Turnover of case management staff and training new workers are critical issues. Early assessment of barriers is critical to maximize the amount of time available for working on the barriers. Average length of stay on welfare is 18 months. Utah has a hardship exemption. If the client did not receive services from DWS or another state agency, then they can go beyond the 36-month state limit on a month-to-month basis. There is also a 24-month extension when a client gets a job.

New Mexico. Posters in offices and mailed notices emphasize time limits. ISP exchanges a list of 30-month cases with contractors and with the child support enforcement agency. A longitudinal study showed that 90 percent of clients who reach 30 months are aware of the time limit. Most thought that something would change in the law. The study revealed a sense of hopefulness, but also procrastination and denial on the part of clients.

Grant Collins. Regarding suggestions for technical assistance, we have heard about case management principles and front-line training. Are there any other suggestions?

As the 1115 waiver is about to expire, Texas is struggling with subsidized employment and how the Fair Labor Standards Act applies. Also, Texas needs help in training local boards.

Building Bridges Between TANF Agencies and Community Based Organizations

The final session of the TANF Pre-Conference Meeting on Monday afternoon included a discussion led by Clarence Carter, Director of the Office of Community Services within ACF. Mr. Carter was accompanied at the session by State Community Service Block Grant Directors and Community Action Agency Presidents. They were joined by the TANF Directors, as well as other State, local and Federal staff participants. The discussion centered around providing a continuum of services for TANF clients who are leaving the roles and for the working poor.

Mr. Carter provided some background as to where he worked prior to accepting the position at ACF. He indicated that he worked in Virginia on the Virginia Independence Program (VIP). Mr. Carter noted that States have collectively done an extremely good job at reducing the welfare rolls, but noted that if we are to manifest the full effect of welfare reform, we must partner with many entities; it cannot all get done in the Department of Social Services. That is, we need to address the issues of the working poor and the Office of Community Services (OCS) is responsible for making the resources available to build that infrastructure to assist the working poor.

Mr. Carter made a plea for beginning a conversation around improving relationships between human service agencies with the community service structure. He indicated that those relationships were healthy in some communities, but nearly non-existent in other communities. Mr. Carter noted that collaboration and comprehensiveness are becoming essential.

Mr. Carter recognized that OCS operates on a relatively small budget, around \$4.5 billion annually. Its goal is to build healthy communities—need to bring multiple resources together to make communities healthy. Today, we are providing an opportunity to beginning, in a cursory way, discussions to address the holistic needs of our communities. As we get back to our respective communities, we need to continue to collectively address the needs of our customer base.

In discussing TANF, Mr. Carter made an observation that the original TANF legislation was imposed on State practitioners by Congress---that it was legislatively driven. He noted that it is now the perfect time to identify what we need to do now---that practitioners must take back their “industry” and figure out how to move the agenda forward to look out over the services spectrum and to see what needs to be done.

Tribal Programs Administrators’ Meeting: January 7, 2002

The objective of the Tribal meeting was to review important activities in each of the ACF programs administered by Tribes. Special focus was placed on the subjects of Child Support Enforcement and TANF interface, fatherhood and reauthorization. This was the first Mid-Winter Conference that attempted to bring together all the ACF Tribal programs from throughout the West-Central Hub.

Tribal Program Overview

Gale Spotted Tail, Rosebud Sioux Child Care Program

Gale spoke about her 10-year journey as a child-care provider. A part of her learning was realization that caring for Tribal children required an awareness of how Tribal culture and belief systems needed to shape the care provided. She shared examples of how the actual construction and space utilization of the Tribe’s new child-care facility reflected important practices and beliefs of her people.

Judy Sands, Lutheran Social Services of North Dakota, works as a child-care consultant for the Tribes in both North and South Dakota. She offers technical assistance, consulting services to the Tribes and acts as a liaison to the State and Tribes concerning the development of the Child-Care Assistance program. The cost of these services is shared between the North Dakota’s DHS and the Tribes. It is thought that this type of arrangement for technical assistance services is unique in the nation. Her remarks are detailed in Attachment 1.

Eddie Screechowl, Muscogee Creek Nation Children and Family Services, discussed the new responsibilities his program inherited when providing services to delinquent youth was

transferred to him. He expressed concern about the capability of his existing resources to cope with the new demands.

Tribal Child Support and State TANF Interface

Raymond Lasley, Osage Nation TANF Program. The Osage began to operate its TANF Program in May 1998. Recently, because of the Tribe's greater control of the program, they were able to increase its grant to families by 10 percent. They also provide supplemental funds to support clients who have gone to work. Transportation, clothing, auto repair, eye glasses, etc., are among assistance provided to support work. The Tribe also assists clients to obtain vocational education.

