U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for
CHILDREN & FAMILIES
Office of Family Assistance

Webinar Transcription

Maximizing Multiple Funding Streams to Improve Employment Outcomes

James Butler, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Family Assistance (OFA)

Hello, everyone, and welcome to our second in a series of Webinars on subsidized employment entitled, "Maximizing Multiple Funding Streams to Improve Employment Outcomes," sponsored by the Office of Family Assistance. For more than eight decades now, subsidized employment in various forms has been utilized to strengthen the employability and improve the employment outcomes for many different groups, including our Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) recipients. As we mentioned in our first Webinar, for those who were able to participate in it, subsidized employment programs continue to provide jobs to people who cannot find employment in the regular labor market, and use public funds to pay all or a portion of their wages. We also noted that back in 2009 and 2010, they could access funding from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the Emergency Fund, which was established under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), to create or expand subsidized employment programs. When the funds expired on September 30, 2010, States had placed more than a quarter of a million people in subsidized jobs, making it the largest subsidized employment initiative in the country since the 1970s. Our hope during today's Webinar is that we will provide you with some peer-based strategies for leveraging different federal, State, and local public funds, as well as some different private funds.

With the help of ICF International, we gathered practitioners from various locations and developed an agenda that we think uniquely aligns with the needs of TANF stakeholders seeking to gain a better understanding of ways to leverage public and private funding to increase subsidized employment opportunities. We are delighted to have MDRC join us again to present their research on recent subsidized employment efforts. We have collected some important resources related to subsidized employment. That information will be made available to everyone who registered. Once the Webinar is complete, it will be sent directly to each of you through our Welfare Peer Technical Assistance (TA) Network. Once again, resources have been gathered from our partners in the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, and from the Welfare Peer TA Network, and range from insightful studies on the experiences of locations during the Recovery Act period to how locations can generally utilize TANF funds to support subsidized employment. As Mary Beth already mentioned, at the end of the presentation you will have an opportunity to ask questions through the WebEx system. You can also submit questions to be answered following the last presentation and throughout the Webinar using the question and answer panel on your WebEx screen. We invite you to submit questions for our speakers through the WebEx technology. If your question is for a specific speaker or program, please be sure to specify that in your question. Following the presentation, or at the very end, we will ask you to respond to a short evaluation poll.

What I would like to do now is to tell you a little bit about today's speakers. Dan Bloom is the Director of the "Health and Barriers to Employment" Policy Area at MDRC. He currently directs two large-scale federal projects that are testing subsidized and transitional employment programs. Dan previously worked for America Works, which is a for-profit company that operates job placement programs for welfare recipients. Some of his previous projects include evaluating the Center for Employment Opportunities program for former prisoners, and three State welfare reform initiatives in the 1990s.

Then we will have Alice Frechette Johns, who is the Manager of the Welfare to Work Unit at the Connecticut Department of Labor. As manager of the Welfare to Work Unit, she oversees the administration of Connecticut's Jobs First Employment Services program. I might also add that she has worked in the Welfare to Work Unit since the Jobs First Employment Services program was implemented at the Connecticut Department of Labor in 1998. Prior to coming to the Department of Labor, Alice worked for Connecticut's Department of Social Services for 16 years.

Then we will have Maria Mojica, who is the Vice President for Programs at the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, the community foundation for the 29-town Greater Hartford region in Connecticut. Prior to that, she served as an executive at the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund in Hamden, where she managed Discovery, a multi-year, $15 million program serving young children and families in 49 towns. Maria has also served as the executive director for the Bridgeport Futures Initiative, and the director of planning and allocations for the United Way of Greater New Haven.

We will also have joining us today Meredith Threatt, who is the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 3 Program Coordinator for the City of Dayton, Ohio, as part of the Human Relations Council, known as HRC. The HRC investigates complaints brought under the City's anti-discrimination laws, and seeks opportunities for meaningful participation by woman-owned, minority-owned, and small businesses. Meredith was formerly the Director of the Southwest Central Ohio Procurement Technical Assistance Center, which guides small businesses interested in government contracting. She is also a Licensed Professional Counselor and works part-time at Samaritan Behavioral Health as a mental health counselor.

Damon Waters is a Technical Specialist in the Family Self-Sufficiency group at ICF International, which is a Virginia-based consulting group. Since 2007, he has worked on behalf of the Office of Family Assistance on a series of activities targeted to improve the economic and social well-being of low-income families and TANF participants. He provides ongoing technical assistance to community stakeholders on the creation and sustainability of subsidized employment programming and other supported work programs for TANF participants and low-income residents.

What I would like to do at this point is turn it over to Damon Waters, who will lead us into our speakers for the day.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thanks, James. Subsidized employment has been utilized to move unemployed, low-skilled, and low-income individuals into employment since the Works Progress Administration expended $11 billion during the Great Depression to employ 8.5 million Americans. And since that time, subsidized employment has been funded by a variety of private and public entities. Subsidized employment programs have always been an allowable expenditure under TANF, and the legacy of the ARRA TANF Emergency Contingency Fund shows that TANF can lead and be a part of effective and countercyclical employment initiatives meant to improve employment among low-income and working Americans. More than 200,000 people were employed using subsidies from the Emergency Contingency Fund, and even though States cannot draw down additional federal funding, they can, however, still use their available TANF funds to support subsidized jobs. OFA is continuing to work with a variety of partners to leverage available TANF funds with other private and public funding streams in order to subsidize the wages of welfare recipients and low-income and working adults.

Today, we are excited to have presenters from a variety of programs who will discuss alternative funding mechanisms that can be utilized to subsidize the wages of TANF participants and others. OFA continues to work with a variety of partners to highlight these initiatives and other potential private and public partnerships and funding streams. One partner OFA is looking to work closely with is the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to discuss ways of better utilizing the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Work Supplementation Program. Section 849, the Work Supplementation Program provision of the SNAP program, allows the value of SNAP benefits to be paid in cash as a wage subsidy to an employer who agrees to hire an employee recipient. States that wish to select this option should prepare a State plan amendment describing their proposed work supplementation or support program. This amendment must follow the parameters set forth in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) and specify how public assistance recipients in the proposed program shall, within a specified period of time, be moved from supplemented or supported employment to employment that is not supplemented or supported. The State plan amendment should be sent to the appropriate Food and Nutrition Service Regional Office. These submissions will be forwarded to the National Office for review.

The Work Supplementation Program has its restrictions as they relate to TANF recipients, and we encourage you to reach out directly either to Regional FNS administrators or ACF leadership to receive further information.

