URBAN PARTNERSHIPS FOR WELFARE REFORM

ACADEMY II FINAL REPORT

Prepared by:

Bradley Myles
Research Assistant

H. Lien Bragg
Senior Associate

Stephanie Scott
Senior Associate

Courtney Kakuska
Senior Associate

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Managing Associate

Dr. Jeanette Hercik
Project Manager

Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street
Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
Tel: (703) 385-3200
Fax: (703) 385-3206

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
Office of Family Assistance
Office of Community Services
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
Submitted in accordance with: Contract # 282-98-0025
October 2003

The following report describes the Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform Academy II that took place in Minneapolis, Minnesota on October 26th-29th, 2003 at the Hilton Minneapolis. The Academy agenda is included as Appendix A; Appendix B lists the Academy participants and speakers; Appendix C summarizes the Academy Evaluation; and Appendix D provides a list of questions that were not answered in the allotted time of the Federal discussion panel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ACADEMY II OVERVIEW 5

II. PROJECT BACKGROUND 6

III. ACADEMY SESSIONS 8

1. WELCOME RECEPTION 8

2. DIALOGUE WITH FEDERAL PARTNERS 9

2.1 The Panel Presentation 9
2.2 Questions and Answers 10

3. STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATES 15

3.1 Atlanta 15
3.2 Baltimore 16
3.3 Detroit 17
3.4 Grand Prairie 18
3.5 Miami 19
3.6 Minneapolis 20
3.7 Oakland 21
3.8 Omaha 22
3.9 Seattle 23
3.10 St. Louis 24

4. ACADEMY LUNCHEON 25

4.1 Improving Outcomes for Families with Multiple Challenges 25
4.2 The Role of a Workforce Intermediary 26
4.3 Questions and Answers 27

5. WORK SESSIONS 29

5.1 Effectively Using the New Hire Registry 29
5.2 Teen Parenting 31
5.3 Case Management Tips and Techniques 32
5.4 Work Place and Employer Support Strategies 33

6. ACADEMY DINNER: PARTNERING FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY 36

7. SITE VISITS 38

7.1 MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center 38
7.2 Rise, Inc. 39
7.3 Employment Action Center 40

7.4 Site Visit Report Out 42

8. INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO PROMOTE HEALTHY MARRIAGES 44

8.1 The Panel Presentation 44
8.2 Questions and Answers 46

9. ACADEMY LUNCHEON: THE HEALTHY MARRIAGE INITIATIVE 46

9.1 The Federal Healthy Marriage Initiative 47
9.2 The African-American Healthy Marriage Initiative 48
9.3 Questions and Answers 49

10. WORKSHOPS 50

10.1 Specialized Service Program Strategies 50
10.2 Non-Custodial Parents 53
10.3 Defining the Optimal Workforce System 55
10.4 Strategies to Meeting the 20 percent Limit 56

11. CITY TEAM-BUILDING 59

12. CITY-TO-CITY DIALOGUES 59

13. NEXT STEPS 60

13.1 Atlanta 60
13.2 Baltimore 60
13.3 Detroit 61
13.4 Grand Prairie 61
13.5 Miami 61
13.6 Minneapolis 61
13.7 Oakland 61
13.8 Omaha 62
13.9 Seattle 62
13.10 St. Louis 62

14. CLOSING SESSION: RETIREMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT WORKFORCE 62

APPENDIX A: AGENDA
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT LIST
APPENDIX C: EVALUATION SUMMARY
APPENDIX D: FEDERAL QUESTIONS

I. ACADEMY II OVERVIEW

While Academy I was designed to provide a forum for the ten city teams to formulate their action plans, forge constructive partnerships with each other, and share information about the characteristics of their high urban caseloads, this second academy focused on solutions, action planning, and implementation strategies. Academy II included presentations from senior Federal policymakers, strategic plan updates of the ten city teams, simultaneously occurring workshops and breakout sessions, site visits to local community-based organizations, and discussions of innovative approaches for meeting the needs of hard-to-serve TANF populations. After eight months of intense strategic planning and initial implementation, this second Academy afforded the city teams a chance to learn about each other's progress as they all embarked on the task of reducing their high urban caseloads from a variety of methods. The second Academy also provided a venue for the ten city teams to build on the relationships that they formed with each other at Academy I. This report summarizes the main points discussed in the various Academy sessions.

II. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform Initiative is jointly funded by the United States Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Family Assistance and Office of Community Services (both of the Administration for Children and Families) and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE). Together, these agencies saw a critical need to support the efforts of local TANF administrators in urban areas that, despite dramatic declines in TANF caseloads nationally, are still home to a disproportionate share of TANF participants.

At the beginning of the project, urban areas were facing caseload declines a full ten percent smaller than their non-urban counterparts.[1] Additionally, children living in urban areas were at significantly higher risk for negative adult (e.g. poverty, unemployment) outcomes as suburban children.[2] Recognizing these risks and challenges, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services created the Urban Partnerships Initiative to support local efforts to improve services to these families.

Launched in early 2002, the Urban Partnerships Initiative targeted large urban areas with populations over 300,000 and invited local teams to apply for the technical assistance project. From the 57 eligible applicant cities, over 30 applications were received and, ultimately, ten cities were selected. The participants in the Urban Partnerships Initiative are Atlanta, Baltimore, Detroit, Grand Prairie[3], Miami, Minneapolis, Oakland, Omaha, Seattle, and St. Louis.

The purpose of the technical assistance provided by the Urban Partnerships Initiative is to support the efforts of local TANF stakeholders to develop and improve partnerships and strategic plans to effectively meet the needs of the TANF participants they serve. The Urban Partnerships team has responded by providing responsive technical assistance tailored to the needs of each individual city (e.g. strategic planning, facilitation, research, and resource development tools) as well as drawing on the experience and knowledge of each city to support their partner cities. Two Academies (the first held February 2003 in Dallas) were organized to facilitate this type of peer exchange as well as to provide the cities with subject matter expertise, access to Federal partners, and additional facilitated "team time" in an environment separate from the daily demands on the members' time.

---

[1] *The state of welfare caseloads in America's cities* (1999). Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
[2] Sawhill, I. & Chadwick, L. (1999). *Children in America's cities: Uncertain futures.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
[3] The tri-cities of Arlington, Dallas, and Fort. Worth, TX were each eligible applicants, but the cities chose to apply jointly to maximize the impact of the available technical assistance. They came together under the city name Grand Prairie.

A report on the first Academy is available online at http://peerta.acf.hhs.gov/uploadedFiles/Urban_Academy.pdf. This report describes Academy II, held October 26-29, 2002 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. While Academy I was designed to provide a forum for the ten city teams to formulate their action plans, forge constructive partnerships with each other, and share information about the characteristics of their high urban caseloads, this second Academy focused on solutions, action planning, and implementation strategies.

As the city teams ready for TANF reauthorization, Academy II included presentations from senior Federal policymakers, strategic plan updates of the ten city teams, simultaneously occurring workshops and breakout sessions, site visits to local community-based organizations, and discussions of innovative approaches for meeting the needs of hard-to-serve TANF populations. After eight months of intense strategic planning and initial implementation, this second Academy afforded the city teams a chance to learn about each other's progress as they all embarked on the task of reducing their high urban caseloads from a variety of methods. The second Academy also provided a venue for the ten city teams to build on the relationships that they formed with each other at Academy I. This report summarizes the main points discussed in the various Academy sessions.

III. ACADEMY SESSIONS

The agenda of Academy II was comprised of many session formats and topics. Sessions included presentations by senior Federal officials, interactive panel discussions, presentations by each of the ten city teams, workshops, local site visits, city-to-city dialogues, and cluster breakouts. The following sub-sections of this report summarize the contents of these Academy II sessions.

1. WELCOME RECEPTION

The first session of Academy II was structured as an informal welcome reception that provided all Academy participants an opportunity to network within their city teams, across city teams, and with the Federal partners in attendance. This session deliberately offered the space and time to facilitate conversation and allow the attendees to get back in touch with each other and re-build relationships that were formed during the first Academy. Because the session was designed for networking, speakers' comments were intentionally brief.