The Tribe is considering a number of other initiatives to help families including a marriage bonus. The Tribe participates in a Child Support Enforcement Program operated by the Chickasaw Nation.

Linda Tresaugue, Puyallup Tribal Child Support Director. The Tribe consists of 16,000 members and non-members. It's an urban reservation. Prior to the Tribe receiving their own CSE funding, the State of Washington established a Tribal team in their IV-D offices to work Tribal cases. Whenever an order was established on a Tribal individual, the Tribe was able to review the obligation for accuracy. Puyallup employs a large number of non-Indians. They received a Special Improvement Program (SIP) grant for two years to develop a CSE program prior to receiving direct CSE funding. The Tribe has an informal agreement with the State that provides the ground rules for the program.

The Tribe does not administer its own TANF program, but has it under consideration. Since it began to run its CSE program, it has doubled collections, mostly from non-Indian employees.

Rose Nelson, Navajo Nation, CSE. The headquarters for CSE is in Window Rock, AZ. Additional offices will open in Gallup in January, with two other offices to open in 2002. Actual collections by the Tribe increased from \$0 in FY 1993 to \$1.5 million in FY 2001, and have already reached \$3.5 million in the first quarter of FY 2002.

Fatherhood/Family Formation Issues

Gary Neuman, WTW Project Director, Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribe

CSK program for young male non-custodial fathers is based on the Medicine Wheel that focuses on mental, spiritual, physical and emotional aspects of the total person. It is based on the values of honesty, love, respect, understanding, loyalty, caring feedback, commitment, forgiveness, and responsibility. The process of change includes the steps of awareness, understanding, acceptance and change. It is within this context that Gary's programs operate.

The program is primarily funded with a DOL competitive grant of \$2.5 million. Although the Tribe does not yet formally operate its own CSE program, through informal arrangements with the State, its Tribal Court supports the program. Examples of the cooperative relationship with

the State include a less punitive State approach to non-custodial fathers if they are in Gary's program and Tribal employers will honor State wage withholding assignments.

The program works on clients' feelings of self-sufficiency and pride in their cultural heritage. The program provides a number of services to support employment, and are creative in bringing several part-time jobs together to form a year-around job. An example would be fire fighting in the summer and fall and woodcutting during the cold months. Holistic approach to the treatment of substance abuse is of primary importance to many clients.

The program tries to influence community attitudes toward substance abuse and promote fathers' positive involvement with their families through community events. See Attachment #2.

Important Developments Impacting Welfare Reform in Indian Country

Norm DeWeaver, Washington Representative, Native American Empowerment and Training Coalition.

Current Welfare Reform Law, PRWORA, impacting Tribes, needs to be reauthorized this fiscal year. One of the important benefits of the law has been the increase of Tribal Child Care. However, the opportunity to influence the legislation is beginning now. Congress has not done very much to address changes in the new law, but that should change soon.

In addition to Congress, the Secretary of DHHS will have a great deal to say in the future on the law. The National Congress of American Indians has recently released a position paper on reauthorization suggesting changes in the law. See Attachment #3.

Tribal Inclusion in CFS Reviews

Judy Baggett, West-Central Hub Team Leader

Future CFS Reviews will include Native Americans child welfare professionals on future review teams, so that Indian cases will be reviewed with important cultural considerations in mind. A recruitment process is underway to identify people qualified to serve in this capacity. Material and applications were distributed. See Attachment #4.

Bridges to Practice: Working with Adults Who Have Learning Disabilities

Presenters: *Beth Blanchard, Seattle Workforce Investment Board*
Anson Green, Adult Literacy Coordinator for the Texas Workforce Commission

Session: Tuesday, January 8, 2002 Time: 1:30p.m. – 3:00p.m. State Room 2

ACF and the National Institute for Literacy have jointly funded development of **Bridges to Practice**, a research-based tool kit designed to support local, state, and regional systemic change in the provision of services to adults who have learning

disabilities. **Bridges** is the result of a 5-year collaboration between the University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities and the Academy for Educational Development. Our first presenter, Beth Blanchard, is the Project Director for the NIFL-Bridges to Practice Project at the Seattle Workforce Investment Board.

Ms. Blanchard explained that there are several definitions of learning disabilities. Washington State uses the following definition:

A learning disability (LD) is a neurological condition that impedes a person's ability to store, or process information. LD can affect one's ability to read, write, speak, or compute math and can impair socialization skills. Individuals with LD are generally (but not necessarily) of average or above average intelligence, but the disability creates a gap between ability and performance. This definition is measured through a discrepancy diagnostic model looking at the differences between the individual's expected performance and his or her actual performance as measured on an academic achievement test.