Private foundations offer other potential alternatives for subsidizing employment for low-income individuals, welfare recipients, and the long-time unemployed. Foundations like the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) Foundation, the Open Society Foundation (OSF), the C.S. Mott Foundation, the Skillman Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and other national, regional, and local foundations have provided complete, partial, and matched funds to support subsidized employment. In each of these instances, strong cases were made, clear plans developed, and targeted engagement initiated by a variety of stakeholders. The private/public partnerships maximized funding in a way that further incentivized employers to hire, while enabling the participants to gain valuable experience. OFA is thinking about new ways to aid stakeholders in developing new strategic partnerships and it hopes to hear from TANF programs and stakeholders about specific technical assistance needs and ideas for developing and implementing countercyclical approaches to increase the employment of welfare recipients and other unemployed individuals having challenges gaining employment on their own. With that, I turn things over to Dan Bloom of MDRC. Dan?

Dan Bloom, MDRC

Thanks, Damon. I am going to try to set the context for the later speakers by providing some background information about subsidized employment, defining some of the terms, talking a little bit about what we learned from research and evaluation in this area, highlighting, just for a second, some current evaluation work that is going on around the country, and then finishing with a couple of lessons to think about.

So what is subsidized employment? I think you have heard James and Damon both give a definition. I have a very similar one. Basically subsidized employment is a program that uses public funds to create or support jobs for people who cannot otherwise find work in the regular labor market. There are many, many different kinds of approaches that fall under this umbrella. Many terms have been used over the years, and I listed a few of them here. I am not going to go through and define each of these, in part because the terms themselves are often used inconsistently. I do not think each one has a specific meaning, but this will give you a flavor for some of the kinds of interventions that have fallen under the subsidized employment umbrella.

So here are some of the ways in which subsidized employment interventions or programs vary, and I think these are really important to get on the table at the beginning. I want to draw particular attention to the first set of bullets around goals. Some subsidized employment programs really have a goal of primarily trying to provide work-based income support, in other words try to put money in people's pockets during a time when jobs are scarce. And that has been true of the largest subsidized employment programs mentioned earlier from the Great Depression and, to a large extent, under the ARRA period as well. The primary goal was to provide income support to people through work. Now, a subset of subsidized employment programs has another goal in addition to that, and that goal is to try to use subsidized employment almost as a training tool to try to improve people's long-term labor market outcomes. So these are programs where work experience, itself, is designed to try to make someone more employable so that after they are finished with subsidized employment, they will do better in the regular labor market. Now, some programs have also had an explicit goal of building infrastructure or improving communities. The other areas on this slide targeting program structure and the amount of ancillary support, to a large extent those flow from the goals. So, in other words, many of the programs where the goal is to try to improve long-term labor market outcomes, those programs have targeted "hard to employ" groups; groups that would, frankly, have difficulty in the labor market even when the labor market is good, whereas a program that is a broad-based countercyclical program trying to get money into people's pockets might have a much broader focus on unemployed workers. I will not go through the rest of the slide in detail, but you would think that a program that targets a harder-to-employ group and wants to use subsidized employment essentially as a training tool also has a much richer range of supports that are associated with it.

So that is what this chart is trying to capture, and this does not capture every possible kind of subsidized employment program, but it is trying to give a sense of the spectrum of programs. On the left side, you are looking at kind of the least supportive version of subsidized employment where really what you are doing is subsidizing jobs in the regular labor market so that people who cannot find jobs in a recession or a depression can work. Then all the way over on the right you have transitional jobs programs that are really a much more supportive kind of a program that is designed to help the "hard to employ" population to try to improve its employability so that folks can do better in the labor market in the long term.

So here are three common structures, there are many more, but these are three common structures. So subsidized private sector employment – and these are terms I am using, people may use different ones – what we are seeing is a government entity usually reimbursing employers for all or part of the wages that they are paying to an individual who is participating in this program. In some cases, there is an explicit requirement that the employer also provide some kind of on-the-job training. In other cases, it is really just a subsidy to employ somebody who needs a job.

A scattered site transitional jobs program looks a little bit like that, but usually the job placements in these kinds of programs are with nonprofit or government agencies. There is really no expectation that those organizations will employ the person permanently, but what they are agreeing to do is take on a subsidized worker temporarily and to play a training function so that this individual can learn how to work, learn soft skills, and learn workplace behaviors. Often what happens is there is an intermediary organization that literally employs the people, but they work, as I said, in scattered sites around the community in nonprofit organizations or government agencies.

Then there is an in-house transitional job model, and this is familiar to many people. Goodwill Industries often looks like this. Individuals who are in the transitional job program literally work for the program itself and the program is often a social enterprise. It is often some kind of a business that has a social purpose so it is earning revenue in some way, and the individuals in the program are working and learning on the job while they work directly for that enterprise. In some cases, in these programs, the employees are arranged in work crews. In other cases, they might be a different structure, but that is generally the way that in-house model works.

Here are two contrasting examples from way different points on the spectrum, just to make this a little more concrete. We evaluated a program in New York City called the Center for Employment Opportunities, or CEO, which is a large-scale transitional jobs program for ex-offenders. Individuals come into this program, they work for CEO, they are arranged into crews, the crews work for city and State agencies around New

York City doing various kinds of maintenance and repair work. Their supervisors are actually CEO employees, so CEO will contract with a government agency to do work, for example, cleaning the floors in a courthouse. They will supply both crews and supervisors to do that work. And during the time when participants are not actually working, they may be at CEO's main offices getting access to a wide variety of supports: case management support, job development/placement, help finding permanent jobs, a fatherhood program because many of the ex-offenders in the program are fathers dealing with the child support system. So a wide range of supports.

Now, all the way at the other end of the spectrum is Pennsylvania's program that they ran under the Emergency Fund. This is a much larger program. And CEO, I should say, is a relatively large program, serving about 2,000 people a year. Pennsylvania's program under the Emergency Fund was a much larger statewide program that placed about 25,000 people into jobs, targeted much more broadly at low-income parents essentially, and it reimbursed employers 100 percent of wages, up to $13 an hour, but did not provide that whole rich set of supports and structure that I talked about with CEO. These are two programs at very opposite ends of that spectrum that I showed on an earlier slide.

So I will just talk for a minute about the experience under the Recovery Act. This was mentioned both by James and Damon before. Almost all States drew down some funding to run a subsidized employment program, more than a billion dollars. These programs, as those of you who are involved in them know, were ramped up very quickly. Most ended or were scaled back dramatically when the Emergency Fund expired at the end of 2010. As you heard, there were about a quarter of a million placements nationwide. About half of those were youth in summer jobs, and the other half were adults in regular year-round programs. Over half of the placements were in four States, but 14 States had at least 5,000 placements, so all 14 of those States ran relatively large scale programs, and then a number of others ran programs that had more than a thousand. So these are relatively large programs that ramped up very, very quickly.