Ms. Lois Bell, Division Director of State and Territory TANF Management for the Office of Family Assistance (OFA), formally commenced the second Academy of the Urban Partnerships Initiative with her welcoming remarks and energizing words of encouragement for the city teams in attendance. After briefly describing the history of the Federal cross-agency collaboration that created the Urban Partnerships Initiative, she thanked everyone for coming and outlined her vision and goals for the next four days. Ms. Bell stated that she was excited about this Academy because it afforded the city teams a chance to talk about solutions.

Mr. Grant E. Collins II, Chief Program Office with OFA, offered brief introductory remarks as well. He elaborated on the history of the project and recounted the main tenets of the Urban Partnerships Initiative such as the selection process of the cities, the success of Academy I, eight months of strategic planning by the city teams, and individualized technical assistance provided to each of the cities by Caliber Associates. Mr. Collins also gave the participants an update on TANF reauthorization by stating, "It is continuing." He concluded his remarks with words of support for the city teams. Academy II was designed as a reflection of feedback from the ten city teams and is intended to provide a venue that allows the cities to take full advantage from the benefits of peer learning. Mr. Collins conveyed his excitement to work with and learn alongside the city teams over the next four days.

Mr. Kent Peterson of Caliber Associates concluded the presentation during the Welcome Reception by framing the purposes of Academy II. He encouraged the city teams to enjoy the luxury of being among peers and to form solutions together in this knowledge-rich environment. For Mr. Peterson, the purpose of Academy II is grounded in sharing strengths and focused on finding solutions that allow the ten cities to connect on ideas that matter to them.

2. DIALOGUE WITH FEDERAL PARTNERS

Ms. Lois Bell began the morning session with her introductory remarks, stating that this panel dialogue with the Federal partners was the official kickoff of Academy II. She reiterated the purpose of Academy II to be a chance for the cities to reconvene and share their lessons learned from their work over the past eight months. Because helping low-income families achieve self-sufficiency requires the coordination and collaboration of the services provided by numerous Federal agencies, this panel discussion was designed to give the cities the chance to talk directly to various agencies of Federal partners. Ms. Bell described how the functions of the represented Federal agencies all link together to serve low-income families. Panelists included: Mr. Grant E. Collins II, Chief Program Officer for the Office of Family Assistance; Mr. Roberto Salazar, Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service within the Department of Agriculture; and Mr. Jerry Patiuk, Public Housing Grant Program Coordinator for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Mr. Kent Peterson served as the facilitator for the discussion by fielding questions from the audience.

2.1 The Panel Presentation

This panel discussion was explicitly designed to be interactive and driven predominantly by questions from the audience. Mr. Peterson reminded the cities that what they would get out of this panel discussion was guided by what they ask, what they seek out, and what they share with their neighbors and colleagues. All individuals were given the opportunity to submit written inquiries, which were compiled and organized by topic, city, and panelist.

Before the interactive discussion began, each panelist had the opportunity to speak briefly about the specific programs of their respective Federal agencies. If they opted, panelists were also asked to describe their three most important program areas to help frame questions for the audience.

Mr. Roberto Salazar of the U.S. Department of Agriculture began the panel discussion by stating that his agency, the Food and Nutrition Service, was the Federal cornerstone of the Food Stamp program. As he described them, the three most important program areas of Food Stamps are: Access, Participation, and Integrity. Speaking in terms of a business model, Mr. Salazar compared the national Food Stamps program to a multi-billion dollar corporation. He discussed the concepts of wholesale, retail, monopoly, products, and market share. Although the Food Stamps program is available to give away money to buy food, Mr. Salazar noted that of all the individuals that are eligible for Food Stamps, only 59 percent are using them. "We cannot even give it away!" he exclaimed as he elaborated the purpose and procedures of Food Stamps. As Administrator of the Federal program, Ms. Salazar's priority is to provide eligible customers with quick and easy access to

Food Stamps, so they are not deterred from using them. He also stressed the importance of increasing participation and maintaining the integrity of the program.

Mr. Jerry Patiuk spoke about local Housing and Urban Development (HUD) resources. He first corrected the misconception that HUD only provides houses. In fact, HUD offers millions of dollars through multiple programs to support local communities. In addition to providing subsidized public housing, HUD also gives funding to nonprofits and offers a whole battery of programs for the homeless. Mr. Patiuk described the Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) program in detail, a program that has been very successful with many housing authorities around the nation. The intent of FSS is to assist those needing public vouchers to become self-sufficient by enlisting the support of community-based services and using escrow accounts as supplementary income.