Ms. Blanchard provided a brief history of the **Bridges to Practice** curriculum. In 1997 the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) held a competition for "Learning Disability Hubs," in which to establish training academies to help human services professionals learn how best to work with adults with learning disabilities. Seattle-King County was one of four sites selected. Seattle has since conducted training in other states, including Virginia, Alabama, Texas, and California. Another training academy in Seattle is being planned for March 2002.

She summarized some of the lessons learned thus far:

- There is a high prevalence of learning disability among clients in employment and training programs, in some cases greater than 50 percent.
- Undiagnosed adults often are unemployed or underemployed.
- Adults with LD do have skills.
- Job fit and explicit and consistent case management are essential to job retention.
- Community linkages are key.

The second presenter, Anson Green, is the Adult Literacy Coordinator for the Texas Workforce Commission. Anson has taken a lead role on the Texas Learning Disability Workgroup, which began in August 2001. This group comprises several state agencies, local workforce boards, federal agency representatives, community-based literacy organizations, and service providers. This year, there are three different opportunities for state/local staff to participate in training that will lead to certification as a Master Trainer for the Bridges to Practice curriculum. These new master trainers will be expected to set up training around the state for front-line staff who work with recipients of TANF and employment-related services. The

work of the group is just getting underway, and they would welcome additional partners in this effort.

Immigrant Access to Human Services

Presenters: *Dinah Wiley, J.D., Senior Civil Rights Analyst
USDHHS, Office of Civil Rights
Lauren Saine, J.D., Program Specialist
Office of Self Sufficiency
Colorado Department of Human Services*

Times: Tuesday, January 8; 1:00 to 3:00, and 3:30 to 5:00

Handouts: (1) Immigrants: Civil Rights Issues and Concerns (23 pgs.)
(2) Immigrants and Public Benefits in Colorado, Resource Guide for Immigrant Advocates (26 pgs.)

Dinah Wiley addressed a host of issues involving immigrants from the Federal perspective. That perspective included: an overview of federal laws; categories of eligible qualified aliens, issues involving deeming (of a sponsor's income); programs that are exempt from the federal bar on services and potential consequences of using health and social services involving public charge matters and verification and reporting. Using her handout material, the discussion focused: (1) on Federal guidance (and its location in regulations and websites), (2) a comprehensive review of HHS programs providing Federal "public benefits", specialized charts illustrating major Federal "public benefits" programs and eligibility of "Qualified" immigrants before and after August 22, 1996 and "Not Qualified" aliens and (3) State funded replacement programs

Mediation Services & Techniques In Policy Dialogue Between State And Local Agencies And Tribes

Presenter: *Anna Spradlin, Ph.D.,
Employment Opportunity Specialist
USDHHS, Office of Civil Rights, Region 8*

Times: Tuesday, January 8; 1:30 to 3:00
Wednesday, January 9: 10:30 to Noon

Handouts: Mediation Services and Techniques in Policy Dialogue Between State & Local Agencies & Tribes (11 pgs.)

Anna Spradlin, with post graduate credentials in conflict resolution, and nearly two decades of both private practice and academia instruction in the field of mediation, focused her lively discussion on issues of conflict management. The conflict management alluded to addressed issues in public policy dialogue as it

impacts differing layers of State Agency operations, local agency operations, and Tribal program operations.

Utilizing her experiences while visiting an African Tribe, Ms. Spradlin used an interest-based negotiation model to illustrate how teamwork can be accomplished among disparate policy perspectives in achieving mutually satisfactory results. The interest-based negotiation process was contrasted against positional bargaining strategies and stresses that: (1) interests are the concerns of each party; (2) is a problem solving process that takes longer than positional bargaining, but may achieve more long-term results; (3) in interest-based negotiations, substantive, as well as psychological as well as procedural interests are important; (4) principles of effective listening are at play in interest-based negotiation involving public policy dialogues; and (5) mediation and interest-based negotiation must recognize both the cultural aspects of the negotiators in both the ethnic sense, but just as importantly, in the environmental sense.

Discussion questions and issues were diverse, involving such matters as: (1) applying the model to 3 Head Start centers in Texas where personnel perspectives originating from history, experience, and family service versus social service perspectives are creating conflict within the agency; (2) effectuating medical and dental services to Head Start children where religiously fundamentalist parents refuse to permit medical service provision to the children; and (3) resolving service disputes between Head Start Centers and local school districts as to the proper method of serving Downs Syndrome children with limited English proficiency backgrounds.

Lauren Saine's discussion of how one State plays into the mix and how that State makes every effort to move individuals, quite legally and appropriately, from the undocumented population to the qualified alien population shed a different light on service provision. Her handout, although not used because of its applicability solely within the State of Colorado, illustrates that approach and represents materials that the State Department of Human Services regularly provides to field workers at the county level as well as any advocacy organizations within the State.