In terms of what these programs look like, most of them, as I mentioned before, did not explicitly target the "hard to employ" or TANF recipients. Some of them did, but more likely they targeted low-income, unemployed parents in the same way that the Pennsylvania program I mentioned before did. So they were somewhat broadly targeted. Most of the subsidized job placements were in the private sector, and this was very different from earlier programs like the Works Projects Administration (WPA) or the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program in the 1970s, where most of the participants worked for the government. In this case, these were mostly programs that reimbursed private sector employers, often small businesses, who employed individuals who were eligible for these programs. And when you look from program to program, the emphasis on the transition to unsubsidized employment varied a lot from State to State. In many States, it was not a strong focus. The focus was on giving people work during a period of very high unemployment, and they were not thinking explicitly about where the people were going to go after that necessarily because, in some sense, the assumption was that once the labor market picked up, people would be able to go back to the kinds of jobs they had had before. Some States did design their subsidies in kind of an interesting way where the subsidy that was given to the private employer stepped down over time. It might have started with the first couple of months the employer got 100 percent subsidy, and then maybe the next couple of months it was a 50 percent subsidy, and then the next couple of months maybe a 25 percent subsidy. The purpose behind those was to try to kind of move people gradually onto the payroll of the host employer, but that was typically not a requirement. It was just something in the structure of the program to try to see if they could get that to happen at least sometimes.

I want to talk a little bit about research evidence – evidence from evaluations of subsidized employment programs. I just want to make the point before I start that it is really, really important to understand a program's goals before you evaluate it. So a program that does not focus on building long-term employability through subsidized employment should not be judged on that outcome. If the main goal of a program is to get people employed during a period of very high unemployment and make sure they have money in their pocket, that is the program's goal and that is how it should be evaluated. But what we have looked at, and we have done a number of evaluations of programs that were explicitly designed to use subsidized employment to try to improve longer term employment outcomes, is using subsidized employment more as a training vehicle. And there have been a number of random assignment studies of that kind of program since the 1970s, and by random assignment studies I mean studies where individuals were randomly assigned to one of two groups – a program group that had access to a subsidized employment program or a control group that did not. In many cases, the control group had access to some more basic employment services, but not to a subsidized job.

I am going to summarize this very, very quickly, and we can talk more in the question and answer if people have more questions. There was a major project in the 1970s and 1980s called the National Supported Work Demonstration, which tested a very highly structured work experience program for disadvantaged groups – long-term welfare recipients, ex-offenders, dropout youth, and what were then called ex-addicts. And what the study found is that there were very large employment gains early on in the program. So, in other words, during the period when the program group had access to the subsidized jobs, the supported work jobs, they were much, much more likely to be working than people in the control group. And that is a good thing because that meant that the programs really were targeting people who would not have been working otherwise. What we found, though, as we followed people longer, as the subsidized job ended, for three of the four target groups, there were not sustained increases. So if you looked two or three years later, the program group was no more likely to be working than the control group. The long-term welfare recipient population did have some sustained increases, so even three years later their earnings were still better than the control group, even though the subsidized jobs had ended, but that was not true for the other target populations.

Another model that was tested several times in the 1980s is an on-the-job training (OJT) model, and this was used often in what was then the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) system and, to some extent, used in the welfare system as well. This is a model where typically an employer will get a subsidy for hiring someone and the subsidy will usually pay for half of the individual's wages during a period of maybe three to six months, and there is often an explicit requirement that the employer will provide some kind of training. Those programs actually did have sustained gains and earnings, even after the subsidies ended, so the program group was still doing better than the control group, but they were mostly quite small and selective. They did not target very hard to employ people and they were not very large-scale programs.

Most recently what we have looked at are what are called transitional jobs programs, or TJ programs, and these are programs that look a little bit like the Supported Work model that I talked about before, but tend to be shorter. Individuals will work temporarily in a job, often with a nonprofit organization, sometimes with the program sponsor, and the idea is that through this work they will learn soft skills and employability skills, and then they will get help finding a permanent job, and they will also get a variety of support services. What we found is, again, very large short-term increases in employment for very hard-to-employ groups, and we tested programs for ex-offenders and for welfare recipients. So that means the programs were serving many people who would not otherwise have been working, and that is terrific, they got a lot of people employed who would not have been working otherwise. There is not, however, much evidence of post-program increases in employment or earnings. So when we followed people for two or three years, the subsidized jobs were over by that time and there was not much evidence that the program group was working more than the control group. There were, however – and this is very important – there were some positive impacts on some other very important outcomes. For example, one of the programs for ex-offenders, the CEO program that I mentioned before, did reduce recidivism, which is a very critical outcome in the criminal justice system and something that can save a lot of public dollars and justify the expenditures on a program.

Some of the recurring issues were: Who should these programs be targeting? And how exactly do people make the transition from subsidized to unsubsidized employment? There was some evidence and hints of evidence that the programs may have worked better for the more disadvantaged or higher risk people. In a bad economy that may sound counterintuitive. Why would a program work better for people who are less employable? And the reason is because when those people were randomly assigned and half of them ended up in a control group, the control groups ended up not doing very well because the participants were not very employable, and the programs made a bigger difference for those people. So a program actually can work better for people who are less employable, even if the employment outcomes do not look so great.

So why do we not see long-term employment gains from most of these programs? We do not know for sure but we have some hypotheses. One is that maybe the programs did not target the right people. Maybe they targeted people who already had the soft skills that they were trying to teach in the transitional jobs, so that the transitional jobs did not necessarily make those people more employable. That is one possibility. Maybe the transitional jobs experience did not make participants more employable because of something about the experience itself, the way people were supervised or the kind of work they were doing. So maybe the basic hypothesis that this subsidized employment would make people more employable did not turn out to be true because of the way the subsidized jobs actually looked in practice. Maybe the programs did not focus enough on the transition to unsubsidized employment. I think many of these programs work very, very hard to set up the subsidized jobs, make sure they are good jobs, make sure the people are doing good work, productive work, but then they do not focus as much on the transition, it becomes a little bit of an afterthought. And then the question becomes: Are people able to build on that subsidized experience to make a transition to unsubsidized employment? Then another possibility may be resistance to hiring certain groups, and I am thinking particularly of ex-offenders. Maybe resistance to hiring those groups is so strong in the employer community that the fact that someone had worked for a few months in a transitional job was just not enough to change an employer's decision. They were either willing to hire this population or they were not, and the transitional job may not have made a difference. So it could have been any of these things, it could have been all of them, and those are just some thoughts that we have from studying a number of these programs.