Mr. Grant E. Collins II of the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) concluded the panel presentation by describing some of the functions of OFA and discussing some of the main tenets and challenges of reauthorization. He described how TANF is a block grant program, which means that the flexibility for implementation lies at the State level. Moreover, Mr. Collins also stated that the Federal government has a good sense that not all places are functioning at full engagement. He cited the statistic that only about four in ten people on the welfare caseload participate in activities that count toward the Federal participation rate.

Mr. Collins also spoke of the frustration he feels with the reality that while States have done a wonderful job of moving people from welfare to work, many individuals with jobs still remain below the poverty line. Lastly, Mr. Collins mentioned that while States have focused considerable attention on employment, many States have not paid a sufficient amount of time and programmatic energy to other main priorities of TANF such as strengthening families and healthy marriages. Both of these topics will be addressed in greater detail in later sections of this report.

2.2 Questions and Answers

The discussion content for this interactive panel was driven by questions from the audience that were submitted in written form to a scribe and the moderator on a variety of pertinent topics. An attempt was made to include questions posed by all ten city teams and to allocate questions evenly to each of the three presenters. The contents of the panel discussion are described in this section of the report. A list of questions that were not answered in the allotted time is included as Appendix D.

Question: *What is the possibility of placing kiosks in malls to make Food Stamps benefits more accessible?*

- **Mr. Salazar:** Placing kiosks in malls certainly is a possibility, and it is an idea that has been considered at the Federal level. There are a number of Web-enabled tools at the

State and national level. Most States are determining their own technological tools. In the absence of a unified State tool, the Food and Nutrition Service launched a national tool as well. Moreover, the idea of placing kiosks in malls could also be expanded to grocery stores and other frequented locations.

- **Mr. Patiuk:** With respect to HUD, we have put kiosks in malls targeted to facilitate family home ownership.
- **Mr. Collins:** I think TANF is a bit unique within the context of this question, because while we want to encourage individuals and make them aware of services, we also do not want to create dependency. Our whole philosophy centers on helping participants to become self-sufficient and independent.

Question: *As a follow-up question, is there any software available to upload into kiosks that could be placed in either malls or grocery stores?*

- **Mr. Salazar:** Our recent applications are actually Web-enabled and therefore do not need software. If you access our Web-enabled national program or State program, you do not have to download local software. Please visit www.usda.fns.gov to find our Food Stamp calculator along with a variety of other tools.

Question: *Where is the presence of a representative from the U.S. Department of Labor on this panel? It seems that jobs in this Department have been severely cut.*

- **Ms. Bell:** A representative from the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) was invited to attend Academy II and be a part of this panel. However, at the Federal level, the DOL is currently undergoing a major reorganization, and at this point, they felt that they could not send anyone to represent their program at this time. To remedy the situation, we will take any questions that you pose about labor back to the DOL and disseminate their answers to the Academy participants.

Question: *How can Food Stamps be marketed differently to change the image of participation? We are concerned that not enough elderly citizens are participating. Why do you suggest that lapse in elderly participation might be occurring?*

- **Mr. Salazar:** As I previously stated, only 59 percent of those eligible for Food Stamps are actually using them. This discrepancy naturally begs the question: why are the other 41 percent not participating? We believe that barriers to access discourage participation. In the case of the elderly participants, one potential cause of non-participation might be transportation barriers. They may have to pay someone to drive them to the Food Stamp office and might have difficulty scheduling such a trip. Again, the solution continually points toward the importance of location. We are also trying to change the face of our product because we recognize that most folks do not like the stigma of going to the local welfare office. We are piloting a partnership with Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to run a streamlined application process, which in turn should increase access.

Question: *Can you speak briefly on the issue of collaboration at the Federal level and the importance of linking services, programs, and funding streams at the Federal level?*

- **Mr. Patiuk:** The Federal agencies do need to integrate and work together, simply because we often serve the same clients. For example, TANF participants often live in public housing and receive Food Stamps. However, the main barrier to collaboration is

that many Federal agencies have their own agendas and have been given conflicting mandates that are built into the structure of their charter.

