Administration for Children and Families
Office of Family Assistance
Peer Technical Assistance Network

Summary of Structured Calls on TANF Service Delivery Restructuring

Connecticut Peer TA Request #230

2014

This technical assistance activity was funded by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance and managed by prime contractor BLH Technologies, Inc. and subcontractor ICF International Inc. for Contract No. HHSP23320110006YC, "Welfare Peer Technical Assistance."

Table of Contents

Summary Narrative

The Peer Technical Assistance (TA) Network recently responded to a technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services in June and July 2014. Connecticut's technical assistance request focused on understanding how other states have restructured or redesigned their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) service delivery, intake process flows, participant engagement, and service coordination. **Eight** states identified as having recently restructured various components of their TANF programs were engaged in semi-structured conversations by Peer TA Network staff around their processes, procedures, lessons learned, and other information, including assessment, engagement of participants, case management, and service coordination. The eight states interviewed include: **California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, North Carolina, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin.**

The summaries of all eight state interviews are attached as appendices. A high-level summary of findings and information shared by these eight states has been organized by the following categories:

- Focus of State Restructuring
- Systems Collaboration and Information Technology Solutions
- Change to Intake Flow
- Case Management Changes
- Work Activities and Supports
- Early Outcomes

Focus of State Restructuring

The eight states interviewed for this technical assistance request varied in the focus of the restructuring, reorganization, and redesign of their TANF programs; this was often reflected in the terminology they used. Some states implemented changes in all aspects of their programs, while others focused on certain components. Examples include:

- The **District of Columbia** exemplifies an *entire overhaul or redesign* of their TANF program. They have changed every aspect, from eligibility to referrals to tracking contractors.
- **Washington** defined their program as a *redesign*, but split the redesign into two parts: business process reengineering (BPR) and employment services (TANF WorkFirst redesign). Washington first focused on its TANF program and case management activities, and then focused on intake maintenance verification (which they call BPR). Their 52 community service offices (CSOs) across the state redefined business processes to provide a variety of technology options for participant engagement with case managers (face-to-face, self–service work online, and a live navigator triage telephone system).

- **Hawaii** and **South Carolina** define their changes as *BPR or business process re-engineering*. Modeled after activities related to each state's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) BPR activities, the changes sought to immediately synchronize intake and eligibility activities, while streamlining application and determination activities. In Hawaii, the changes in processing occurred around their eligibility system, where they went from a case management model to a task-based model, breaking a client's case into different tasks and assigning a group of workers to the tasks. The changes in South Carolina centered on streamlining activities, and the state reorganized its program staff workflow into five regional offices responsible for various components of the program.
- **California** and **Colorado** restructured to make their programs more *employment-focused*. California concentrated their changes on the welfare-to-work side, instead of eligibility, as they had done previously. Colorado wanted to look at the most meaningful outcomes for participants and their families by maximizing the use of work activities.
- **North Carolina** and **Wisconsin** also reorganized their programs around *employment-related activities* and their service delivery structures. While Wisconsin reorganized service delivery for welfare-to-work participants with changes concentrated on where individuals go to receive service, North Carolina implemented its Pay for Performance and North Carolina Families Accessing Services through Technology (NC-FAST) systems to focus on subsidized employment programs.

Reasons for Restructuring Policy Changes

- Changes in Time Limits. Time limit changes were sometimes triggered by economic or budgetary needs. For example, in **California**, a move towards offering subsidized employment, training, and barrier removal services during the economic recession led them to create a two-year flexible Welfare-to-Work (WTW) time clock where for the first two years, a family on assistance with an able-bodied adult (non-exempt case) could meet the participation mandate of CalWorks with activities that might not meet the federal requirements (after two years, participants need to meet the federal requirements).
- Legal Need. Because of a preliminary federal injunction, **Hawaii** needed to address its untimeliness in SNAP application processing, and realized it needed to do business differently. This, combined with a reduction in the state workforce during the economic downturn, generated a need for Hawaii to process applications more efficiently. They decided to break down the application process and case maintenance into different tasks shared across multiple workers. Workers now only focus on one objective and process one task, instead of processing multiple tasks.

Systems Collaboration and Information Technology Solutions

- Technological and Organizational Changes. Most states streamlined their systems and used technology to support their new processes. Customized systems such as the NC-

FAST case management system and Hawaii's new BPR case management model are helping these states support and manage changes. Some of these systems like NC-FAST are not only making TANF processes more efficient, but are also being utilized with other programs including SNAP. Other states made organizational changes to their staff to help redefine roles. Washington reorganized program workers into financial eligibility workers, and assigned them to that task. Case management activities and service coordination were assigned exclusively to case management workers, which reduced duplication and streamlined processes.

- Performance-based Contracting. In a state like **Wisconsin**, where the entire TANF program is contracted out to private for-profit and nonprofit entities, changes included implementing short-term performance-based contracts to ensure an effective delivery structure. Previously, **Wisconsin** had moved from each service area having two vendors to a model requiring three vendors. They are now back to one contractor (with subcontractors) providing all aspects of the program in a service area using a performance-based contract. **Washington** also has moved to a performance-based contracting model.
- Collaboration with Other Agencies. Change also requires collaboration with other agencies that serve the TANF population. **Colorado** uses a general business model to improve coordination among different programs, including food assistance, Medicaid, and Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Other states such as the **District of Columbia, Hawaii, North Carolina,** and **South Carolina** also work closely with their SNAP partners. **Washington** also collaborates with the state colleges, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Early Learning.

Changes to Intake Flow

- Intake and Orientation. To collect the appropriate data in response to program changes, states needed to change their intake and orientation processes. Some states such as **California** and **Colorado** changed the content and focus of their intake forms to reflect new program rules and make them more participant-focused. Others added supports such as videos and brochures **(District of Columbia)**, motivational interviewing evaluation tools **(Washington)**, and interviewing scripts and verification matrices **(Hawaii)**. **Wisconsin** changed the structure of the intake/orientation process by moving from group orientation to one-on-one meetings. Other approaches to intake/orientation include a comprehensive four-part evaluation in **Washington** that makes activities more family-based.
- Assessment Tools. Changes in the assessment tools are meant to make the intake process less burdensome to both program staff and participants. Most states use a customized or updated version of the Online Work Readiness Assessment (OWRA) Tool, in combination with other tools. For example**, California** counties are currently being trained on the use of the Online Cal Works Appraisal Tool (OCAT) (their version of

OWRA), which delves deeply into people's lives and helps with appraisals. Both **Colorado** and **Hawaii** are encouraging the use of the OWRA while they look into developing a customized tool for their states, and **Wisconsin** is developing career and vocational assessments and has a web-based barrier screening tool. All case managers in **Washington** use a web-based motivational interviewing evaluation tool that facilitates the understanding of issues, questions, and each family's strengths, skill sets, and goals.

Case Management Changes

- Case Plans. Due to changes in their programs around work activities and a refocus on the family, many states are also modifying their case management approaches. **Colorado** has redesigned its Individual Responsibility Plan (IRP) as the Family Plan, and in **North Carolina,** the IRP is referred to as the Mutual Responsibility Agreement. Other changes involve a restructuring that will help reduce caseload/staff ratios and efficiently assign tasks to caseworkers.
- Case Management Approach. For example, with additional funding, counties in **California** are looking to achieve smaller case carrying ratios per social worker, especially for family stabilization cases. For others, such as **North Carolina (NC-FAST**), their case management approach is greatly enhanced by technology in the form of a single system that manages work activities and individual plans, electronic payments, and other programs such as SNAP. In **Washington,** the use of a predictive modeling tool helps case managers determine other supports such as medical needs.
- Eligibility. Other states are changing the rules around work activities. For example, in **North Carolina**, participants can receive benefits once work activities have been completed with their new Mutual Responsibility Agreement (MRA). **South Carolina** is now requiring participants to complete 30 hours in their job readiness program, Jobs Up Front Mean More Pay (JUMMP), prior to case approval.

Work Activities and Supports

- Work Activities. As part of their refocus on employment outcomes, many states have modified their work activities and requirements surrounding this component. **California and Washington, D.C.** are looking at the core activities that make up work activities, while others such as **Colorado** are maximizing the use of work activities. As discussed earlier, **California** allows greater flexibility in what counts as work for the first two years.
- Post-TANF Supports. In response to limited funding due to the recession and other state specific factors, post-TANF supports were also affected by program changes. For instance, in **California**, post-TANF supports are reserved for only those participants in the subsidized employment program. In **Washington**, most post-TANF supports were eliminated, and now the state focuses on how to help improve employment outcomes and

self-sufficiency. Through its unified case planning structure, the **District of Columbia** still offers post-TANF supports including child care, Medicaid, and grants.