I just want to highlight two projects that we are working on right now that some of you may be familiar with. These are really two projects federally funded that are testing kind of the next generation of subsidized employment programs. One is a Department of Labor project called the Enhanced Transitional Jobs Demonstration, and the Labor Department gave grants to seven programs around the country that are serving either ex-offenders or noncustodial parents in the child support system, the two mostly male populations. And these seven programs are running different versions of, as the name suggests, Enhanced Transitional Jobs. They look different from those programs I just talked about on the last slide that we tested before, and they look different in a variety of ways, and they are trying to see whether there are different ways to use subsidized employment to produce longer term employment gains.

The Department of Health and Human Services also has a project called the Subsidized and Transitional Employment Demonstration, and we are fortunate enough to be running that one as well for them. That one is also testing up to seven programs that use subsidized employment for a range of populations. Many of the ones that we are probably going to have in that project target TANF recipients, but others target youth or other groups, and we are still selecting the programs for that evaluation. Both of these studies are using the random assignment research design that I talked about before, so we will get some really, really rigorous evidence in the coming years about the next generation of these programs, both in terms of their effects on long-term employment, but also in terms of their implementation and operational issues that the programs encounter and their costs and benefits. So look out for reports and communications about those two projects in the coming years.

I just want to close with a couple of general lessons from what we have learned so far. The first is just to be really clear about the program's goals. If you are starting a subsidized employment program, is the goal to just primarily create jobs for unemployed people in a period where there are not enough jobs? Is the goal to promote long-term employment by using subsidized work as a training tool? Or are you trying to do both? You need to be explicit about that up front and those goals should shape the targeting and the program design. The other thing is do not simply assume that giving somebody a job for three or four months is necessarily going to make people more employable just by itself. It really depends who it is you are serving and it depends what is actually going on in the work experience. Is there something happening there that is teaching somebody either a hard skill or a soft skill? But you need to be intentional about making sure that people are learning through the subsidized employment.

The other point is to make sure that scarce subsidized employment resources are targeted where they can make the most difference. These are fairly expensive programs when you start paying people's wages, the money starts flowing pretty quickly. You really, I think, do not want to target these programs to people who could find jobs without a subsidy. That is not necessarily a good use of the dollars. On the other side of the coin, if you are subsidizing employers you really want to be targeting employers who will use the subsidies to really increase the net number of jobs they have. So not necessarily just using the subsidy to hire one worker and then not hire somebody else in place, and then leading to no net increase in employment. I know that is sometimes hard to determine, but it is a really important thing. If this is all just displacing other people, it is not leading to an overall increase in employment.

And the last point is just to pay attention to "systems" issues, and I know a lot of folks on the call are from the TANF system and you probably know those issues well. We have been focused a lot on individuals who are in subsidized employment programs who are also involved in the child support system or the criminal justice system. Both of those systems have procedures and rules that can affect the way programs operate and can really affect their success, and it is really very important to understand all of those standard operating procedures in those systems and to work closely with individuals from those systems as you are designing a program so you can make sure that it works in synch and the participants are not being pulled in different directions by a program and by a system that, in some cases, they are required to be part of. So the criminal justice system and the child support system are not voluntary, and people have got to do certain things as part of those systems, and you want to make sure that your employment program, your subsidized work program, is in synch with those requirements. I will stop there.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thanks, Dan. Now we would like to turn it over to Alice Frechette Johns, who is the Program Manager for the Jobs First Employment Services in the Connecticut Department of Labor. Alice?

Alice Frechette Johns, Connecticut Department of Labor

Thank you, Damon. Dan Bloom's presentation is the perfect background for the discussion I am about to have about the Jobs First Employment Services in Connecticut, and how our program supports subsidized employment. Before I get into the details of subsidized employment, I need to describe the background of how Jobs First Employment Services is set up in Connecticut, how we deliver the services.

The Jobs First program is the umbrella name, and it is a Connecticut Department of Social Services (DSS) program. They are the designated TANF agency and they are responsible for the administration of the TANF cash assistance, child care assistance, and employment services.

In Connecticut, the State Legislature in 1998 made a law effective that the Connecticut Department of Labor (DOL) is also responsible for the Jobs First Employment Services. We are responsible for the provision of employment-related services to all non-exempt recipients of cash assistance, so it is about 8,000 a month, and 16,000 a year. The program includes: the employment assessments, employment plan development, case management, job search assistance, occupational skills training, coordinating with adult basic education, subsidized employment, employment support services including transportation support, coordinating with the Department of Social Services childcare program, and interagency case management/database system that was required by legislation.

The Department of Labor provides these employment services in partnership with the Department of Social Services and the regional Workforce Boards. This is important, it was part of the legislation, and the intent was to put the employment services for welfare recipients in the department that provides employment services to the general public, but also oversees the Workforce Investment system. The Workforce Boards are actually named in the legislation to be a partner in the delivery of these services. By contracting with the Workforce Board, DOL and its partners are able to leverage the Workforce Investment system resources for Jobs First participants. We are able to leverage Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funded services, other State funded programs that the Workforce Boards administer, and grant funded services that the Workforce Boards have applied for. These are different programs and services that we can leverage for Jobs First participants.

On this slide, there is kind of a diagram of how it all works. The Department of Social Services, DOL, and the Workforce Boards all partner in the delivery of these services. We meet at the central office level, the administrative level, to work out client flow issues and regularly make decisions about the program. Then locally, the local Workforce Boards meet with the local Department of Social Services staff and the DOL staff to coordinate services. The Workforce Boards contract out for assessment and case management, vocational skills, they arrange the subsidized employment, job search assistance, support services, and adult education with the local adult education providers. They do this for all their customers. So Jobs First is just one of their programs that they are contracted to provide. But they also are charged with assessing the local labor market needs, where the jobs are, what the employers need from their new employees, and to assess the skill level of the potential employees, the candidates walking in the door, to try to match the services to what the employers are looking for in employees.

So the Jobs First Employment Services are provided in the One-Stop Centers, along with the Workforce Investment Board's other programs in the Department of Labor Services. These services, the Jobs First program is administered with the same interagency case management system that is operated in our One-Stop, but the Department of Social Services accesses that system to do an initial assessment and make referrals. So within that system, the Department of Social Services has access to make referrals. And within the same system, the Workforce Investment Boards administer their WIA program and Wagner Peyser, so it is all coordinated.