- **Mr. Collins:** Because TANF is a block grant program that provides a great amount of flexibility to the States, it is difficult for us to effectively collaborate at the Federal level on State policies that are greatly varied. Part of the new reauthorization proposal includes the superwaiver, which is a direct result of the listening sessions that OFA conducted in 2001. In terms of the superwaiver, collaboration at the Federal level is precisely the issue that is being addressed.
- **Mr. Salazar:** In my previous work at the State level, I oftentimes found myself frustrated by the lack of coordination in Federal programs. Now that I do work at the Federal level, I recognize that different Federal agencies have authorizing legislation and programs that do conflict. There are certain concepts that are incompatible. Put simply, sometimes the extent of our collaboration is bound by laws. I think we need Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and other mechanisms that allow us to work around and within the guidance of our conflicting statutes. We have to find ways to be flexible, such as waiver concepts like the superwaiver, so our collaboration does not solely rely on a legislative change.
- **Mr. Collins:** If you have suggestions of how the Federal agencies can collaborate better, I encourage you to put those ideas together and send them to us at OFA.
- **Ms. Bell:** I would like to elaborate on what Mr. Collins just said. I have previously sat on an Integration Committee with representatives from Food Stamps, HUD, and Medicaid on how we could better coordinate rules. I assure you that there are efforts at the Federal level to try to coordinate policies. Yet, I have found that Federal collaboration occurs more successfully when we have had a specific issue to address. If you could provide us with a specific issue, that specificity might facilitate collaboration at the Federal level.

Question: *From your unique perspective as a State Administrator who moved to the Federal level, can you describe any specific remedies that have been implemented to sort out these knotty coordination issues at the Federal level?*

- **Mr. Salazar:** On our Web site, you will find a publication that lists all current waivers that States are using. There you should find a good resource where a high degree of experimentation takes place. For example, we are currently providing a waiver to Florida to allow outsourced TANF case workers to do Food Stamp eligibility determination. I think you will discover that this particular administration is willing to push the envelope and test new methods. Please reference our Web site at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns/.

Question: *In the TANF block grant, is there an opportunity to have some monetary incentive to foster collaboration within and among States?*

- **Mr. Collins:** There is a push for increased flexibility, however, rarely will we hear of individuals that want the Federal government to exert more control over the States. This Administration believes that the best opportunity to address your concern is the superwaiver. With the superwaiver, an unprecedented amount of flexibility will go to the State.

Question: *In Detroit, we have families participating in welfare reform who are ready to move out of their dilapidated house but cannot find affordable housing. Instead they find only five to seven year waiting lists with the Detroit*

Housing Commission. What can HUD do, in a set aside program, to reward those families that successfully participated in welfare reform?

- **Mr. Patiuk:** HUD recently initiated Section 8 vouchers for the purposes of your question. Minnesota actually had the first model Section 8 program back in the early 1990s. However, Section 8 vouchers are difficult because they only apply to a certain sub-set of the population about which you speak. At least they are a start. I also think that the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program has potential, although the Housing Authorities that administer the program often lack a sufficient number of staff. Increased Congressional funding of HUD might also improve the situation.
- **Mr. Collins:** I agree that the Family Self-Sufficiency program has potential. If the public Housing Authorities have the ability to determine who has access to particular housing slots, an allocation of TANF participants can have access to slots on a regular basis. To further provide work incentives, those individuals can have an opportunity to roll into slots for houses. With some guidelines, an enterprising local TANF Director with a good number of participants in public housing can brainstorm opportunities.

Question: *Can you please discuss your perspective on the intersection of TANF leavers who are still receiving Food Stamps?*

- **Mr. Salazar:** We want to ensure that participants are gradually phased out of dependence on both TANF and Food Stamps. The 2002 bill that reauthorized Food Stamps allowed for transitional benefits. I believe this is a step in the right direction. States can lock onto Food Stamps for five months when families leave TANF cash assistance and move into their own employment settings. However, we are still trying to work to make this transition smoother.

Question: *Is there any reason why we cannot combine Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and Food Stamps? These seem to be two programs with similar objectives.*

- **Mr. Salazar:** WIC and Food Stamps have two distinct purposes. Food Stamps are intended to provide purchasing power for nutrition. WIC prescribes food and is more health-based. WIC is focused on health outcomes specific to mothers and infant children. Food Stamps are the financial support of the purchase of food. Moreover, Congress has maintained the Food Stamp program as an entitlement program, whereas WIC is discretionary. The ability to merge the two on a regulation is very unlikely.