Most attendees were from Head Start. Much of the discussion tended to focus on undocumented workers and non-qualified aliens. Discussion points during both sessions were equally illustrative of the interest provoked by the discussion, including such topics as: (a) questions and issues centered on the provision of Medicaid services; (b) needed linkages to Medicaid contacts for children with emergency medical service needs, (c) the need for CMS and OCR to get such information out with regard to emergency medical services; (d) crime victim (U-Visa) aliens; (e) the need to be in touch with State Human Services Agency personnel responsible for handling immigrant access issues; (f) the pressures that numbers of Head Start centers are beginning to experience with the influx of heretofore unheard of numbers of Hispanic and foreign born children (and in some cases U.S. born children of foreign born parents); and (g) the apparently

unfounded position of some Head Start administrators that the only ones that can be served are U.S. citizens.

Impact of Domestic Violence on ACF Caseloads and Achieving Collaboration

Presenters: *Marcia Smith, Executive Director, Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault; Pauline Musgrove, Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault; Donald J. Smith, Ph.D., Director of Research, Violence Prevention and Intervention Center, Parkland Health and Hospital System; Gloria Montgomery, Program Specialist and Domestic Violence Lead, Region VIII, Administration for Children and Families, Denver; Moderator: Carol Beth Sedanko, Program Specialist and Region VI Domestic Violence Lead, Administration for Children and Families, Region VI, Dallas, Texas*

Session: Tuesday, January 8, 2002 Time: 1:30p.m. – 5:00p.m. Room: City View 1

Ms. Smith and Ms. Musgrove provided a foundation for the workshop with a presentation and discussion on what is involved in the dynamics of domestic violence and the complex range of associated issues. Ms. Musgrove is Native American and a survivor of domestic violence. She provided a unique perspective. Ms. Smith then described collaboration in Oklahoma and the range of organizations involved. She was instrumental in the formation of the Oklahoma Native American Coalition against Domestic Violence, one of only a few in the nation. She and Ms. Musgrove discussed the steps involved in forming the coalition.

Ms. Smith addressed how to work with Domestic Violence Coalitions and programs and defined the funding sources and responsibilities of a coalition. Within this context she discussed educating law enforcement, prosecutors, judiciary, and direct service providers regarding state laws, protective orders, full faith and credit and other topics. Ms. Smith provided information for the audience on how to work with domestic violence shelters, including the importance of establishing a relationship before the service is needed.

Ms. Smith defined some basics of collaboration, such as being open-minded and approachable, and then discussed the wide range of collaborative efforts in Oklahoma with which her coalition is involved.

She and Ms. Musgrove concluded their presentation with a segment on establishing effective Tribal linkages.

Dr. Smith's presentation began with an overview of the documented increase in the percentage of children who witness domestic violence, and the current statistics on child witnesses in Dallas County. Dr. Smith also presented maps depicting by zip code in Dallas the high correlation of police reported domestic violence, child abuse reports, low birth weights and infant mortality. The number of Dallas domestic violence police department interventions is representative of other cities in the nation. After discussing research findings which demonstrate that child witnesses to domestic violence experience such problems as increased numbers of illnesses, poor

academic performance, anxiety, education and behavior problems, Dr. Smith discussed the prevalence for adolescent and adult health risk factors including substance abuse, smoking, multiple sexual partners, physical inactivity, heart disease, cancer, stroke and diabetes, as well as the increased risk of becoming a violent offender in the home or community. The implications for these individuals becoming members of the ACF service population were explored.

The last segment of Dr. Smith's presentation was on the development and maintenance of community collaborations in developing programs to address the needs of children and their families impacted by domestic violence, including the importance of addressing such factors as cultural appropriateness and access. The aspects of planning, evaluation, confidentiality, and safety of the client were discussed within the context of addressing challenges in collaboration such as differences in philosophy. As an example, Dr. Smith described the current collaboration in Dallas of the Children and Domestic Violence Sub-Committee of the Child Abuse Prevention Coalition that he chairs. The process of how the group was formed and the process of identifying the need for and development of services were presented.

Ms. Montgomery presented on the Greenbook Project, which is a collaboration of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Department of Justice and the David and Lucille Packard Foundation. The project was initiated by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges to develop guidelines for practice and policy in cases where domestic violence and child maltreatment overlap. Five national demonstration sites have been funded. Participants were given the information on obtaining a copy of the Greenbook.