So that is the background for the Jobs First Employment Services Subsidized Employment. To give you a background or an understanding of how we are able to leverage the services in the One-Stop, first we have some basic subsidized employment. To go back to Dan's presentation, the Jobs First program at the Department of Labor receives a State appropriation that DOL contracts with the Workforce Boards to provide not only all the employment services needs, but also to provide subsidized employment. In the past, we have had much higher levels of subsidized employment, but as State funds keep dwindling – and I am sure this is happening nationwide – the number of subsidized employment opportunities we have been able to provide to Jobs First participants continue to shrink. Now, with our Workforce Boards, the type of subsidized employment that we are providing would basically fit under Dan's transitional description because since we have so few slots, we tend to want to use those slots for our Jobs First participants who need work experience to help them get a job. So for our younger participants who have never worked, who need those soft skills, who need to get some practice going to work, we tend to use subsidized employment for those participants. The Workforce Boards will try to place them anywhere they can. There is public sector, private sector, nonprofits, wherever they can set up a subsidized employment experience for our Jobs First participants, they do. We usually fully pay the wages and there is no expectation to hire, so it is really meant to be a work experience for our Jobs First participants. Now, as that has been dwindling, we have been looking for other places to get work experience for our participants, and because we contact with the Workforce Boards, anything that comes their way we expect them to leverage that for our Jobs First participants.

Last year, in October 2011, the Connecticut General Assembly and the Governor supported and passed a bill. It was a Jobs bill during the State's Jobs Special Session to fund a program called a STEP UP Program. It is an economic development bill meant to spur economic growth, and the purpose was to promote job creation and opportunities for workers in Connecticut who had been long-term unemployed, who were not able to find a job in this economy, and to help small businesses who needed that little incentive to give someone a chance and to help with the expense of training a new employee.

So the STEP UP Program offers an incentive to hire a new employee and to create jobs in three different ways: It provides a subsidy, so straight out it could just subsidize employment, there is a maximum of 20 dollars an hour, and it is over six months, and the amount that is provided gradually goes down to the employer; there is a Small Manufacturer Training Grant, which a flat amount is given to an employer per month, and it is to help with the training of a new employee or to subsidize the wages; and the last one was just added last June and it is to encourage employers to hire Armed Forces members who are returning from the current conflicts in the Middle East. So any employer is eligible if they hire a Veteran. The other two are limited to certain employers.

With regard to the eligibility for the worker, they have to be unemployed at the time they are being hired. They also have to be a resident in a municipality or a town, with an unemployment rate that is equal to or higher than the State's unemployment rate when the bill was passed, and in September of 2011, it was 8.6 percent. They were hoping to help people who live in the inner-city or a town with a population of greater than 80,000 or more, and people with an adjusted family income equal to or less than 250 percent of the federal poverty level.

For businesses, they were targeting businesses or manufacturers that employ no more than 100 full-time workers. That limitation does not apply to members of the Armed Forces who come and apply. Any employer who hires a Veteran that is unemployed would be eligible. They do not have to be a smaller employer.

Since this program started, 844 unemployed job seekers have been provided with jobs, and 330 small business owners have received incentives to expand.

So, what we did here is the Workforce Boards were giving this funding for the next two years, for this year and next year, to administer this program and find subsidized employment for the unemployed. And they also, since they also administer the Jobs First program, they are expected to – and have been – screening

Jobs First participants for eligibility for the STEP UP Program. Currently, the expectation – they told us when we contracted with them – is that statewide there are about 35 slots, that is 35 Jobs First customers they think they could accommodate in the STEP UP Program. It could be more, but this is a different kind of subsidized employment. This subsidized employment is a hire, the employer actually hires this person and the wages are just subsidized, as opposed to the Jobs First subsidized employment program, which is really meant as a work experience and there is no expectation that the employer would hire them. So with this program, it is the Jobs First participants who have the work experience, who are ready to work and leave the Jobs First program that would participate in this one, so the numbers are lower.

One other way we leverage funding through our One-Stop is the Connecticut Youth Employment Program. It is a summer youth employment program mostly, targeted mostly at inner-city youth. And every year our State legislature has been appropriating money and the Department of Labor also contracts out with the Workforce Boards to provide that type of subsidized employment. It is geared for mostly project based employment for youth between 14 and 21, and many of our Jobs First participants are in that age range. As much as possible, the Workforce Board would try to accommodate a Jobs First participant who needs work experience with using this as a subsidized employment experience for them. It only lasts no more than six to eight weeks, so it is not the best but it is a way of leveraging another resource to give our Jobs First participants some employment experience. That is it. Damon?

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thanks, Alice. Now we are going to turn it over to Maria Mojica of the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving. Maria?

Maria Mojica, Hartford Foundation for Public Giving

Thank you very much, and thank you for the pronunciation of my last name, pretty good. This is going to be a little bit different than the previous presentations. I want to talk a little bit about the resourcing side in terms of the programs that have been described, as well as others. So I want to start by giving you a little bit of a background on a community foundation. Basically there are 700 community foundations in the United States, and we are number 15 in terms of rank against that number. We are 87 years old, and it has been 87 years of making sure that we are serving communities.

As you see up there on the slide, that is our mission. We are a community-wide charitable endowment, committed to improving the quality of life for residents throughout the region. It is a very broad mission. Under that, we are there to provide the support and also inform our donors, and also identify important community needs.

We have certain guiding principles that we have developed over the past 87 years, and we consider ourselves a broad-based grant maker, meaning we will fund programs from the arts to basic human needs. Again, as a responsive grant maker, it is what comes to us in terms of community need expressed in the form of a grant application. We are here to see that there are programs and activities that will have a long-term benefit on our community, that strengthen families and neighborhoods, and that strengthen the capacity of the nonprofit sector. We have an entire program, a nonprofit support program, which is dedicated to that – to building the capacity of the nonprofit sector through grant making as well as the provision of consultants and other technical assistants. We also want to see that our grants increase the diversity in our communities and continue to support outreach to all sectors of our community. We are looking, and this is what is important to this conversation, to foster the cooperative efforts between private and public sectors. We are looking at sustained and interrelated grant making and, again, that goes towards the first one, which is what the partnerships, not only the dollars blend, but the work blend. And the last one – we recently completed a strategic plan, and within that strategic plan there are two goal areas. One is employment and the second is education. We have one of the largest education gaps in the country as well as income, and so that plan has been a motivator to reach out even more intentionally to other partners.

The foundation itself, we made 1,600 plus grants in 2011. We have a total grant making budget of 28.7 million dollars, and we fund various types of community programs and activities. We have our regular responsive grants. We also support capital projects. We have initiatives that the Foundation has initiated and special projects. We provide transitional operating support, and this was really key after 2008, as we saw organizations lose federal, State, and other dollars. The transitional support program is designed to be a bridge from that loss to either a new funding source or the opportunity to responsibly close down a particular program. So again, it is the do-no-harm principle. I mentioned before the nonprofit support program. We also do summer programming to the tune of three-quarters of a million dollars. Then we also provide grants from our restricted funds, which are those that have been designated or which have active advisors, our donors directing those funds.