Early Outcomes

- Generally from all eight states, there was a consensus that their restructuring may not have immediate outcomes or "benefits" due to the complexities and indirect effects that changes may generate. They also shared that it was still early in their change processes. States shared generally that successful implementation may include: observing change processes in other states first before implementing changes in your home state, pilot testing changes first in a few locations within the state, avoiding over-reliance on technology, and seeking participant and staff buy-in on changes and new processes you would like to implement.
- Nonetheless, as a result of the redesign and restructuring of their TANF programs, some states have realized efficiencies in their business processes. An example of the positive effects in **Hawaii's** Maui office was their increase in SNAP application processing timeliness from 29% to 95% within three months of implementing their BPR. Aside from tracking outputs such as caseloads, other states, namely **California**, are in the process of conducting evaluations and longitudinal studies to assess the success rate of the changes they have implemented.
- **Washington** shared that with their BPR changes, they could handle an almost doubling of their SNAP caseload with 500 fewer fulltime employees and still stay within timeline requirements.
- **The District of Columbia** has 6-7 outcome measures and has seen an increase in work participation rates and job retention. Before they made redesign changes, the average length of time participants retained their jobs was 60 days, and now, around 50% of participants retain their jobs for six months or longer.
- **South Carolina** shared that with their BPR changes, they have noted the establishment of even caseloads across the state, whereas before some offices were overburdened.

Appendices

Appendix A: California Call Summary
Monday, June 16, 2014, 4:00 p.m. eastern time

Participants

Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

- *Julie Fong*, Regional TANF Program Manager, Region IX

California Department of Social Services (DSS)

- *Todd Bland*, Deputy Director for Welfare to Work (WTW)
- *Karen Dickerson*, Branch Chief for Employment and Eligibility

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Renee Rainey*, Senior Manager, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut wants to redesign their TANF program and would like to hear from nine other states which have recently redesigned various components of their TANF programs, including assessment, engagement of participants, case management, and service coordination. Connecticut is interested in learning about processes and procedures that other states have developed. TANF redesign varies from state to state; the collected information from the states will be stored in one place as a matrix. We hope to provide the information to Connecticut, as well as other states and regions.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Todd Bland and Karen Dickerson a series of questions regarding California's service delivery and business process restructuring. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Mr. Bland's and Ms. Dickerson's responses:

1. What does TANF redesign in California mean?

   Although changes might have been called "redesign" early in the process, California does not use this term often; instead, they use the phrase "focus on early engagement." When California initiated a redesign in the past, it was a change in eligibility rules that could have potentially changed the entire program. Changes to the program recently have been on the welfare to work side, as opposed to the eligibility area. They are currently making some changes to the employment services side of the program.

2. How did the early engagement changes start? Did they start with legislation?

   The changes started in 2011 when Will Lightbourne became the director of the Department of Social Services (DSS) and wanted to focus on participants' first two years in the program, because participants might need more time than that to get on the path toward self-sufficiency. 2011 was the last year of California's budget crisis. Mr. Lightbourne felt that it was better to offer whatever services DSS could provide, such as subsidized employment, training, and barrier removal, earlier in the process. A two-year flexible Welfare to Work (WTW) time clock was created. The fundamental change was that for the first two years, a family on aid with an able-bodied adult (non-exempt case) could meet the participation mandate of CalWorks without meeting the federal requirements – after two years, participants needed to meet the federal requirements. The consequence of not complying would be removing the adult from aid, which is the same as the four-year time limit. Another change is that while participants still have an hourly work requirement, it is now 20, 30, and 35 hours of work per week, where previously it was 32 hours for a single parent, regardless of the age of the children. Also, California removed the core activity within that requirement. California has a chart posted on their Web site that shows the before and after related to these changes. This was the first set of enacted changes, after which they implemented three more changes, which created 8,000 subsidized employment slots, a new program called Family Stabilization, and a better statewide assessment tool to determine the participants' needs. These three changes were created or enacted in the summer of 2013, and while improvements are still underway, they are available to the counties; the assessment is the slowest of the three changes to be implemented.

3. Has there been any privatization of services, or is this not applicable?

   There has been no privatization at the state or county level. Many counties contract out their employment services and some counties have taken up the performance-based contracting for services while others have not, but they were already doing that before the changes were made. Family stabilization is a six-month opportunity for families in crisis, where the focus is on barrier removal. Counties are anticipating expansion of barrier removal services and must find additional providers for services addressing substance abuse, mental health, developmental disabilities, and housing. Families are not exempt, but the goal is to alleviate crises; if they receive help with a crisis, they are in a better position to start WTW effectively.

4. Is the case management approach the same as before, or have you made any changes?

   Counties received additional funding, and most are thinking about smaller case carrying ratios for the workers handling family stabilization cases. Many counties have social workers instead of case workers. They wanted to increase contact between the case manager and the participant so that the caseload declines.

5. Have there been changes statewide regarding early engagement in terms of intake and orientation?

   There have been no changes regarding intake. The orientation is delivered the same way as before, but the content has been changed, due to new program rules. There was a slight change in the statute; originally, it was thought that too many participants were being sent by the counties to fail the market test, but there was some ability to change the flow. The Welfare to Work activity flow changed a little, but this was not a big programmatic change. First, orientation and appraisal occur; DSS then encourages the counties to pursue whatever path is appropriate for the individual, versus automatically engaging in a job search immediately.

6. Have there been any changes regarding referrals?

   No. Referrals are a result of the appraisals. Some counties hired a family stabilization worker, who might assess more thoroughly to determine whether the individual needs barrier removal or additional services to address issues such as substance abuse and mental health. Referring out to vendors still exists in the same manner.

7. Have there been any changes regarding wraparound supports such as child care and transportation with this new focus on two years and early engagement?

   No. Those services were and are now available. California provides child care and transportation support for participants to engage in all required activities.

8. Has the verification process changed?

   No.

9. Have there been any changes in providing post-TANF support?

   No. In the expanded subsidized employment, if the person incomes out during the subsidized employment placement, DSS honors the duration of the placement of the slot.

10. Regarding work activity, do participants still have to work the same number of hours, even if they do not have to do the core?

    Yes--it is still the same number of hours and the activity list is the same, but the core requirement is removed.

11. What measures of success have you seen based on the changes on early engagement?

    It is too early in the process to know. To clarify, there is early engagement, and there is re-engagement. During the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) period, California continued its grants structure, which was funded under ARRA, but they reduced the resources for the WTW side in the block grants to counties, which was $275 million. To manage that, they created additional exemptions for families with multiple children under age 6, or very young children under age 2. At the same time that there was early engagement, there was also re-engagement of around 60,000 cases that came into the program without a participation mandate. There is a slight increase in the sanction rate, because they went from people having no participation mandate to having one. California is ending its contract with the Rand Corporation to evaluate re-engagement by taking a three-year longitudinal look at the impact of the new 24-month clock requirement, studying participants with the new requirement compared to those in the former CalWorks flow. Success is determined when more participants can access programs they need quickly. California is not yet measuring this, but hopes to do so in the future. They strive to improve its work participation rate.

12. Renee Rainey asked, “What are the key factors in launching the changes? What has helped you move on things? Have you had a change advocate?”

    Ms. Dickerson responded, “Economic recovery.”

13. Julie Fong asked, “Is there a parallel process of training or support to the counties that would help them to operationalize these ideas and build their capacity around developing case management skills and gathering information to measure effectiveness?”

Staff have conducted individual county visits and shared best practices. Some counties have created PowerPoints and developed and shared training aids. When the Online CalWorks Appraisal Tool (OCAT) is launched, there will be intense training on how to use the tool, as well as motivational interviewing so caseworkers become familiar with the tool which delves deeply into people's lives. By being prepared, it is hoped that staff will make participants as comfortable as possible. Counties are knowledgeable and have formal training units; they have groups train workers on how to administer from paper forms or an automated system. The process has been in development for several years and has involved many workgroup meetings and calls with their legislative staff, county, and advocate partners to discuss the details so that all parties understand how to administer the change.

14. Is there any other parallel workflow?

    Business processes within counties will change; a lot of counties will change their workflow now as automation occurs, and they will become more task-managed. It is not anticipated that changes will be significant, and they will be specific to each county.

15. Would both of you be willing to participate in a webinar or roundtable on this topic? Regions I-III want to focus a roundtable on the TANF redesign.

    Mr. Bland said they would be willing to participate, given enough notice. California anticipates being busy with a new housing program, which would help with family stabilization. They also have a potential grant increase, which coincides with the end of their budget process.

The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have restructured their service delivery approaches for their TANF programs and create a matrix for Connecticut within the next two weeks; this will be a resource that can be shared with the states and regions.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
  - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
  - Contact California again if future needs for information arise.
  - Create a matrix of states' approaches to restructuring their service delivery approaches for Connecticut and to share with other states and regions.

Appendix B: CalWORKs WTW Activities and Hourly Requirements

	Prior Law	Adults' 48 Months On Aid For 24 Months	Adults' 48 Months On Aid After 24 Months
Hourly Participation Requirements *(total hours per week/core hours required)* • Single parent with child under 6	32/20 core	20/0 core	20/20 core
• Single-parent families with children ages 6 and over	32/20 core	30/0 core	30/20 core
• Two-parent families	35/20 core	35/0 core	35/30 core
WTW Activities **Core Activities**	• Employment activities[1] • Work experience • Community service • On-the-job training (OJT)	• Employment activities • Vocational education (12 month lifetime limit) • Job search • Job readiness activities • Work experience • Community service • Job skills training • Adult basic education • Secondary school • Barrier removal activities	• Employment activities • Work experience • Community service • OJT

	Prior Law	Adults' 48 Months On Aid For 24 Months	Adults' 48 Months On Aid After 24 Months
Non-Core Activities	*"Blendable" Activities*[2] • Job skills training • Adult basic education • Satisfactory attendance in a Secondary school • Barrier removal activities[3]	• Employment activities • Vocational education (12 month lifetime limit) • Job search • Job readiness activities • Work experience • Community service • Job skills training • Adult basic education • Secondary school • Barrier removal activities	• Job skills training • Adult basic education • Satisfactory attendance in a secondary school
Time-Limited Core Activities[4]	• Vocational education (12 month lifetime limit)	NA	• Barrier removal activities • Job search • Job readiness assistance • Vocational education (12 month lifetime limit)
Employment Services • Child care • Supportive services	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓

[1] Employment activities include unsubsidized and subsidized employment, work study, supported work and transitional employment, and grant-based OJT.
[2] These non-core activities were "blendable" activities that could be counted toward the core hourly requirement.
[3] Barrier removal activities include mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence services.
[4] Job search, job readiness, barriers removal activities are limited to four consecutive weeks, not to exceed six weeks in a 12-month period.