Attendees at the workshop were provided with a range of informational material including a bound training manual which included copies of the power point presentations, educational material on domestic violence, the impact of domestic violence on children, domestic violence in ethnic and minority communities, twelve articles on coordinated community response, web sites, fact sheets on ACF sponsored domestic violence services, and a complete listing of domestic violence resources in each of the eleven States in the West-Central Hub. The listing of State and local resources was provided to make outreach and collaboration less formidable.

Marriage and Strengthening Families Initiative

Presenters: *Jerry Reiger, Secretary, Oklahoma Health and Human Services Cabinet*
Scott Stanley, Ph.D., Senior Program Consultant
Mary Myrick, President, Public Strategies

Session: Wednesday, January 9, 2002 Time: 10:30a.m to noon Room: Lone Star A-4

On Wednesday morning, the above presenters discussed the design, development and implementation of the Oklahoma Marriage Initiative (OMI).

Oklahoma has dedicated \$10 million in TANF funds to a multi-sector strategy, involving health, education extension, social service, religious, business, government, and legal providers, to strengthen family relationships and dramatically reduce the divorce rate in the State. Department of Human Services employees and other referral sources are being trained in how to raise

relationship issues and share information about these services with their clients. The research underpinning the training was discussed during the session, as well as the method used to evaluate the program's impact.

Mr. Jerry Reiger, Secretary of Oklahoma's Health and Human Services Cabinet, spoke first, outlining the origin of the Oklahoma Marriage Initiative and addressing the questions around why government is involved in marriage. Mr. Reiger noted that government already commits major portions of annual expenditures to the results of the dissolution of marriage and family (Foster Care, Non-marital births, Child Abuse/Neglect, Juvenile delinquency, etc.). He noted that there is a role for government to play in terms of strengthening marriage and reducing divorce, and that actually supporting those efforts should tend to promote *less* government rather than more government involvement. Critical steps for building a good foundation for the Marriage Initiative includes (1) bold leadership, (2) communicating a balanced approach, and (3) committing to key principles. Under "bold leadership," Mr. Reiger noted that the State established a measurable goal to reduce the divorce rate by 1/3 by the Year 2010; that the State did not just appoint another "commission," and that the nation's first Governor's Marriage Summit to educate a broad base of State leadership was convened in March 1999. In terms of communicating a balanced approach, Mr. Reiger noted that the purposes of the initiative are to strengthen marriage and not bash divorce, communicate societal impact of divorce as well as the value of the institution of marriage, and to involve diverse players as long as they value and support marriage. Finally, under the "commit to key principles" bullet, Mr. Reiger addressed the necessity of leadership at the top and addressed the multi-sector approach used to gain a broad spectrum of support for the project (government agencies, service providers, business community, educational system, religious organization, media and legal professionals).

Mr. Reiger also addressed the State's implementation strategy for the project. He indicated that they moved along two primary tracks: religious and secular. Under the religious track, leaders of almost every denomination and faith group formed a committee to work toward better preparing couples for the complexities of marriage. Over 700 religious leaders have signed a marriage covenant, committing to 4-6 months of pre-marital preparation and an adequate engagement period. Under the secular track, the State's strategy has been to utilize existing government and community infrastructures to build a statewide delivery system through the State Department of Health, Department of Human Services and the Cooperative Extension Services. The chosen curriculum for the material is the Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP) designed by Dr. Scott Stanley and Dr. Howard Markman of the University of Denver.

Mr. Reiger concluded his remarks by noting that we need to do what we can to promote stronger marriages---that strong marriages need personal commitment and promise. We need to develop societal expectations and need to recreate a societal norm that esteems and honors marriage. The overall goal of the initiative is to strengthen, promote and encourage marriage and reduce divorce.

Mary Myrick, President of Public Strategies, discussed working on this initiative for about 2 ½ years. She discussed some of the accomplishment to date, as well as discussed a survey which is being used to evaluate the initiative. The 4 major themes of the survey used in the OMI included (1) attitudes about intimate relationships, marriage, family and divorce, (2) demographic data on

marriage, divorce, remarriage, patterns of cohabitation and intent to marry/remarry, (3) qualitative information on couples' relationship quality and (4) knowledge and acceptance of preventive education. There were 123 questions on the survey which was estimated to take about 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Survey workers called 2,000 Oklahomans in the Fall of 2001 through random sampling. They also called a sample of neighboring State residents (Arkansas and Kansas) to compare attitudes, etc. Preliminary findings of the survey suggest some of the following:

- 33% of Oklahoma adults report having been divorced at least once.
- Among Oklahomans who have a previous spouse, 25% have children under the age of 18 with their previous spouse.
- Among Oklahomans who are romantically involved with someone, 40% live with their partner. Of these persons, 30% have children together.
- Among currently married persons, 33% report having pre-marital preparation (educational class, workshop or counseling to get a good start in marriage), whereas 18% of divorced persons report having pre-marital preparation.
- A majority of persons currently receiving government assistance (Food Stamps, TANF, Medicaid) (50%) believe they would lose at least some of their current benefits if they became married.
- Over 2/3 of Oklahoma adults (69%) think divorce is a very serious national problem.
- 90% of Oklahoma adults strongly agree or agree that too many couples rush into marriage.
- A majority of Oklahoma adults (62%) believe it is very important for couples to prepare for marriage through educational classes, workshops or counseling to get a good start at marriage.
- A majority of currently married and romantically involved Oklahomans (65%) said they would consider relationship education to strengthen their relationship.
- A large majority of Oklahoma adults (82%) feel a statewide initiative to promote marriage and reduce divorce would be a good or very good idea.

Ms. Myrick also discussed some of the design, development and implementation of the Marriage Initiative. She talked about the utilization of the PREP curriculum in terms of the State's wanting to use a curriculum with a proven track record. She also discussed the design of the service delivery system in terms of the establishment of 3 tiers of training: Tier I (Orientation and consultation for agency administrators presented by various key experts in the "Marriage" field), Tier II (2-day orientation and skills development institute for staff who will be referring clients to the PREP training), and Tier III (3 day training session for persons who wish to become PREP trainers). Ms. Myrick noted that over 140 Oklahomans have already been trained in the PREP curriculum and that each trainer is to provide a minimum of 4 PREP sessions per year. Mary also talked about the process that the State was using in developing a "County-based" implementation team of trainers.

Finally, Dr. Scott Stanley spoke to the audience of 40 to 45 workshop attendees. Dr. Stanley discussed potential clients for the initiative (i.e., low income disadvantaged single moms who were having relationships with the father of the child or who had a boyfriend or fiance, etc.). Dr. Stanley also mentioned the study, "Fragile Families, Welfare Reform and Marriage" put out by the Brookings Institute. He noted that in fragile family settings, the baby takes the surname of

the father in 79% of the cases. Also noted in the study is that almost 2/3 agree or strongly agree with the statement: It is better for their children if their parents are married.

Dr. Stanley noted that the PREP curriculum is research based, it is empirically informed, it is empirically tested and it is regularly updated. He noted that PREP is the vehicle for empirically based strategies to impart to young couples. PREP, rather than focusing on static factors, focuses on the dynamic factors such as interactive danger signs, ability to communicate, etc. The curriculum wants to lower risks and raise protections in such areas as commitment, friendship, fun, sensuality and spiritual and religious intimacy. Dr. Stanley showed a few clips from a video illustrating what some of the key training components of PREP include, such as an effective “listening/speaker” technique of communication.

Fatherhood Initiative: Promoting the Involvement of Fathers in the Well-Being of Their Children

Presenter: *Chris Brown, Vice-President, State and Community Initiatives, National Fatherhood Initiative*

Session: Wednesday, January 9 Time: 10:30a.m. – 12:00p.m. Room: Lone Star C-4

Mr. Chris Brown helps States and communities across the country launch fatherhood initiatives. The basic purpose of this meeting was to train the individuals and organizations present on how to create father inclusive organizations and programs, and how to develop, manage, market, and evaluate services and programs for dads.

The session opened with a short summary of the five “pillars” of leadership in the fatherhood arena. These pillars were described as (1) an examination of one’s own attitudes about men and fathers, (2) thinking “out of the box,” (3) ability and willingness to take risks, (4) ability to get “buy-in” from other staff, and (5) empowering others to take action.

He then presented his idea of a “Best Practice Model for Fatherhood Programs.” This model consisted of seven components.

The first component of the model was to know the setting. Mr. Brown directed the participants at the session to know your organization and your community based setting. You should be aware of the demographic (ethnic/racial) breakdown as well as the rate of fathers’ absence in each group. You should also be aware of available resources (i.e., transportation, day-care, etc.).

The second component was the need to know the fathers as individuals and their support structure as well as their needs and wants.

The third component was the requirement that the fatherhood programs should match the programs and services to the needs and wants of the fathers served in a particular setting.

The fourth component was the seventeen critical issues that must be considered in designing a program. Those issues are grief work, anger management, sexuality, intimacy, family of origin, marriage, discipline, raising boys vs. girls, communicating with children, child development, gender communication, fathering skills, power of faith, masculinity, work/family balance, and financial responsibility.

The fifth component was the need to involve the entire family when working with fathers.

The sixth component was the issue of marketing the program. This requires that you consider how to recruit and retain the fathers by reflecting a positive image. He mentioned that no matter how well designed the fatherhood program or service might be, if you can't get fathers to use it or keep coming back, you're wasting your time.