In terms of public private partnerships, what we have been able to do for many years now is to really build on that as much as we can. One of the realities is that philanthropy cannot support all that government does or other funders as well, and so we look to see where is there leverage. How can we, with our resources, attract other resources and really make sure that what we are doing is having a community impact? We have participated, and I am just using these as examples, most recently with the Workforce Investment Board, where we provide funding from one of our donors for retention specialists, and that person is there to make sure that, once a job is secured, that the person continues to be employed over time. That particular program will be with that client for a period of two years, and that is provided through the Jobs Funnel Program, which has been structured to be the conduit for construction workers, their training, and that pipeline then feeding the jobs here in our region, and sometimes statewide. There is a Regional Adult Literacy Partnership. Hartford has a very sad number here, 73 percent of adults in the City of Hartford cannot read at a basic level, and that includes the labels on prescriptions or an ATM. So the Regional Adult Literacy Partnership involves the State, city, other private funders, and ourselves coming together and developing the strategy to see how we can make a difference, have some impact on that number that I stated before, 73 percent. Then there is the Workforce Solution Board of Metro Hartford, and that particular program involves federal dollars, as well as local private dollars, the United Way, ourselves, and so on. But the one that I think demonstrates a partnership where it just works, we were able to really make the best of an opportunity…next slide, please.

Because of the quick action and collaboration in our State, we were able to bring in 30 million dollars in aid and 6,600 jobs to needy Connecticut families during the recession. And this is through the Federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Emergency Contingency Fund, which was part of the stimulus package in 2010. This kind of collaboration and relationship and leveraged funding ended up in about 95 programs being provided by 67 nonprofit organizations to eligible families. The funding was used for non-recurrent short-term benefits, subsidized employment, and basic assistance. In Connecticut, the philanthropic community raised 614,000 dollars, of which the Hartford Foundation was able to make a grant in the amount of 371,000 dollars, again looking to see how we could leverage resources for families in our communities.

Nancy Roberts, who is the President of the Connecticut Council for Philanthropy, and you see the quote up there: "Connecticut government, philanthropy, and nonprofit advocates went to work in a public/private partnership that produced an initiative that was unique among all the States." And so with the guidance of the Connecticut Council for Philanthropy, other foundations in the State were called upon to see what they could do. What do we fund in order to be able to leverage the dollars that would be available to Connecticut if we had that local match? So that was an incredible opportunity that does not happen that often. Our board was pleased and excited to be able to be this kind of a resource for communities.

The reason that TANF was so successful was that, again, the Foundation and others just could not pass up that opportunity. And we are talking about a leverage of 4:1, as most of you know, to help needy families. This was incredible and, again, an opportunity that we did not want to see go by us. There was a very tight deadline; but we did not let that be a barrier to our working to try to leverage those dollars locally. And, as you see, the deadline was there, but we all were able to put aside other tasks and really focus on that. There was this really deep commitment from three partners: the private funders, the public sector, the nonprofit sector, and businesses, and nonprofit communities, and municipalities. And, of course, there was the coordinating role of the Connecticut Council for Philanthropy and we had one statewide organization that was the fiscal agent for the entire project. So I have to say, to date, it was incredibly successful and I think everyone did their due diligence in getting this. It was not just putting it out there without the facts and without knowing who our grantees would be and what the outcomes to expect would be.

Some tips in terms of a foundation perspective on how to leverage and achieve shared goals, and that is to bring the opportunities to the foundation. See if they are consistent with the foundation's priorities and areas of interest. Do not wait for a request for proposal. It is always wonderful to keep your eye out for them when they do come out, but more importantly, as a community foundation we are here to be responsive. So as priorities and areas of interest develop, please bring them to the foundation for a conversation.

Secondly, do your homework; know all you can about a foundation. It is really important that there is an understanding of what is their priority, how do they want to work with community, and see how the opportunity matches up with that. There are some foundations that will say that they do not fund public agencies directly – others do often through a collaborative/partnership relationship. So, again, there are other opportunities and methods that could be brought to a funder to see how they can participate in an opportunity to leverage additional resources.

Foundations can be early investors, but we need to see a thoughtful planning process for sustainability. Again, often there are grants where there is some risk involved, as with TANF, that was a whole new world for us, but the outcome was well worth it. So, again, we can be early investors and supporters but, again, we are looking to see how can this be sustained over time?

Lastly, foundations will join partnerships where there is depth and breadth to the shared problems and solutions. The kinds of partners and the depth of the relationship among them is key. And what is everyone putting in to getting the work done? So that is another thing that we would be looking for. That is it. Thank you.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thank you, Maria. That was very insightful about developing partnerships with private foundations. Next, we would like to turn it over to Meredith Threatt, who is the Section 3 Coordinator for the Dayton, Ohio, Human Relations Council. Meredith?

Meredith Threatt, Ohio Human Relations Council

Thank you. It is actually Meredith Threatt, rhymes with feet, and I am the Section 3 Program Coordinator for the City of Dayton, and happy to be with you guys today.

Before I forget, I want to say out loud that I want to, at some point, refer back to Maria's "Tips" slide, because if you were to take that slide and replace the word 'foundation' with the word 'city,' all of those tips would be true for working with a city government. All of those things are true when looking to partner with us on similar activities. So I thought that was fantastic, and I will go back and talk about those things as well.

Section 3, if you are new to it, falls under Housing and Urban Development. It is part of the Act from 1968, and I highlighted in purple the parts that really matter to us. Really, Section 3 ensures employment and economic opportunities be directed to low and very low income persons. From a Section 3 Program Coordinator's standpoint, which is what I do, it is my job to make sure that the money that the City of Dayton gets from HUD goes to the people and the businesses to whom it is intended. And the reason that I am on this call today is to talk to you about the ways that we have taken that money and partnered with organizations so that we can get the most effect for our community out of those funds, while making sure that it gets directly and indirectly to low and very low income individuals.

So, Section 3 applies in – you may have heard of terms like the MBE or the WBE – those are set-aside programs where you want to do contracting with a minority owned business or a woman owned business. Section 3 is a regulation that is attached very specifically to money. So, if HUD money, even one penny of HUD money, goes into a city project and the project is greater than 100,000 dollars, or if the city grants 200,000 dollars or more of HUD funds, then the Section 3 regulation applies. Then with Public Housing Authorities (PHAs), regardless of size or the number of units, we are required to apply a Section 3 rule. The Section 3 rule says that 10 percent of the work that is being funded by the money has to go to a Section 3 eligible business, and we are going to talk just very briefly about what that is. I do not want to get into the details of how you become eligible for Section 3 as much as I would like to talk about how we have been able to leverage Section 3 dollars and partnerships, because the nitty-gritty of it is not so important to you.