Table Description

CalWORKs adults are required to participate in WTW activities as a condition of aid, unless exempt, until the maximum 48 months for CalWORKs assistance is reached. Once the 48-month time limit is reached for the adult, aid continues for eligible the child(ren) until the age of 18.

Prior Law- CalWORKs participation requirements before January 1, 2013:

Under previous law, there were weekly minimum participation requirements of 20 core and 32 total hours per week for single parents, and 20 core and 35 total hours per week for parents in two-parent families. Some non-core activities, such as job skills training, education directly related to employment, and barrier removal activities, could be 'blended' with core activities and counted toward the core requirement. Clients could participate in vocational education as a core activity for a lifetime maximum of 12 months.

Senate Bill 1041- CalWORKs participation requirements starting January 1, 2013:

During adults' 48 Months on Aid

For 24 Months- CalWORKs recipients are able to participate in any of the full array of CalWORKs WTW activities they need, consistent with an assessment, to become self-sufficient with no core hourly requirement. The 24 months are cumulative and may be used at any time during adults' maximum 48 months of CalWORKs assistance.

During the 24 months, clients must meet new CalWORKs minimum weekly hourly participation requirements. The new law reduced the hourly requirement from 32 to 30 hours per week for single parents and to 20 hours per week for single parents with a child under six.

After 24 Months- Unless otherwise exempt or having received an extension, CalWORKs recipients must meet CalWORKs federal standards, based on federal work requirements, in order to continue receiving aid. CalWORKs recipients can only participate in federally countable activities and must meet a weekly core and overall hourly requirement consistent with federal requirements.

CalWORKs federal standards allow for an additional 12 months of vocational education to be countable as a core activity. This provides up to three years of predominantly education-focused activities during the 48 months of aid.

Participation requirements remain at 30 or 20 hours per week for single parents, however 20 hours must then be in core activities. The core hourly requirement for two-parent families increased to 30 from 20 with the new law, with the overall 35-hour requirement maintained.

Source: California Department of Social Services, Assembly Sub Committee 1, April 30, 2014

Appendix C: Colorado Call Summary
Wednesday, June 9, 2014, 2:30 p.m. eastern time

Participants

State of Colorado Department of Human Services

- *Anne Berkeley*, Assistant to the Director
- *Katie Griego*, Programs Manager

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Renee Rainey*, Senior Manager, ICF International
- *Ama Takyi-Laryea*, Senior Technical Specialist, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut would like to hear from other states which have recently restructured or redesigned their service delivery approaches of their TANF programs and learn more about their processes and procedures and what works for them. Other states and regions are also interested in this same topic and want to include discussions on it during their OFA regional roundtables. The Peer TA team has identified nine states that have engaged in some form of TANF service delivery redesign revolving around assessment, engagement, case management, service coordination, and/or business process re-engineering. Today's call with Colorado is the first call with the nine states.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Katie Griego a series of questions regarding Colorado's redesign. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Ms. Griego's responses:

1. What did Colorado redesign and why?

   In the last year, Colorado has been moving away from looking at processes, and instead is considering specific outcomes that are meaningful to families. Other things should measure the program in addition to activities, number of hours, and the work participation rate. Colorado wanted to redefine their program as employment-focused, since that is the most meaningful outcome for participants. They are looking at outcomes in the most meaningful way for the families they serve.

2. Why has redesign become a priority? Was it due to legislation?

   Redesign has always been a priority, but change takes time. There has been a programmatic shift over the last several years, and a series of policy and eligibility changes have been made within their program. They have asked, "How to move forward? What does practice look like?" The change was not due to a big shift in legislation, although state leadership has recognized the importance of the change and supported it.

3. What eligibility and policy changes have been made?

   Colorado wanted to move away from the work that was getting in the way of outcomes; they had a resource limit that caused verification issues with it being time-consuming. They identified policies getting in the way of work and eliminated policies that were not meaningful to their program. They also streamlined their program and aligned with food assistance and Medicaid. They moved away from monthly status reporting and monthly recertification of eligibility to a six month eligibility certification period. If someone was under their program and fell within the income guidelines and still had a dependent child in the home, they could continue to receive benefits. The design was different than that in other states, and Ms. Griego does not know if other states have since changed their design from several years ago. Arizona's program design was not working out. Colorado has a generous income disregard of 67% earned income when someone is within the recertification period; it is a lot lower for those applying for the program. As long as they remain eligible for the program, their grant remains stable over the six months. Colorado hypothesized that if they can stabilize the family then that would be considered work support for the family. How can they provide support during this time frame? They want to incentivize working. Since income levels are so low for the program, it is unlikely that someone with a full-time job making minimum wage would be eligible. While they have come a long way, there is more work to be done.

4. When did the redesign start?

Research on the redesign began in 2009, a Senate bill eliminated some of the red tape regarding the resource limit in 2011, and the certification period changes started in July 2013. Eligibility was part of the redesign. Colorado engages in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with their county only around the work participation rate. The past MOU created allows for the optional employment outcome, in lieu of the work participation rate; Colorado began engaging with counties regarding the optional MOU outcome. Mathematica will provide TA support to Colorado to help define the structure of a work employment-focused program. Colorado made system enhancements before, eliminating costly eligibility criteria that were not meaningful to the program. Regarding the workforce, they maximized the use of work activities and tied outcomes to them. If someone is searching for a job, they can record that the individual went from job search to employment. Staff is being trained on what that means in the system, and they are now sharing that data with the counties statewide. Counties are competitive, so that will directly impact the numbers. They are now cleaning up data entry.

5. How does Colorado engage with Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP), Child Support, and Workforce Investment Act (WIA)?

It is challenging, since things keep changing in different programs. Colorado utilizes a general business model to coordinate changes through different programs that use the same systems. They share regulation changes because different programs share the same families. Their Work Support Strategies grant enforces consistency and streamlines eligibility practices. Sometimes Federal policies do not align with State policies. Colorado is looking to use WIA, but they do not know if TANF workers know about WIA and how it can supplement the participants. They are redesigning how they deliver training; their focus had been eligibility, but they will also focus on how to complete an assessment and how to make contracts individualized. They want to show what can benefit individuals. Several activities within work activity rate work. Colorado wants to allow people to continue with their education so it can help with their employment outcome. Colorado is moving in an exciting new direction that will hopefully have positive outcomes for families.

6. What are the procedures regarding intake, assessment, and referrals?

Regarding intake for TANF participants, Colorado has started changing eligibility, but the changes are not complete. Also, they are trying to make sure that participants have buy-in, and that the program's message is more positive. In some counties, the eligibility workers and the case managers are one in the same, but in other counties, they might be different individuals. Colorado wants to make sure the participant does not have to repeat his or her story to the various staff they encounter. Regarding assessment, they are encouraging counties to use the Online Work Readiness Assessment (OWRA) and will provide training for staff on it. The Individual Responsibility Contract (IRC) will be renamed the "Family Plan" and has been redesigned. Colorado wants to make participation more equal, being 50/50 between the participant and the worker, with even responsibilities. Part of the system enhancements and training changes will occur in September, and the rest in December, including integrating WIA (Connecting Colorado), which will eliminate duplicative data entry.

7. What is your case management structure and caseload size?
   Regarding case management structure, in some counties, the eligibility worker is the same individual as the case worker. Other counties use contractors from Goodwill and community colleges, and public and nonprofit organizations provide case management. County human service departments provide case management for certain types of cases, such as some cases on medical hold. They will triage, asking "Is this person ready to go to work?" and then send the case to a subcontractor.

   Regarding caseload size, some counties have fifty cases per case manager, which would be ideal, and others have over 150 per case manager – it really depends on the county. There is one case manager for each participant, and this person is sometimes different than the person to whom they are providing verification for determining eligibility. Ms. Griego asked what other states think is a reasonable caseload size; she is looking forward to hearing what other states are doing and hopes Ms. Jones will share whatever information she gains. Ms. Jones said this should be a question to ask the Peer TA Network and Connecticut.

8. Regarding wraparound supports, are there any changes in your redesign?

   Not yet, but they might have a post-TANF employment that would lend itself to that.

9. Are there any changes to the structure of work activities?

   There have been no changes to the state work verification plan since the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005.

10. What successes do you have regarding the TANF redesign?

    Since Colorado is still in process of the redesign, they cannot address this question yet.

11. Do you have a factsheet or briefing document that you shared with your state regarding redesign, or is there an internal document?