The seventh component was the need to build a good support network. You should involve components at all levels of government (i.e., Federal, state and local). You should also involve non-profit social services, education sectors, healthcare providers, law enforcement agencies, faith community, civic organizations, business leaders and the media.

Faith-Based Initiatives: Charitable Choice and HHS Programs – Leveling the Field

Presenters: *Elizabeth Seale-Scott, Director, HHS Center on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives*
Larry Jones, Texas Workforce Commission
Jacqueline Jaramillo, Faith Partners, El Paso County Colorado

Session: Wednesday, January 9, 2002 Time: 10:30a.m. – 12:00p.m. Room: Houston B

Mrs. Elizabeth Seale-Scott provided information about the Department of Health and Human Services' faith-based policies and activities.

Faith-based and community organizations have a long history of providing essential services to people in need in the United States. In recognition of this, President Bush (then Governor Bush) promoted the Charitable Choice provisions in Texas.

Charitable Choice redesigned the government's procurement rules to eliminate barriers that prevented many religious organizations from working with government.

The Bush Administration's faith-based initiative expands the ability of government officials to procure services from religious providers using TANF, Welfare-to-Work, and Community Services Block Grant. This initiative does not transfer the functions and responsibilities of welfare and social service agencies to churches and charities. It levels the playing field and expands the range of eligible service providers.

In January 2001, President Bush issued Executive Order 13198 creating Faith-Based and Community Centers in the Departments of (1) Health and Human Services, (2) Justice, (3) Education, (4) Labor and (5) Housing and Urban Development. The president charged each of

these centers with coordinating their departments' efforts to eliminate programmatic barriers that prevented faith-based and other community organizations from participating in the provision of services.

The government is opening the process by eliminating unnecessary rules that prevent participation of faith-based providers. Faith-based providers are eligible to compete for procurement funds on the same basis as other providers. They are neither excluded nor included because of their religious character. Faith-based providers can maintain a religious environment. Providers have the right to maintain control over their religious mission and internal governance. They cannot buy bibles with government funds, but they can have bibles in the room. Government funds cannot be used for inherently religious activities such as worship.

Faith-based providers cannot discriminate against individuals of a different faith. Government must ensure a secular alternative for clients who do not wish to receive services from a faith-based agency.

Some barriers to faith-based participation in government programs include lack of knowledge. They do not know they are eligible to compete for contracts. They do not understand the grant process. Many do not know how to write a fundable proposal.

Mr. Larry Jones indicated that the Texas Workforce Commission has 16 faith-based contracts.

The President and the Texas Governor are strong advocates for Charitable Choice.

There are four funding sources for Charitable Choice: (1) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF); (2) Welfare-to-Work; (3) Community Services Block Grant; and (4) Drug Treatment programs.

Mr. Jones described Charitable Choice versus faith-based services. He made a point of saying that there are differences between the two, although they are concentric circles that are intertwined. His presentation focused on Charitable Choice.

Charitable Choice provides protections for the institutions, the individuals, and provides accountability of the funds used. It is not about proselytizing or funding religious organizations.

Protections for institutions assure that the institution: (1) cannot be discriminated against because of its religious nature; (2) shall retain its independence from federal, state and local governments; (3) shall retain control over its religious beliefs; and (4) shall not change its form of governance, nor remove art, icons, scripture or symbols, and may retain its employment practice.

Protection for individuals obtaining services assures that if an individual is uncomfortable with receiving services from a faith-based provider, the individual should be directed toward an alternative of equal value.

When getting started, faith-based organizations must address the needs stated in the Request for Proposal (RFP).

Some faith-based agencies might not have strong fiscal controls. It is important to know that more accountability is required when using state or federal government funds. “Keep funds separate.”

Jacqueline Jaramillo provided information about Faith Partners services. Faith Partners is a nonprofit organization formed by several El Paso County, Colorado churches. The group was formed in response to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

Faith Partners assists individuals and families who desire to leave their welfare dependency but require additional support in dealing with the many issues that arise as people transition from welfare to work.

Since June of 1999, Faith Partners has been contracting with the El Paso County Department of Human Services to develop mentoring teams that are trained and prepared to lend encouragement, support and life-skills coaching to families desiring to get off of welfare.

All teams are volunteer mentors who commit for a minimum of one year to serve in their ministry to a family. The role of the Department of Human Services is to provide access to mentors for those families who desire the support services of mentors. This is being accomplished through the widespread distribution of materials to clients about the services of Faith Partners.

Some challenges in developing Faith Partners included:

- Resolving issues resulting from denominational differences, i.e., finding common ground,
- Educating churches to take advantage during the window of opportunity, and
- Developing a structure that was inclusive while protecting the integrity of the Christian nature of the churches.