Here are the different types of grants that are funded through HUD that are considered Section 3 eligible. I will not go through and read all of those, but the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership, Neighborhood Stabilization Program Grants (NSP), these are the ones that primarily hit us, and you may have seen those before. All of these are considered community building, community sustaining, community rehabilitating grant programs.

So with our program, Section 3, we utilize funds in two ways. We have a public bid process and we use subrecipient agreements. Our public bid process is used really when the city is going to spend money directly, we are going to do a project, we are going to build something, we are going to pave something, we are going to improve a facility, that sort of thing. Then we publicly bid that project and that is where the 100,000 dollar limit comes into play. Then with the subrecipient agreements, that is when we are going to grant money to usually nonprofit agencies, and we are going to try to do a larger project, and it is something the city would not do directly. With the publicly bid projects, my job is to certify Section 3 businesses and residents and monitor compliance. But what we are most interested in, for the purposes of this call, are those subrecipient agreements. I did, though, want to talk very briefly on our publicly bid process, that we are partnering with a Workforce Investment Act center, the One-Stop Center, which here is called the Montgomery County Job Center. And they are able to screen for us who is a Section 3 eligible resident, along with screening for job skills, and that helps us to find individuals who can be hired by the companies that we want to hire on city projects who are eligible for Section 3 programs. In that way, we are trying to complete the loop. We want individuals getting jobs, we want to be able to hire the businesses, and we want the businesses on the projects. So we are trying to get as many people tied into the loop as possible.

So let us talk a little bit about what the City of Dayton has done with subrecipient agreements. In the last two to three years, we have created subrecipient agreements, which are really grant agreements, with these agencies: St. Mary Development Corporation, East End Community Services, St. Vincent Hotel, Samaritan Homeless Clinic, YWCA of Dayton, Citywide Development Corporation, Homestart, Inc., Habitat for Humanity, and Tawawa Community Development. I wanted to show you those individual agencies to show you sort of the breadth of services that are covered.

Some of these agencies are specifically doing construction in the community. They are rehabilitating houses and physically rehabbing communities. St. Mary Development Corporation does historic restorations, so they are going into the historic areas of the community, buying up older historic homes, and rehabilitating those homes. So that means a very specific skill set, individuals who can handle historic restoration, not just the average any old hammer and nail kind of job.

East End Community Services works with a very specific community in town. Their primary mission is to help children from the cradle all the way into adulthood in their community. They want to make sure that children have everything that they need, from birth to adulthood – that they complete the cycle – so the next generation of individuals in their community is well educated, stronger, better prepared for better jobs, so that they improve their entire community. What we have done with them is to partner to help them take down some dilapidated houses in the community, some abandoned houses, some vacant properties, and to rebuild a senior center, things like that. So their primary mission is not construction rehabilitation, but we have been able to partner with them so we could help with their mission while they are helping with our mission. As we are able to rehab properties, it improves the whole of the City of Dayton and the Greater Dayton region.

St. Vincent Hotel is a homeless shelter, and the Samaritan Homeless Clinic is a medical clinic that is attached to the homeless shelter. The YWCA of Dayton provides shelter for the women and children, along with domestic violence shelters, and they help – I think in the last year housed 77 families in the area.

Citywide Development Corporation is helping to rehab properties, but they also are rebuilding facilities and then helping low-income families to finance those properties. So they will buy up properties, maybe it is foreclosed properties or abandoned properties, and then when the rehab is done, they make sure that the individuals who are able to either move in and lease – they can do a lease-to-own – but they are specifically helping low and very low income individuals get into those properties. And then Tawawa Community Development Corporation is doing the same thing.

So the individual missions are very different for each of the organizations, but overall, they are spread out throughout the Greater Dayton region and what they are doing is helping the entire Dayton region to improve visibly – as we drive around the community we see the number of properties that have been repaired – and we are directly getting services to those low and very low income individuals because each of these organizations assists those individuals directly through their services. And then they are also hiring through the Section 3 program low and very low income individuals as employees and then as contractors and subcontractors.

So what I wanted to do was break down under some of those projects specifically what are the things that were accomplished through those subrecipient agreements. So each of those – I put them all in one big pile. So out of those ten or 12 subrecipient agreements, we were able to deconstruct 183 abandoned houses, and build 29 residential homes that were made available for lease or ownership to low and very low income individuals in the region. We renovated eight houses, purchased and renovated one historic home, rehabbed 25 low income apartment units, managed 527 low income senior apartments. We began construction of a green roof on a senior apartment complex, which saves the residents 250 dollars a year in utility costs. We assisted 1,683 homeowners with foreclosure prevention services, provided 77 families with emergency and permanent supportive housing, trained 150 workers to get 300 professional construction trade certifications, and provided 11,693 medical and dental visits to 2,540 uninsured folks.

As I go around and I meet with the subrecipient agreements – when you are sitting in your office and you are looking through the paperwork and you are thinking, okay, where are we going to build these partnerships and we have money here and we are going to put money there – it does very little to help you understand the value of what this program is doing. But when you go out and you meet some of the seniors living in the low income senior apartments and you know that $250 a year is saved in utility costs, it is altering some of their lives. And you meet some of the 77 families who are in the supportive housing and you see that 480 feet of pipe that we were able to replace in their showers, it makes them feel like they are being treated like human beings again. It just completely alters the way that you look at something like a Section 3 program, where it felt before like you were just pushing papers around.

So let us talk about how you might go about finding local partners like the City of Dayton. First of all, you can simply go to your local municipality and find out if they are receiving HUD funds. But the Web site that I listed here shows you all of your local HUD offices. One of our primary partners was formerly called the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority; it is now called Greater Dayton Premier Management. But the Metropolitan Housing Authority in your area most likely is receiving the majority, if not all, of their funding from HUD, which means they have Section 3 requirements. So if you start there, start with your local HUD office and also talk with your city government, these are great partners for you to work with because we have the same mission that you do, which is to do more with the resources that we have.

I love the way that Maria put it – we want to leverage other resources, we want to be able to do as much in our community as we possibly can with what we have. As the City of Dayton, we can only provide so many services, but through these subrecipient agreements, we are now able to provide shelter to the homeless, provide dental services, provide housing for folks who have been victims of domestic violence, things that the city could never do directly. But like she said in her tip sheet, if you understand your local government before you approach us and talk about your great new plan for working with us, understand where our focus is, where our passion is, what kind of problems we are trying to solve, and understand our process before you have that conversation, and make sure that you have your ducks in a row and you understand the sustainability of your project before you come.