    Colorado has factsheets on different changes made. They can put together information on their current work with Mathematica and with the counties and the MOU. They have redesigned their division to support their county partners, have a new section of the division dedicated to employment outcomes, and are simplifying eligibility criteria. They have accomplished a lot in the past few years, but it takes some time.

12. Would you be willing to participate in a webinar or roundtable or host someone from Connecticut?

    Colorado would be glad to do that and thinks that we can learn from each other. People are working toward the same goals, but redesign means different things over time. There will be several regional meetings, during which TANF redesign might be discussed. The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have TANF redesigns and create a matrix for Connecticut to share with other states.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
    - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
    - Contact Colorado again if future needs for information arise.
    - Create a matrix of states feedback on how they have restructured or redesigned their TANF service delivery approach for Connecticut and to share with other states.

Appendix D: District of Columbia Call Summary Wednesday, June 10, 2014, 1:15 p.m. eastern time

Participants

Office of Family Assistance (OFA)

- *Eileen Friedman*, TANF Program Manager, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Region III
- *Peg Montgomery*, TANF Program Specialist, Region III

District of Columbia Department of Human Services

- *Deborah Carroll*, Administrator, Economic Security Administration
- *Brian Campbell*, Special Assistant

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Jessica Kendall*, Technical Specialist, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut would like to hear from nine other states which have recently redesigned their TANF programs and learn more about their processes and procedures and what works for them. She has some background information on D.C.'s redesign which she has reviewed, but she would like to capture some additional information today.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Deborah Carroll a series of questions regarding D.C's TANF redesign. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Ms. Carroll's responses:

1. What did D.C. redesign and why?

   At the time D.C. wanted to make changes, they were able to see only around a third of its work eligible caseloads and lacked a good understanding of what participants needed. They relied on contractors to report on participants' needs and make necessary referrals. D.C. embarked on a redesign that completely changed every aspect of its TANF program, including the intake process, eligibility, how they assessed and referred participants to services, how they tracked the performance of the contractors and staff, and how they delivered services.

2. When did the redesign start?

   The process started in 2009-2010, and then D.C. drafted a white paper describing the philosophy behind the changes, after which benchmarks were planned.

3. Do you feel it has been completely implemented now?

   Previously, D.C. had ten TANF staff people working with the participants waiting for their applications to get processed. D.C. repurposed these staff to begin their redesign and realized that they would require three times the staff to make it work. The changes were implemented in phases. They have just completed the administrative aspect and are still working on some programmatic pieces, including the integration of case management with other agencies and nonprofit partners. More changes are required.

4. Why has redesign become a priority? Was it due to legislation?

   The change in legislation followed the redesign. In 2009, D.C. started making technical corrections to the legislation to close loopholes in the law that allowed participants to linger without any real accountability, and they made updated policy decisions. Then they developed a white paper and presented it to the D.C. Council; the Council considered Human Services' request and submitted legislation, which coincided with funding. In 2010, legislation was changed, closing a loophole and requiring participants to have an assessment and orientation as a condition of their eligibility. At the time, participants were approved for TANF and referred for a service with the contract vendors, but then they never showed up. It was difficult to plan, and the only way staff knew what participants needed was for contractors to conduct an assessment. Assessments started to be conducted in-house. In 2013, it became mandatory for participants applying for benefits to have a TANF assessment as a condition of their eligibility.

5. Were there any other changes to eligibility determination beyond the assessment?

There were no other changes to eligibility. D.C. implemented a sixty-month policy, which was already law, and the D.C. Council proposed legislation which would gradually reduce benefit payments to participants over sixty months. This will eventually end at the end of 2015.

6. Were there any changes in family caps, penalties, or work activities?

D.C. made policy changes regarding what is a countable work activity on the local side. They developed a program model in which the participant could be work ready and enter the work readiness queue, and barriers were removed. Depending on the level of barriers, participants could receive intensive case management. Participants could receive SSI. Out of recommended quadrants, they modified their policies in terms of the hours as work activities. If participants were job ready, they needed to meet the federal work requirement. If they were in the work readiness program, they had to meet their hours but did not have to meet the core and non-core; they just needed to comply with their plan, which was developed in conjunction with their case worker. If the participant was in barrier removal and work support, they had to meet their plan, and if they were in the financial support program, they needed to comply with their plan and apply for SSI. Based on their assessments, participants could be in more than one quadrant and receive additional services depending on their level of barriers and engage with the work vendor. If the participant has a plan to follow and the plan addresses barriers to employment and they comply with their plan, then they are in compliance with their Individual Responsibility Plan (IRP). D.C. holds the vendor to a different standard and still expects them to meet the work participation.

7. How did you change the initial participant orientation?

D.C. created a video for its orientation that featured TANF success stories and the changes made to the TANF program. They also developed information sheets and a TANF employment program guide in booklet format that was distributed to participants at the orientation. D.C. discontinued classroom training, since it was found that participants were not paying attention; there are better results now when staff conducting the assessment provides the orientation information first individually with participants. Human Services staff continues to evaluate the effectiveness of various approaches.

8. Is the Individual Responsibility Plan (IRP) the source of referrals to other services, and has that changed with the redesign?

This is an area to improve. There is a primary and secondary provider, and the goal is to get agencies engaged so that when a referral is made, a plan is developed; if the participant needs to work full-time on his or her mental health needs, this is acceptable and will meet TANF goals. To join the workforce, the participant's mental health concerns need to be addressed, and this should be included in the participant's plan, as well as referrals to mental health providers. Mental health providers are the secondary providers and can document the plan so that participants can get credit.

9. Regarding wraparound supports, are there any changes in your redesign?

Yes — wraparound has been enhanced. Previously, participants needed to demonstrate that they were either enrolled or engaged in a training program and/or working to receive child care subsidies. Under the existing policy, D.C. worked with their state superintendent so that if participants completed the assessment, they could access child care subsidies immediately without delay and receive them on the front end. Individuals in TANF can now be moved into early Head Start and the subsidy can be used as a wraparound for before and after care, so they can participate in an early education environment. Because these families are part of the direct certifications and receive food stamps as well as TANF, D.C. is working on a child care subsidy categorical eligibility process for TANF participants so they do not have to submit a new application for child care subsidy – they just need to determine co-pays based on income. Transportation stipends increased from $10 per day to $15 per day. Also, there is now an easier way to capture data on transportation stipends; the CATCH system was developed, which is the case management system for TANF. For a participant to receive a transportation stipend, they need to engage in four or more hours per day on their plan. The attendance data automatically calculates the amount of their stipend, which makes it easier to administer. This changed the system from paper- to electronic-based, but they have not changed the verification process for work activities -- they still do 100 percent work verification.

10. What was your overall vision for the case management structure?

The participant has one unified plan, which may include mental health and substance abuse services and parenting classes. Since the primary provider develops the core plan, and the secondary providers work with the participant to integrate the services, the participant avoids receiving duplicate services and the services are coordinated; there is no conflict of services being provided at the same time.

11. Are there any other case management supports for participants post-TANF?

Some employment retention supports are provided to individuals still on TANF who have graduated from the employment program because they have had more than six months of wages. That presently exists on a small scale. Once participants leave TANF, they usually are not seen again. They have group employment and training services available to families no longer on TANF, and that includes child care services, which goes up to 125% of poverty. Participants are allowed to receive Medicaid. They also have grants in the community that are not limited to TANF participants and are available to those who are TANF-eligible.

12. How did you change the vendor setup for the redesign?

D.C. moved from a requirements contract (i.e., limited number of contractors to provide the services) to a human care agreement model, which is used in social services such as group homes; an individual or group is requested to provide their qualifications for the services that are listed in the Request for Proposal, and then Human Services staff determine if they are qualified or not. By determining this, vendors can receive a human care agreement, but it is not a contract until a task order is issued. That gives D.C. a lot of flexibility, since there are many more qualified providers than there are funds, and it allows D.C. to expand its capacity. If the contractor is not performing well, D.C. can decrease their caseload size or terminate them. Under the former model, D.C. had to go through an entire modification process but could not add additional providers. D.C. can expand or contract under the new system. It had been 100 percent performance-based, but now there are staffing ratios and qualifications. The money that D.C. had previously given providers for assessments was rolled into their compensation package. Providers now receive a small base that pays a percentage of their staffing costs, and the rest is performance-based and is based on outcomes, such as helping a participant keep a job for six months or if the participant meets their federal work participation requirements. Providers also get bonuses if the participants they are helping have their wages exceed $10.50 or $12.50 per hour. The expectations are determined by the type of contract they have; they only serve either a job placement or work readiness participant base. The rest of the quadrants are served by other parts of the agency.

13. What outcomes or measures of success have you seen?

D.C. has six to seven outcome measures, including length of time participants retain employment, and the rate that they meet the work participation rate and complete educational goals. Since the beginning of the change, there has been an increase in work participation rates and job retention. Before the change was made, the average length of time the participant retained their job was sixty days, and now around 50% of them retain their jobs for six months or longer (employment can include part-time jobs). D.C. took advantage of performance bonuses before for a long time, which was not a measure of sustainable jobs. D.C. has not seen an increase of participants exiting TANF because participants can work a minimum wage job and be in TANF.