Question: *As a follow-up, if it is impossible or unlikely to integrate WIC and Food Stamps on the front-end, what is the likelihood of integrating these programs better on the service delivery side?*

- **Mr. Salazar:** There is a much higher likelihood of this integration. Development is underway of Smart Card technology and Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) systems. Smart Card makes good business sense. WIC enjoys the support of the President and First Lady because it is successful. I envision a time when an individual could go to their local nutritional center to obtain both WIC and Food Stamps, as opposed to the stereotypical welfare office. I am not saying that Food Stamps should divorce from TANF. Given the current problems with obesity and nutrition in America, I am saying that Food Stamps should borrow from the success of WIC and help recognize that they are a health-related service.

Question: *It seems that the concepts of strengthening families and increasing work are in conflict. When parents are forced to work more, they are precluded from staying home and spending time with their children. Can you discuss how the current Administration reconciles these two seemingly opposing concepts?*

- **Mr. Collins:** The concepts of family strengthening and healthy marriage are included in the original purposes of welfare reform. The research shows that married parents produce more wealth than single parents. I do not necessarily agree that the two issues are at odds, nor are they mutually exclusive. Moreover, additional hours for family strengthening activities can count towards the participation rate. The research shows that two-parent married families tend to have better outcomes.

Question: *As a follow-up question, if strong families and marriages are the priority of this Administration, why then are all the major financial penalties for failing to meet work participation in place and there is no financial penalty on families? In Detroit, if we do not meet the work participation rate, we are in danger of losing 77 million dollars. If fewer people get married, the financial penalties are absent.*

- **Mr. Collins:** The whole notion of how to send messages around promoting marriages is new. It is not as involved and institutionalized as the work programs are. Quite honestly, we are currently looking for States and localities to teach us how to provide these types of messages and incentives. We want to incentivize this type of activity through demonstrations. This is a TANF purpose that does not only affect TANF participants; it affects the general community. I do not see a day when we have penalties associated with marriage.

Question: *Why must the language of the legislation use the word 'marriage' instead of the word 'family?' It does not seem that the Administration is explicitly trying to get people married. Instead, the Administration is trying to find ways to strengthen the relationship between a non-custodial parent and a custodial parent, one of which is marriage. I think it is unrealistic to solely focus on marriage.*

- **Mr. Collins:** Should government be in the business of creating marriages? No. But the government should not discourage good marriages either. This initiative is not about relationships; it is about marriage. It is about marriage because the data is clear. However, the subtle distinction must be made. This initiative is not about marrying people, however, it does have a focus on healthy marriages. This Administration is not trying to marry welfare recipients, nor is this a Federal dating service. This initiative is about providing the skills and knowledge to help individuals form and sustain healthy marriages.
- **Ms. Bell:** This Administration's marriage initiative is intended to move the human service arena from intervention into prevention. It is all about prevention strategies. We are giving States the opportunity to bid on money and come up with innovative strategies. We are experimenting with 200 million dollars.

Question: *If a TANF participant happens to believe in a religion that justifies more than one wife, would the government honor those marriages under this initiative?*

- **Mr. Collins:** The Defense of Marriage Act only recognizes the act of marriage to occur between a man and a woman. For Federal contracting purposes, that definition is what is recognized as a marriage.

Question: Could you please leave us with any final thoughts from your presentations?

- **Mr. Collins:** I would encourage you, at your local level, to really press at the State level around the kinds of things that you would like to do in your local programs. The State enjoys a significant amount of flexibility, and they will not be able to flexibly respond to your ideas unless you bring them to the table. I would also encourage you to visit our Web site at: http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/.
- **Mr. Patiuk:** The HUD Family Self-Sufficiency Program has been successful thus far, and we all need to work together to improve upon and expand the program. HUD's Web site is located at: http://www.hud.gov/.
- **Mr. Salazar:** The role of the Federal government is to help families pick up the pieces. We recognize that as our role. But we also recognize the costs to society of many of the challenges that we aim to address with our programs and policies. For example, in the area of nutritional assistance, obesity poses a huge cost to society. America now spends over 117 billion dollars a year in health-related treatment of obese and overweight individuals. The nutritional services role in curtailing these problems is that we want our products and services to become prevention focused. Please take the time to look at the Web sites of the three agencies represented on this panel. Plus, please do not hesitate to constantly share your feedback with us at the Federal level. Talk to your Federal partners. Take advantage of opportunities to talk to us. Keep us fresh in our daily reality.
- **Ms. Bell:** We have made many efforts to provide Federal resource personnel here for you at this Academy II. You can meet them in the Resource Room.

3. STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATES

During this portion of the Academy II, in separate simultaneous breakout sessions, selected representatives from each city team presented the team's Action Plan in a standardized PowerPoint format. Each team was encouraged to talk about the team structure, main objectives of their plan, action items to meet each objective, challenges, solutions, lessons learned, and the process of developing implementation strategies. Members of each city team not involved in the presentation attended other team's sessions that were occurring at the same time. The following sections of the report provide a summarized version of each city team's action plan presentation.

3.1 Atlanta

Ms. Marie Elder and Mr. Wayne Casey opened their session with an overview of their team. Mr. Casey leads a team of one city staff, one State staff, two county government employees, and seven county Department of Children and Family Services' (DCFS) staff. The two presenters then provided an overview of the organizational structure of their TANF systems in Georgia and Atlanta. DCFS is a county system within the city of Atlanta, and they are charged with serving both city and county residents. The city of Atlanta and Fulton County have two separate workforce systems and therefore, collaboration and coordination between the city and county is essential in delivering quality services to TANF participants. The team then provided an overview of the city's population, the characteristics of their TANF population, and a description of the organizational makeup of their program.

The Atlanta team described their system as "inadequate," "demoralizing," and "overwhelming." However, the team identified the following as their primary strengths: Atlanta has a long and rich history of collaboration due to their unique county-city infrastructure; Atlanta enjoys a variety of community partners involved in their system, including the workforce system, mental health providers, domestic violence agencies, the Department of Labor, and Vocational Rehabilitation services which are often co-located in multiple TANF offices.

In addition to the rich history of collaboration and the breadth of community partners, Mr. Casey felt the strengths of their TANF system were a dedicated staff and a willingness to be innovative. He demonstrates their commitment to improving and maintaining staff morale by instituting activities such as "Employee of the Month," "Employee of the Year," Popcorn and Ice Cream Day, and Personal Wellness trainings. Furthermore, Atlanta has implemented a variety of innovative promising practices to promote effective service delivery and solid programming. For example, in Atlanta, they screen all clients for mental health diagnoses, and if necessary, link individuals to a co-located mental health clinician for further assessment and services.

The Atlanta team offered the following challenges as their primary impediments to effective service and reducing caseloads: multi-barrier clients who have been identified as hard to serve due to mental health and substance abuse, staff training needs, technology, and funding limitations.

Mr. Casey finished his presentation with a discussion of the service objectives and strategies on which the Atlanta team has chosen to focus. The first objective they have chosen to address is the need for technological enhancement. The city is interested in implementing a model that integrates their eligibility and child welfare divisions. The team also expressed a desire to enhance their case management processes through the implementation and training of new models that will begin in January 2004. Mr. Casey lastly identified Life Skills Training for TANF participants as one of their objectives and is currently exploring funding opportunities for this program, including foundation funding. Prior to Academy II, the Atlanta team received on-site technical assistance from Caliber Associates regarding foundation funding and government and foundation partnerships.

3.2 Baltimore

The Baltimore team is a fairly large team of 16 members, comprised of six city staff, one State staff, and nine non-governmental partners. Ms. Brenda Redding serves as the Team Leader for the purposes of the Urban Partnerships project. To begin their strategic plan presentation, the Baltimore team provided valuable insight about their TANF caseload to frame the context of their action plan. 651,154 citizens live in the city of Baltimore. The TANF system currently serves approximately 8,600 TANF participants, 90 percent of which are African-American and female. Fifty percent of the TANF participants have been on the caseload for less than 36 months.