And, back to what Dan was saying at the very beginning of our conversation, if what you want to do is bring forward an idea of solving a temporary problem, great, we want to solve temporary problems too. You do not have to have an idea that is going to solve a problem every year from now until forever, but do not try to sell a permanent solution to a temporary problem. If what you want to do is solve a problem that can be fixed in six months and then it will go away, then let's talk about that. So understanding the timeframe of the problem, the sustainability of the solution and the problem is fantastic. Anything that includes on-the-job training, we try to include that in the programs that we have. And we have the one program with East End Community Services where not only were we hiring those individuals to do construction, but we were able to get them over 300 certifications in professional construction skills. So now some of those folks are permanently employed with those construction employers. Some of them have gone on to start their own businesses. And as a city government, that is really a finding for us because not only have we created sustainable, trained employees, but now we have even more taxpayers and that is really exciting to us. All right. If anybody has any questions, I will be happy to answer those. Thank you.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thank you to all of our presenters. Now, we do have a couple of minutes left, since we started about five minutes after the hour, to ask a couple of questions. The first question is going to be really directed to Maria and Meredith, and any of the other speakers on here that may want to answer it also. Entities seeking funding should get to know the foundation and also their Section 3 partners. What is the best way for them to do that research and how can members of the audience convince local recipient agencies that using Section 3 funds and foundational funding for community employment is worth the effort? What is that pitch that people should make to you?

Maria Mojica, Hartford Foundation for Public Giving

This is Maria. Again, to find out about your local foundations, the simple answer would be a Google search. The other is the Foundation Center in New York City and their Web site, which can give you a lot of information. Often at a State level there are organizations, such as our own Connecticut Council on Philanthropy, that will give you a listing of the organizations, the foundations that are out there. In terms of what is the pitch to go after foundation funds, for the most part I would say they are incredibly flexible dollars, depending on, again, what you find out about the foundation. But we have fewer restrictions and have more options available for the deployment of those dollars. Often it may be just one piece of programming that is missing that no one else would cover with government dollars that a foundation would. And so it is that flexibility and also, for a community foundation, the focus on that particular community that is important. In our case, for instance, workforce development is one of our strategy areas, so therefore we are open to listening to what is out there and what we can join in and help others.

Meredith Threatt, Ohio Human Relations Council

I would say with city government and municipalities, keep in mind your government belongs to you. Please do so in a respectful way. Do not lead with, "My taxpayers are paying your salary." Usually there are public meetings that you can attend. If your city or municipality is run by a commission, start showing up at those meetings, start attending those town hall meetings, because they are there publicly talking about what concerns them, so they will openly be talking about what problems they are trying to solve. They are talking about the communities that are an issue or where the buildings need to be taken down or whatever the problems are that need to be solved. Those minutes are typically published either on the city's Web site or even in the newspaper, and so the information is publicly available. Usually within a city government there is someone whose job it is to liaise with the community, and in the City of Dayton it is the Human Relations Council, that is the group that I work with. It is our job to provide fair access to city government for the public. So if you can find that person within the organization whose job it is to champion small businesses, in particular, usually they are very passionate about helping people to participate in the government.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Alice or Dan?

Dan Bloom, MDRC

I do not think I have anything to add.

Alice Frechette Johns, Connecticut Department of Labor

Me either.

Damon Waters, ICF International

And at least for Alice, I know that there will probably be questions for you representing a government agency about how you went about actually engaging new partners like the foundations and other government agencies to work together to fund activities. What was the pitch or the activities that you engaged in to actually make that happen?

Alice Frechette Johns, Connecticut Department of Labor

Well, in partnering with other agencies at the Department of Labor, we worked with the Workforce Boards and they actually have mandated partners under WIA, so in leveraging the Department of Education services, they are a partner at the table – the Workforce Boards partner with employers and look for grant opportunities for their local areas. So we take advantage of that system. Back to the ARRA money, the TANF ECF money, the Department of Social Services coordinated with the Hartford Foundation. Right, Maria?

Maria Mojica, Hartford Foundation for Public Giving

That is right.

Alice Frechette Johns, Connecticut Department of Labor

Right, and did really heavy-duty coordination and collaborated with many agencies on that. We were part of it, but the bulk of that outreach came from the Department of Social Services.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thank you. Just one last question before I turn it back over to Mr. Butler to close us out. It is for Dan or any of the other presenters on the line. You mentioned two subsidized and transitional jobs initiatives, the one that is funded out of ETA and the other that is funded out of HHS. How can sites find out more about those pilot sites that were funded under those projects?

Dan Bloom, MDRC

Okay, so DOL gave grants to seven programs last year, seven Enhanced Transitional Jobs programs, and I am pretty sure there are descriptions of those programs on ETA's Web site. But I can find out more if somebody is interested and can contact me directly. HHS, we are still selecting sites for that project and HHS is not a grant program, it is an evaluation of programs that primarily have funding from other sources, and we are still selecting those.

Damon Waters, ICF International

And just really quickly, Dan, one just came in. Is there any research that you have on combining short-term education, such as CNA training and subsidized employment and retention?

Dan Bloom, MDRC

That is a great question. It is something we wanted to be able to do with these projects, and I think we are not seeing that many opportunities to do it, at least on a large scale. There was a research project a number of years ago, which is worth looking up, called the "Homemaker/Home Health Aide Evaluation." It was done by Abt Associates, and it is worth looking at that because it was a mix of a training program with a subsidized employment component in the home health aide field.

Damon Waters, ICF International

Thanks, Dan, and that study that you just referenced is actually on the Welfare Peer TA Network, and when the transcription and the rest of the Q&A are sent out, I will send information about that study, and also about the two other studies that were referenced from the Department of Labor and HHS. So with that, I want to thank our four speakers and turn it over to James Butler.

James Butler, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance

Thank you, Damon. We had a little over 300 people registered for today's call so I want to, first, thank all of you who joined us for today's Webinar. We hope that something you heard today was beneficial to you, and we will encourage you to begin thinking about next steps in your communities or programs. Again, we encourage each of you to visit the Welfare Peer TA Web site to access additional resources. For our TANF colleagues, we encourage you to request any technical assistance through the Welfare Peer TA site or contact any of the team members directly to discuss any next steps. I would also like to especially thank our presenters for today, Dan, Alice, Maria, and Meredith, for your wealth of information that you shared today. I may have mentioned it earlier but I want to say it once again – a transcript and audio recording will be made available to everyone within the coming weeks, and it will be made available through the Welfare Peer TA Web site. As we close out, please be sure to fill out the evaluation poll that will pop up automatically as you exit the Webinar. And behalf of the Office of Family Assistance, I am James Butler, once again, and I thank you so much for joining us. Have a pleasant day.