14. Would you be willing to participate in a webinar or roundtable or host someone from Connecticut?

    Yes -- Eileen Friedman has already asked Ms. Carroll to speak at the regional conference.

The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have TANF redesigns and create a matrix for Connecticut, hopefully within the next two to three weeks; this will be a resource that can be
shared with the states and regions in the next few months.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
    - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
    - Contact D.C. again if future needs for information arise.
    - Create a matrix of TANF redesign for Connecticut to share with other states and regions.

Appendix E: Hawaii Call Summary
Monday, June 18, 2014, 3:00 p.m. eastern time

Participants

Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

- *Julie Fong*, Regional TANF Program Manager, Region IX

Hawaii Department of Human Services (DHS)

- *Scott Nakasone*, Employment and Training Program Administrator
- *Julie Morita*, Branch Administrator

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Renee Rainey*, Senior Manager, ICF International
- *Ama Takyi-Laryea*, Senior Technical Specialist, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut wants to redesign their TANF program and would like to hear from nine other states which have recently redesigned various components of their TANF programs, including assessment, engagement of participants, and case management. Connecticut is interested in learning about processes and procedures that other states have developed. TANF redesign varies from state to state; the collected information from the states will be stored in one place as a matrix. We hope to provide the information to Connecticut, as well as other states and regions.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Scott Nakasone and Julie Morita a series of questions regarding California's TANF redesign. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Mr. Nakasone's and Ms. Morita's responses:

1. As opposed to the term "TANF redesign," a lot of your colleagues prefer "business process changes" or shared that they made changes to their service delivery approach. Hawaii conducted a business process reengineering (BPR) -- why did Hawaii institute BPR and what has that meant for your state?

   Hawaii previously used a classic case management model, which involved a participant being assigned to a worker who did a determination and kept the case for the life of the case participation. This approach worked until 2010, when Hawaii experienced a reduction in force during an economic downturn and lost manpower through hiring freezes. They become inundated with applications for assistance and were put in a preliminary federal injunction, due to untimeliness in processing Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applications.

   Hawaii needed to determine how to do business differently and accommodate the mass of applications, since manpower would not be increasing in the future. They examined Idaho's model (including a site visit to the state), which had undergone a BPR change. At the end of 2011, Hawaii underwent a BPR change as well, from a case management to a task-based model; this was not applied statewide at first but piloted incrementally. To test the change in process, they first chose as a test site one area of the state that was doing well in terms of timeliness, and then chose another area that had the worst performance. When the BPR started, they had an actual 51% statewide timeliness, with the federal guideline at 90% and their federal injunction at 95%. During the BPR implementation, the Maui office went from 29% to 70% to 95% timeliness in three months. When the BPR model was fully applied, they hit 95% over a few months.

2. What did the BPR actually do?

   With the case management model, one person manages the case. With the BPR, Hawaii decided to break down the application processing and the maintenance of the case into different tasks. They triaged the application and asked: Why was the participant coming into the office -- to apply for a benefit? Do they have a question or want to report a change? Then they determined who would see the participant. Different workers do different tasks; some staff process SNAP applications, some process financial assistance applications and SNAP, and some deal with changes. Instead of one worker doing everything, they had a group of workers doing parts of the task. Rather than the task informing who would take care of it, the availability of the workers determines the work flow. Previously, multiple staff wore multiple hats, and now a worker might wear just one type of hat and process one task.

3. Do you have any other partners besides SNAP and TANF?

No. Other programs that make up their eligibility are state-only programs.

4. Were any policy changes made, or was it just the work flow that was changed?

Part of the streamlining involved policies and procedures. Program offices went through their policies to determine where they could implement common practices and looked at streamlining their forms. As part of the BPR process, DHS created a handbook to clarify tasks. Trying to get buy-in for the changes from the staff involves building trust and confidence in each other. With the case management model, there is one-on-one with the staff and client, but in BPR, each staff person is part of the task.

Two key components of streamlining policies and procedures are interview scripts and a verification matrix. Interview scripts were developed as a codification of basic interview questions, so all staff would know what was required to be obtained from the client. Regarding verification, they found that staff oververified and required documentation that was not necessary. As a result, a verification matrix was created.

5. How long did you run the pilot?

The changes were implemented in phases: the first three offices went live in November, the next one in January, and then the next two in February.

6. How are the tasks handled? Is there only one case manager?

While teams of workers are involved, offices may be in different locations. On Maui, two offices are one mile apart but operate together as one processing center – office A does intake, and office B does everything else. The participant may report to office A because they want to apply for benefits, and they may complete their interview at office A. They might go to office A to say they want to turn in their verifications to complete the eligibility process. It might be a different team of workers in office A that would assist. A team of people is dedicated to a task. Once the benefits are issued, the only time the agency contacts the client is at the eligibility review in six months. The First-To-Work program verifies work participation.

7. How is it handled when a participant faces barriers, such as having a substance abuse issue or being the parent of a child with developmental disabilities, and needs to be referred for services and be involved in an activity? Do they need to go to one group regarding work hours and another group regarding substance abuse?

   The BPR team pertains to eligibility and controls benefits. Once the participant has gone through BPR and receives TANF, they are assigned to one case manager in the First-To-Work program, who oversees work participation, handles the array of services to address barrier removal, and provides case management.

8. Have there been any changes in the way that benefits are disseminated?

   Not related to BPR, but there have been changes due to federal changes.

9. Is the assessment of barriers conducted only after the participant is found eligible?

   Prior to BPR, if applying for TANF, the participant needed to come through the work program and fulfill the work participation. If they met all other criteria, they needed to meet work participation. The First-To-Work program verifies if they have met the performance or not, based on the application. During the application process and monitoring of the work participation by First-To-Work, they are also conducting the assessment. By the time the person is determined eligible and is a TANF participant, they can then begin participating, so their work participation in terms of federal requirements has been met from the beginning.

10. Have you changed your assessment?

    Hawaii has not changed it yet, although they do want to move toward a strength-based assessment.

11. Have you made any content changes to intake?

    No changes have been made -- the work program is still done one-on-one.

12. Anything else you would like to add?

    BPR is not a finished product. It was implemented with no technology changes. Hawaii recommends that whatever change Connecticut plans to implement, they should not rely on technology to be the driving force and make sure to operationalize the change first. Connecticut should build towards a model that works. Hawaii also suggests ensuring staff are informed about any changes and are involved in the planning process – their buy-in is necessary, and they have to feel the change is worthwhile. Once they implemented BPR, Hawaii faced many staffing challenges and found they needed to improve monitoring communication with their staff regarding changes, as well as other areas that needed improvement. Connecticut should visit another state and see their processes in practice, which would give them ideas on how to implement changes.

13. Would both of you be willing to participate in a webinar or roundtable on this topic? Regions I-III want to focus a roundtable on the TANF redesign.

    Mr. Nakasone said he is willing to help, but since Hawaii will be building an integrated eligibility system starting later this year for the next year and a half, his time might be limited. Hawaii has already shared their ideas with Region IX. Renee Rainey asked if Hawaii has any overview documents on BPR or change management communications that occurred with their staff. Mr. Nakasone said he will check to see if they have these documents, and Ms. Jones asked that they be sent to her.

    The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have TANF redesigns and create a matrix for Connecticut within the next two weeks; this will be a resource that can be shared with the states and regions.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
    - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
    - Contact Hawaii again if future needs for information arise.
    - Create a matrix of the states that have restructured/redesigned their programs for Connecticut and to share with other states and regions.

Appendix F: North Carolina Call Summary
Thursday, June 19, 2014, 4:00 p.m. eastern time

Participants

North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Social Services

- *Wayne Black,* Division Director
- *David Locklear,* Acting Chief, Economic and Family Services
- *Johnice Tabron*, WFR Supervisor, Work First Program

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Mary Roberto*, Senior Manager, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut wants to redesign their TANF program and would like to hear from nine other states which have recently redesigned various components of their TANF programs, including assessment, engagement of participants, case management, and eligibility. Connecticut is interested in learning about processes and procedures that other states have developed. TANF redesign varies from state to state; the collected information from the states will be stored in one place as a matrix. We hope to provide the information to Connecticut, as well as other states and regions.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Wayne Black, David Locklear, and Johnice Tabron a series of questions regarding North Carolina's TANF redesign. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Mr. Black's, Mr. Locklear's, and Ms. Tabron's responses:

1. What terminology do you use regarding the term "TANF redesign," and what have you done in this area?

   North Carolina is interested in redesigning its TANF program but is not sure what a redesign would look like. They have been administering the program the same way since 1995 and would like to collaborate with Connecticut and other states to see what others are doing regarding redesign. North Carolina has seen a decrease in their employment caseload, and it is becoming more and more a child-only case program. The county Division of Social Services Directors' Association had a workgroup that started looking at possible redesign a year and a half ago. There was some interest in the subsidized employment program. They also want to look at the child-only caseload because it includes several different situations; in some cases, children are placed with family members, which is an alternative to foster care. Regarding employment, Surry County is trying to put individuals on a fast track by providing physical and behavioral assessments to move them to either Supplemental Security Income disability programs or employment. With a downturn in the economy, there is no uptick in the caseload. North Carolina is trying to determine how they can better serve families.