Stopping Domestic Violence Before it Starts: The Impact of Domestic Violence on Children

Presenters: *Jan Langbein, Executive Director; Genesis Women's Shelter; Donald J. Smith, Jr., Ph.D., Director of Research, Violence Intervention and Prevention Center, Parkland Health and Hospital System; Ashley Lind, Ph.D., Director of Clinical and Professional Services, Genesis Women's Shelter. Moderator: Carol Beth Sedanko, Program Specialist and Domestic Violence Lead, Region VI, Administration for Children and Families, Dallas, Texas.*

Session: Wednesday, January 9, 2002 Time: 1:30p.m. – 5:00p.m. Room: Houston A

Documented evidence strongly supports the intergenerational transmission of domestic violence. Children reared in homes experiencing violence and/or substance abuse by the adult caregivers in the home frequently experience violence as victims or abusers in their own interpersonal relationships. This workshop explored the dynamics of domestic violence and its impact on the

developing child. The information presented offered intervention options to the service providers in order that the cycle of domestic violence may be broken.

Ms. Langbein opened the workshop with a dynamic presentation that provided a basic information foundation regarding domestic violence, including two videos. Encouraging audience participation and questions, she also showed and discussed slides of drawings by children who had witnessed domestic violence in their homes. Ms. Langbein discussed the services of domestic violence shelters and the importance of service providers becoming familiar with the shelters and services in their communities.

Dr. Smith presented on the impact of domestic violence on children, providing background and the development and findings of research, which began in the 1970's. This segment of his presentation included the prevalence, associated risks and mediating factors. For example, estimates of exposure to DV have increased from 3.3 million children in 1984 to 10 million children in 1995. Dr. Smith discussed the effects on children, such as educational problems, behavior problems, physical development, aggression, substance abuse, cruelty to animals and other external problems. Internalized problems were listed and discussed, as well as the increased risk later in life of health problems and anti-social behavior. The presentation also covered the effect on in utero development, brain and immune system development and the importance of early intervention.

Dr. Lind's presentation included characteristics of children living in a violent home, including physical symptoms commonly seen on children versus those indicating abuse. She presented a video and led a discussion on the decrease in the emotional attachment and behavior regulation in children involved with a parent who is depressed or in a violent relationship. Dr. Lind showed children's drawings with analysis and discussion with the audience on what the drawings symbolize and what to do if a child in care does a similar drawing. Her presentation included mandatory reporting, how to talk with the child's mother, and specifics on play therapy and components of the day-to-day program that build children's self-esteem, and reduce self-blame for what occurs at home for the entire child care classroom.

Workshop participants were provided with a number of handouts, including a bound training manual which included copies of the presenters' power points, articles and fact sheets on domestic violence, domestic violence in ethnic and minority communities, generic articles on children and domestic violence, articles specific to the impact of domestic violence on children, using the classroom to help children with violence, how to intervene, web sites, fact sheets on domestic violence services funded by HHS/ACF and a list of all State and local domestic violence shelters and services in each of the eleven States in the West-Central Hub.

Charitable Choice: What's Civil Rights got to do with it?

Presenters: Shelley Jackson, J.D., Senior Civil Rights Analyst
USDHHS, Office of Civil Rights
Sergio Lugo, TANF Program Specialist
USDHHS/ACF, Region VIII

Times: Wednesday, January 9; 3:30p.m. - 5:00p.m.

Handout: Charitable Choice: Considering Civil Rights In a Strategy to Involve Community Based and Religious Organizations (51 pages)

A highly interactive session between presenters and the audience, the workshop used a power point presentation (replicated in the handout) to illustrate and discuss matters of a civil rights nature impacting Charitable Choice. The presentation focused on the following:

1. Goals and Objectives of Charitable Choice;
2. PRWORA's vision statement and aspects of key phrases in the statutory language;
3. Historical backdrop to service provision by religious and charitable organizations;
4. Illustrations of programs introduced under Charitable Choice options of States;
5. Major Section: Civil Rights & Civil Liberty matters, in the context of:
 - A. 1st Amendment Establishment Clause;
 - B. Defining "Faith Based";
 - C. Grantee selection;
 - D. Client Rights not compromised;
 - E. Non Discrimination requirements in hiring;
 - F. Non discrimination requirements generally;
 - G. State practices implementation
6. Appendices: Including extensive discussion of 501(c)(3)

The dialogue, comments and questions during the presentation tended to focus on: (1) opposition to the Charitable Choice options, (2) disentangling the infusion of religious beliefs into curricula and programs, (3) 501 (c)(3) matters, and (4) grantee selection processes within States.