   The last time a major change occurred regarding TANF was the implementation of the Pay for Performance system, which was initiated in October 2009. Before 2009, work-eligible individuals automatically received their benefits, but now, with Pay for Performance, they need to complete their work activities based on their Mutual Responsibility Agreement (MRA) before getting benefits. The last round of subsidized employment was finished in early March in Mecklenburg County, the state's largest county.

   Another change has been the implementation of the new North Carolina Families Accessing Services through Technology (NC FAST) case management system. They have used NC FAST to implement the SNAP program in all counties, and they are piloting NC FAST with four counties regarding Work First and Medicaid. NC FAST replaces the old eligibility legacy system and manages work activity hours and individual plans. North Carolina is still issuing some paper checks but would like to eliminate them; with NC FAST, they are starting electronic payments either with direct deposit or on EBT cards. If currently receiving SNAP, a participant can choose to receive TANF payments on their EBT card along with SNAP, or they can also choose direct deposit.

2. When did the subsidized employment program start?

   When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) started the initial subsidized employment program, it was an optional program in which some counties participated. There were 20 – 30 counties involved when subsidized employment first started, and for the last round, eight counties were involved. North Carolina developed a report that included best practices, a summary, and recommendations on how to make subsidized employment more effective. Ms. Tabron will send this report to Ms. Jones.

   Most of the changes that North Carolina is making are in the adult employment area, but they would like to learn about child-only cases as well to determine if they are using resources effectively. Mr. Locklear said that when he asked during the recent Welfare Research and Evaluation Conference if any other states have looked at a cashless employment program, Administration for Children and Families staff responded they were not aware of any states that have implemented this process. Mr. Locklear said he feels North Carolina is at the same place as Connecticut regarding redesign, and he would like to learn what other states are doing in this area. North Carolina would like to reactivate the workgroup of county directors to restart the discussion of a possible redesign.

3. Can you describe the physical and behavioral assessment?

   The county directors workgroup is discussing the assessment. Mr. Locklear did not have any details about the assessment and said that Mr. Black would be better able to answer this question, but he had left the room at that time.

4. Does NC FAST include the Mutual Responsibility Agreement (MRA) electronically?

   Yes – the MRA is now called the outcome plan, which includes work activity. Outside referrals for services addressing issues such as domestic violence and mental health are on different forms that are connected in the same system. The outcome plan is also used for child immunizations, participants registering for work if engaged in a job search, unemployment claim eligibility, and other program requirements necessary for participants to receive benefits.

5. Have there been changes in the level of work supports, such as child care and transportation?

   No – this has remained constant. If participants are required to complete a work activity, DHHS provides child care and transportation support, based on the participant's need. North Carolina is steadily seeing a decline in their employment caseload, while child-only cases are increasing.

6. Have there been changes in verification of work activities and hours?

   No. The policy still needs to be followed regarding verification of work activity hours, based on the verification plan.

7. After Work First, do you provide additional supports as part of your new structure?

   There have been no changes -- the workforce policy is still in effect. Participants need to be in compliance with that policy.

8. Have there been changes in legislation?

   The North Carolina General Assembly passed a drug testing bill late last year. The law requires that North Carolina implement drug testing by August 2014, which is an unfunded mandate; North Carolina did not fund modifications to NC FAST, and they are going to their Social Services Commission with temporary rules to put drug testing into place. Their system administrators said that due to Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act, adding drug testing to the program will not be possible until 2015. Drug testing in North Carolina is different than in Florida; those with a suspicion of drug abuse are required to be tested, but this does not apply to the child-only cases. If they eliminated the cash, would that eliminate the requirement for drug testing? That is yet to be determined.

9. Regarding changes you have put into place, what are your methods of success, i.e., how do you know you are going on the right path?

   The Pay for Performance system is the most beneficial, cost-effective measure they have put into place; it has helped maintain the participation rate, makes participants accountable, and increases self-sufficiency.

10. Regions I – III are holding a roundtable which will look at the restructuring of processes. Will you be available to participate in a roundtable or webinar?

    Yes – North Carolina wants to hear what other states are doing, as well as contribute to other states.

    The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have TANF redesigns and create a matrix for Connecticut within the next two weeks; this will be a resource that can be shared with the states and regions.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
  - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
  - Contact North Carolina again if future needs for information arise.
  - Create a matrix of state programs that have restructured/redesigned service delivery approaches for Connecticut and share with other states and regions.

Appendix G: Summary of North Carolina Subsidized Employment Programs

North Carolina's Subsidized Employment involves providing a wage supplement to employers who employ TANF eligible participants (*low-income families with a minor child under the age of 18 and the family income is at or below 200% of the federal poverty level*). This supported employment program allows TANF eligible participants, with significant barriers to employment, the opportunity to earn a paycheck and gain valuable work experience through time-limited, subsidized work placements. To date, North Carolina's Subsidized Employment program has evolved through the following:

Subsidized Employment *(ARRA-TANF Emergency Funding)*

In October 2009, North Carolina piloted the ARRA-TANF Subsidized Employment program and was allocated $11.4 million to provide 100% wage subsides and start-up funding for subsidized employment placements in 23 counties that volunteered to pilot a new service delivery model of TANF eligible participants in North Carolina. At the time of application, the availability of funding was limited to September 30, 2010. The ARRA-TANF Subsidized Employment program created **1,881 employment slots** and achieved 621 permanent job placements.

Job Boost (Phase I)

Based on this successful pilot, the Division worked closely with the Office of the Governor to create Job Boost, a 20 week, subsidized employment program designed to leverage public and private funds totaling a projected $5.5 million to create much needed transitional employment opportunities for the chronically unemployed TANF eligible population.

Job Boost introduced a new project methodology by identifying counties with the highest unemployment rates and then prioritize the counties based on the highest number of individuals at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level (2000 Census Data). In an effort to maximize available funding, Job Boost promoted a collaborative partnership with employers in which the program provided a flat wage subsidy of $6.00 per hour and the hiring employer provided remaining wage funds (at least $1.25 per hour) to ensure that minimum hourly wage requirements are met. For the period of December 2010 – June 2011, 28 counties participated in Job Boost (Phase I) and created **517 employment slots with an average hourly wage of $8.27.** Of these positions, 112 (21.66%) became permanent at the conclusion of the 20 week wage subsidy.

<u>Job Boost (Phase II)</u>

Utilizing a similar project methodology of counties with high unemployment rates and high numbers of TANF eligible participants, Job Boost (Phase II) also focused on expressed County interest and assessed ability to partner with employers who commit to hiring employees into permanent positions.

Phase II utilizes federal TANF and private funds totaling approximately $7.5 million. JobBoost (Phase II) also changed the subsidized wage formula to reimburse employers 75% of wages ranging from a subsidy minimum of $6.00 to a maximum of $10.00 per hour. Counties were permitted to allocate up to 10% of their total funding for administrative costs, child care assistance, transportation, and other TANF eligible job-related costs for subsidized employees.

Funds for the JobBoost Program will be available through June 30, 2012 or until, whichever is less. However, each subsidized placement is limited to a maximum of 20 weeks. It is an expectation that all participating employers commit to hiring any employee in a permanent capacity at the conclusion of the 20 week subsidized period, if the employee has performed according to the job expectations. It is an essential responsibility of participating counties that this requirement be clearly conveyed when developing employment opportunities. The 30 participating counties are also strongly encouraged to work with their local Employment Security Commission offices, Chambers of Commerce and other community organizations to build on their existing relationships with local businesses. Job Boost II projects funding for approximately1,350 positions at a median wage of $8.80 per hour (range of $7.25 - $12.00).

Phase II was implemented in July 2011, with 31 counties participating. One county withdrew from the program in October 2011, leaving 30 actively participating counties. In November 2011, 29 of the 30 counties had placed an unduplicated total of 823 TANF eligible individuals in subsidized employment with 167 different employers; the average hourly wage was $8.15.

Appendix H: South Carolina Call Summary
Monday, June 16, 2014, 9:30 a.m. eastern time

Participants

Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

- *LaMonica Shelton*, TANF Program Manager, Region IV, ACF
- *Jacqueline Jackson*, TANF Program Specialist, Region IV, ACF

South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS)

- *Tijuana Gladman*, Program Coordinator
- *Gilda Kennedy*, Program Manager

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Mary Roberto*, Senior Manager, ICF International
- *Ama Takyi-Laryea*, Senior Technical Specialist, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut wants to redesign their TANF service delivery and would like to hear from nine other states which have recently redesigned various components of their TANF programs. This redesign of service delivery of TANF programs varies from state to state; the collected information will be stored in one place as a matrix. We hope to provide the information to Connecticut, as well as other states and regions.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Tijuana Gladman and Gilda Kennedy a series of questions regarding South Carolina's TANF redesign. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Ms. Gladman's and Ms. Kennedy's responses:

1. What did South Carolina redesign?

South Carolina does not call it a redesign, but a change in its business process. South Carolina's business process design resembles that of Hawaii because Lillian Koller, who became South Carolina's Department of Social Services (DSS) director in 2011, was previously Hawaii's Director of Human Services. Ms. Koller's joining DSS started the change in the business process. Since South Carolina was short on staff, they reallocated their resources. Some counties did not have enough staff to cover their cases, and others had staff that were not fully engaged because the caseloads were small; there were different caseload sizes due to rural versus urban counties. The purpose of the change was to even out the work process. The redistribution of the work resulted in all county staff having the same number of actions per day.

2. Have there been any policy changes regarding time limits, work activities, or exemptions?

While there have been no changes as a result of TANF, South Carolina instituted the Jobs Upfront Mean More Pay (JUMMP) program, which added an activity up front. JUMMP means that after submitting an application, the individual needs to be engaged in a job readiness activity for thirty hours for three weeks while in the process of having the case approved. If the individual does not engage, the case is denied. If the case is approved, the individual works with a contractor for an additional ninety days engaging in job search; if they are not employed during the ninety days, they can transfer back to the DSS office, and DSS works with the individual. This is not a redesign – there is a contract with an employment vendor who works on JUMMP and the job search.

3. Have there been any other business process changes?

South Carolina has regionalized their workflow – they have 46 counties of all sizes, and have divided the work per region. Previously four, now five different regions are responsible for various components, including handling the upfront applications and interviewing, new applications, recertification for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and redeterminations, SNAP semi-annual, and all changes.

4. Is the case management approach the same as before, i.e., handling cases locally in the 46 counties?

   Yes—case management is not regionalized, since participants need to meet in their counties. Everything mentioned in question 3 pertains to eligibility determination.

5. Regarding online assessments, have there been any changes in how applications are submitted or processed, specifically changes with IT?

   South Carolina started working with an online application, but applicants can still submit their applications via fax, mail, or in person. Once the application is submitted and registered, the five regions conduct phone interviews at interview centers; the applicant does not have to go to the office. They interview new applications and re-certifications.

6. Have there been any changes with the two employment vendors, such as how you pay them?

   Vendors were selected through an RFP process and are paid for performance. The terms of their contracts may have changed slightly, but DSS has not changed anything. They were not vendors prior to this contract.

7. How are you engaging with other programs? Are there any changes?

   Eligibility workers are now generic and include both SNAP and TANF. Previously, TANF eligibility workers did combination TANF and SNAP, but now they do SNAP only and combination cases.

8. Are you using any type of standard assessment tool for referrals or did you make any changes to how people are assessed and referred to other services?

   South Carolina explains the upfront process with participants. Some types of people are not referred to JUMMP, and they are assessed the same way as before. All mandatory people are sent to the contractor based on what their work eligible status would be and are not assessed. People needing other issues to be addressed, such as mental health, housing, and domestic violence, still receive an in-house assessment and are referred as needed. South Carolina did not change the self-sufficiency or family plan in place for county workers to use. JUMMP has its own employability plan. JUMMP's goal is employment, and if an individual does not get employed through JUMMP after ninety days and they go back to DSS, the case manager in the county will create a new employability plan and will address barriers.

9. Have you made any changes to wraparound supports such as child care or transportation?

   No. Everyone who applies is still eligible, based on work eligibility or if they need services to participate in any activities.

10. Were there changes to the business process in terms of providing verification or if you provide post TANF support?

    No.

11. What measures of success have you seen based on the change to the business design? Since you have made changes, have you seen that they have made a difference?

    South Carolina has not seen much change; it has not changed much for the workers. Most change has been with eligibility, and that caseloads are now more even. There is a more universal caseload and things are only pulled out when they need to be addressed.

12. Has there been change in employment with the two vendors?

    No.

13. Would both of you be willing to participate in a webinar or roundtable on this topic?

    Yes.

Ms. Shelton said that before DSS Deputy Director Linda Martin left, she held a conference call on the changes, during which she said DSS would start tracking and receiving data on clients post-employment (i.e., who returned, how long people worked, their wages) -- has South Carolina been collecting this information? Ms. Gladman and Ms. Kennedy are not sure, since another department handles this.

The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have TANF redesigns and create a matrix for Connecticut within the next two weeks; this will be a resource that can be shared with the states and regions.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
  - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
  - Contact South Carolina again if future needs for information arise.
  - Create a matrix of state approaches to redesigning their TANF service delivery approach for Connecticut and share with other states and regions.

Appendix I: Washington State Call Summary
Monday, June 23, 2014, 1:30 p.m. eastern time

Participants

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Economic Services Administration

- *Babette Roberts*, Director, Community Service Division

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Rebecca Fairchild*, Associate, ICF International
- *Ama Takyi-Laryea*, Senior Technical Specialist, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut wants to redesign their TANF program and would like to hear from nine other states which have recently redesigned various components of their TANF programs, including assessment, case management, and eligibility. Other states use wording other than TANF redesign, such as restructuring their service delivery approach or changing their business process. Connecticut is interested in learning about processes and procedures that other states have developed. TANF redesign varies from state to state; the collected information from the states will be stored in one place as a matrix. The topic of Regions I – III's roundtable is TANF redesign. We hope to provide the information to Connecticut, as well as other states and regions.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Babette Roberts a series of questions regarding Washington's TANF redesign. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Ms. Roberts' responses:

1. What do you call the term "TANF redesign," and what have you done in this area?

   Connecticut is working on redesigning their business processes that would impact TANF and SNAP and reviewing every component. When Carla Reyes of Washington's Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) spoke to Connecticut, she focused on Washington's TANF WorkFirst redesign, which occurred in 2010 and has been improved upon since then. Washington first concentrated on the TANF program and case management activities, as opposed to business process. Washington is now focusing on intake maintenance verification, which they call business process reengineering (BPR). BPR occurred due to the recession, during which more individuals were coming into the program, but the state had less money with which to serve them. Participants need intake maintenance and verification – i.e., "make me eligible and keep me eligible," which is different than case management and social services. Case management moves a person to self-sufficiency, creates an individual responsibility or treatment plan, and ensures the person follows the treatment plan. Case management does not mean continuing to make eligibility determinations, i.e. maintaining in terms of financial eligibility. Washington broke the work into different components: case maintenance, eligibility, and financial eligibility, which are different than case management and social services/treatment management. They were previously in the same entity, but the redesign moved them apart; the BPR identified the staff needed to do eligibility determination and continue to manage that case volume, which was conducive to process management. With BPR, Washington moved from a case management approach to one that was task-based. Case management of social services is more subjective than and not as process-driven as eligibility determination. Washington was able to shift the work to the resources, which is easier to do with financial maintenance than case management. DSHS asked the social workers, "What should we do with the participant? How can we do a comprehensive assessment?" This requires geographically-based face-to face relationship development. Maintenance activities are different and do not require case managers.

   Washington has 52 community service offices (CSOs) across the state. Every CSO has financial eligibility workers. Many participants, especially the elderly and people with disabilities, choose to visit the offices in person, as opposed to mailing documents or finding information online. When developing their new business processes around financial work, Washington wanted to keep options open for participants, so in addition to face-to-face contact, participants can now do some self-service work online and can access staff by phone. The variety of technology options allows participants to choose the options best for them. All of the offices operate similarly regarding the financial component; they have a navigator who checks in the participant and determines his/her most appropriate queues, which helps staff determine quickly where participants need to go. Since participants found it difficult to manage a phone triage menu system and ended up queuing in the wrong areas, Washington changed to a live navigator triage.

2. Are all of the documents scanned in?

Yes. Since all case records are electronic, staff can move work around. Participants can fax documents such as pay stubs; images are sent automatically and then indexed and moved to the correct case record.

3. Have there been any changes in time limits, family caps, or eligibility determinations?

Not as part of Washington's BPR. During the recession, Washington examined TANF, which prompted their Work First redesign. They made necessary cuts while keeping the program viable. After the recession, Washington was positioned to move quickly to restore what they needed. They moved to a hard 60-month time limit; there are few exemptions to the time limit. They took a 15% reduction in the grant standard, which was a hard cut to take. Due to the high unemployment rate, Washington took reductions in some work support activities contracts and allowed for a temporary one-year exemption of participation for families with two children under six or one child under two – that exemption no longer exists.

4. Have there been any changes in the Work First redesign in terms of intake, orientation, or assessment tools?

During the BPR, Washington created a separate track for TANF participants; they were queued to a Work First specialist for financial eligibility and then quickly into a comprehensive evaluation. Washington revamped the comprehensive evaluation and focused it on countable activities that are now more family-based. There are four parts of the evaluation – staff need to determine: if the participant is financially eligible, the nature of the crisis that brought the participant into the office, actions staff can take to help the participant, and the barriers preventing the participant from self-sufficiency. The first piece of the comprehensive evaluation may be the only thing the staff can address in the first day.

Washington is contracting with Casey Jackson, who has a good web-based motivational interviewing evaluation tool that is tied to one of their systems. Ms. Roberts can send Ms.

Jones a hard copy of this new evaluation tool, which will be used by all case managers. As staff may ask participants questions, their responses may raise other issues and questions. For instance, if a participant mentions he/she lives with his/her parents, staff will ask if the participant wants to move into his/her own home. Staff need good listening skills and must be able to pick up on the participant's body language cues. The last piece of the evaluation addresses the family's strengths, skill sets, and goals – this can lead to employability. In January, Washington will have a new predictive modeling tool that considers information such as how the participant uses medical services. If the participant visits emergency rooms frequently, that might indicate the person is encountering domestic violence. Staff will use this tool to give the participant an employability score.

5. Have you made any changes to your wraparound or post-TANF support services?

During the recession, Washington had to eliminate post-TANF supports. They are leveraging their SNAP program to help post-TANF participants, which is a different pathway. Regarding their contracts with entities such as community and technical colleges and the Employment Security Department, they moved to a performance-based contracting model. They are trying to determine where they are achieving good results with participants. While Washington experienced a reduction in number of contracts, it resulted in additional funding for other programs. As part of programmatic redesign, they ensured everyone understood that they had to hit federal participation rates. Employment and self-sufficiency are the focus.

6. Do you have any key partners like SNAP and child support?

Regarding financial eligibility, Washington worked with partners under SNAP and ensured that they had the right waivers in place. They reduced their cost per case. The TANF workforce redesign involved broad community, legislative, and stakeholder support. Washington was already working with partners regarding the TANF program, such as the Employment Security Department, the state college system, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Early Learning, which houses the policy portion of their child care programs. They received advice from community-based partners such as Liz Schott from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, as well as broad legislative input on the task force overseeing the redesign. Washington also conducted focus groups with participants and staff.

7. Regarding changes you have put into place, what are your methods of success, i.e., how do you know you are going on the right path?

Regarding the BPR, from 2008 to 2010, Washington could handle a near doubling of their SNAP caseload with 500 fewer fulltime employees, staying within the standards of promptness. They moved from requiring participants to have an appointment for eligibility determination to providing a same day appointment and assisting participants in receiving benefits that same day. Under USDA, despite strict standards on accuracy, Washington has handled more work with fewer resources. Their wait times in the lobbies and on the phones are down because they can move participants to the right place, and they are getting the work done faster. Since fewer cases are waiting, staff has saved time because they have fewer calls from participants checking on the status of their cases.

Concerning the TANF redesign, some efforts are taking time to get through the process. Since 2010 – 2011, when the redesign report was sent and accepted, it has taken over two years to get through the process of developing the new comprehensive evaluation, which will come out soon. They are tightening policies such as the 60-month time limit, and they saw a reduction in caseload. They are implementing an orientation requirement for participants to receive benefits. There has been an increase in the percentage of participants moving off of assistance due to being over income. As a result of the redesign, Washington is hitting their targets on the all-family participation rate. Based on staff research, around 50% of participants in the TANF program leave within twelve months and do not return in the next three-year period. A lot of TANF participants move off of TANF and do not return at all. Washington has focused their redesign on participants with more issues.

8. Regions I – III are holding a roundtable which will look at the restructuring of processes. Will you be available to participate in a roundtable or webinar?

   Yes.

   The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have TANF redesigns and create a matrix to send to Connecticut by the end of this week; this will be a resource that can be shared with the states and regions.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
  - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today's meeting.
  - Contact Washington again if future needs for information arise.
  - Create a matrix of states restructuring or reorganizing their TANF service delivery and/or program for Connecticut and to share with other states and regions.

Appendix J: Wisconsin Call Summary
Wednesday, June 11, 2014, 1:15 p.m. eastern time

Participants

Wisconsin Department of Children and Families, Division of Family and Economic Security, Bureau of Working Families

- *Janice Peters,* Director, Central Office
- *Margaret McMahon*, Chief, Wisconsin Works (W-2) Policy Section
- *Linda Richardson,* Section Chief, Milwaukee Operations Section
- *Leah Watson,* Program and Policy Analyst

Peer Technical Assistance Network

- *Steve McLaine*, Project Director, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Janet Kreitman*, Health Writer/Editor, BLH Technologies, Inc.
- *Louisa Jones*, Principal and Subcontract Director, ICF International
- *Mary Roberto*, Senior Manager, ICF International

Louisa Jones established that all participants had joined the call. The team will e-mail those who were not able to participate on the call.

Opening

Ms. Jones introduced all call participants and stated that the purpose of this call was to discuss the recent technical assistance request from the Connecticut Department of Social Services. Connecticut wants to redesign their TANF program, and would like to hear from nine other states which have recently restructured, organized, or designed their TANF programs and/or components. They are specifically interested in intake, orientation, assessment, and case management, as well as the processes and protocols that have been established. What this means varies from state to state; the collected information will be stored in one place as a matrix. We hope to provide the information to Connecticut, as well as other states and regions. Regions I – III are focusing on the concept of “TANF redesign” during their regional roundtable in September, and other regions are looking at this too.

Discussion

Ms. Jones asked Janice Peters a series of questions regarding how Wisconsin has restructured their program. The following are Ms. Jones' questions and Ms. Peters' responses:

1. What did Wisconsin redesign?

   As opposed to the term "redesign," Wisconsin has totally restructured the service delivery structure for W-2 multiple times in the last twelve years. Wisconsin contracts with private entities to administer its entire program and provide for all services, including eligibility, case management, job development, placement, retention, and supportive services. The most significant changes have involved where individuals go to receive what type of services.

2. Why did the restructuring occur?

   When the W-2 program was implemented in 1997, Wisconsin was contracting with sixty vendors to run various aspects of the entire program. Then in 2003, the new Secretary for the Department spoke with stakeholders of the W-2 program, including contractors, participants, and advocates, and also wanted to talk to employers who worked with the program. When approached and asked to develop a list of a group of employers with whom they work to meet with the Secretary, contractors in Milwaukee were unable to identify any employers. Consequently, Wisconsin decided they needed specific entities that would focus on job development and placement. They created two types of agencies: a case management agency that conducted eligibility, case management, and assessment and worked on barrier removal; and a job development and placement agency that received referrals from the case management agency and focused on job development and placement and connections to the business community. This was conducted only in Milwaukee, and results varied, depending upon the location where the individual applied. This two-agency type model did not work well, due to coordination issues between the case management agency and the job development and placement agency.

   In 2010, Wisconsin changed to a three-vendor type model, which included: an eligibility and assessment agency, a W-2 employment agency, and an SSI-focused agency. There was consistency with this model, since the same agency was doing eligibility and assessment for all Milwaukee applicants; there was then a handoff to the employment agency that provided the employment function, and those who needed SSI went to the SSI agency. However, this model was too complicated and did not work well in terms of measuring success by job placement.

During the present contract, which started in 2013, Wisconsin has returned to one agency providing all aspects of the program (while also subcontracting) and has moved to a performance-based contract. All other contracts have been cost-reimbursement contracts. They reduced the number of contracts from 38 to 8. Contracts used to run for only two years. The present contract will be for four years, with the opportunity for four two-year additions. They are looking for some stability and an effective service delivery structure. Wisconsin considers their changes as an adjustment of service delivery in the areas of eligibility and assessment, case management, and employment.

3. Have there been any policy changes regarding determining eligibility, time limits, or work activities?

Nothing significant. In 2003, Wisconsin introduced a web-based barrier screening tool. Now they are reviewing their assessment policy and also would like to enhance the policy on career and vocational assessments; they want to incorporate it as a new tool or assessment. Wisconsin's Department of Workforce Development had a workgroup a few summers ago and worked with workforce development boards, surveying the career assessment tools that were used in the job centers. They also worked with the University of Wisconsin Center on Education and Work to look at career development tools and developed a list of recommended tools. They will unveil a revised policy at the first of the year.

4. How are you working with other programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Child Support Enforcement, or Workforce Investment Act (WIA) to help you with the service delivery restructuring?

Wisconsin is not doing any restructuring. The relationship with the workforce development boards is driven by local relationships. Two of the contractors for W-2 are workforce development boards, so the counties that have the W-2 contract as part of their workforce development area have a good relationship between WIA and W-2. Coordination between WIA and W-2 or TANF cannot be driven at the state level and needs to be local. W-2 directors are on workforce development boards, which facilitates coordination at the government level. A coordinating council meets monthly, and W-2 agencies have contracts through the WIA board.

5. Have you made any changes to how you orient W-2 participants to the program?

Wisconsin is different from some of the other states in that it does not run the programs, since they contract with private agencies to provide the services, Ms. Peters was not sure whether the contractors have instituted changes to the orientations. Ms. Peters said that because they increased the geographic areas where they are using the contractors, they are using a lot more technology to provide group orientations. Ms. Richardson mentioned that there has been movement from group orientations to one-on-one, but the orientation content has not changed. There are now two new contractors that have hired people who had roles in other agencies in the past. One agency has a strong Work First model and focuses on this area.

6. Is the contractor in charge of the employability plan and verification?
   Yes.

7. Is the key reason to use a new contractor model due to job placement being the measure of success?

   Wisconsin has five performance measures for the contractors -- three are directly related to helping people get and keep a job, a fourth is helping people who have been on the caseload for a long time get and keep a job, and a fifth is helping people who are appropriate for SSI receive SSI. The five performance measures are outcome-based, and four out of the five are job-focused.

8. Have there been any legislative or policy changes related to streamlining benefit access and interoperability with other programs?

   No – in fact, a bill was introduced recently that prohibited them from doing online applications, but there has been no progress on this bill.

9. Would you be willing to participate in a webinar or roundtable or host someone from Connecticut?

   Yes – someone on the staff could participate.

The TA team will take notes from all of the calls with the states that have restructured or designed their programs and/or program components and create a matrix for Connecticut; this will be a resource that can be shared with the states and regions within the next month and a half.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps:

- Peer TA Team:
  - Create and send summary notes to all call participants from today’s meeting.
  - Contact Wisconsin again if future needs for information arise.
  - Create a matrix of states that have restructured or redesigned their TANF programs and/or program components to share with other states and regions.