The Baltimore team describes their TANF system as "evolving," "complex," and "large." The team's primary strengths include: a large number of community service providers with other funding streams, an extensive public transportation system that includes reverse commute services at a low cost, a strong local Workforce Investment Board, and team dedication and commitment. Challenges that the Baltimore team faces are serving multiple barrier customers and special populations' limited capacity for case management; and building effective collaborations and partnerships. In addition, the Baltimore team also noted that the largest challenges to identifying TANF participant disabilities have been State budget cuts, limited funding, and losing staff.

The Baltimore team has identified serving multi-barrier participants as the overall issue on which they would like to focus their efforts as part of the Urban Partnerships Initiative. For this population, the team has formulated five action plan objectives as part of their strategic plan. These objectives include:

- Improving the identification, assessment, and services to TANF adults with disabilities;
- Ensuring TANF participants with substance abuse issues can access treatment services while pursuing employment;
- Increasing employment of TANF participants with criminal backgrounds;
- Improving the case management process to ensure that TANF participants are offered and receive the necessary services to become independent of welfare; and
- Enhancing collaboration with community service providers in order to improve TANF participants' access to needed services.

During their strategic plan presentation, the Baltimore team listed the different multi-barrier populations that their strategic plan encompasses including TANF participants with disabilities, substance abuse issues, and criminal backgrounds. In order to implement these numerous action plan objectives, the Baltimore team has initiated plans for research, needs assessments, gap analyses of community resources, outreach, capacity-building, and systems change. Also during their presentation, the Baltimore team acknowledged the technical assistance that they received from Caliber Associates and the Federal partners to help their team facilitate their strategic planning process. A team of Caliber Associates and Office of Family Assistance (OFA) staff conducted two days of strategic planning with the Baltimore team to provide guidance and facilitation for effective strategic planning.

3.3 Detroit

Detroit team leader Ms. Cylenthia LaToye Miller opened the session by describing the members of her team and the large TANF caseload they are challenged with serving. Ms. Miller described the TANF system as understaffed, under-funded, and dedicated (to doing more with less).

Detroit's primary strengths include many years of welfare reform experience, a strong commitment to improving services at the State and local level, and a willingness to try new models of service delivery. Detroit's primary challenges include reduced TANF agency service capacity due to reduced budget and workforce size, the reduced workforce agency capacity because of budget reductions, and the reduced demand on the part of local employers for entry-level employees.

The Detroit team has developed four objectives to try to address these challenges. First, they seek establish a family support collaborative by identifying existing resources in areas such as employment, transportation, housing, and union relations. They also hope to create a method for sharing resources among these various focus areas. Furthermore, the team hopes to identify and eliminate the gaps in collaboration through needs assessments and gap analyses. The Detroit team also has a desire to strengthen relationships with the agencies that are members of the collaborative and finally, to develop and advocate for State and Federal policies that promote family support systems.

The Detroit team discussed the ways in which they will meet their objectives, such as inviting new members to join the team and strengthening the ability of the family support collaborative to provide effective and coordinated services. Formal inter-agency agreements will also be created through Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). These agreements will define the referral procedures, the service expectations, and the performance measurement requirements. Agency staff will be trained on ways to activate the agreements, and the agreements will be monitored for compliance.

Finally, the Detroit team will develop, recommend, and advocate for a series of State and Federal polices that will promote an effective family support system. First, the policies that aid or hinder service delivery will be identified. Second, the group will develop policy recommendations and will share them with the Urban Partnership sister cities. Next, the policy change recommendations will be delivered to the appropriate State and Federal agencies. Follow-on activities will include a State level campaign aimed at educating policymakers and monitoring the progress being made with implementing policy change at a State and Federal level.

3.4 Grand Prairie

Grand Prairie team leader Ms. Amy Cuellar opened the session with a team overview. Grand Prairie is the only team of the Urban Partnerships Initiative that actually covers three cities: Dallas, Fort Worth, and Arlington, Texas. Ms. Cuellar described the structure of the ten member Grand Prairie team, covering State staff, regional staff, county staff, and city staff. Due to its tri-city nature, the Grand Prairie team is faced with serving quite a large urban area. The three urban cities add together for a total population of over two million people. Ms. Cuellar enumerated the strengths of the Grand Prairie team to include a commitment between the three cities to work together,

excellent communication across a large collaborative, and diversified techniques of service. Challenges that they face include transportation difficulties across the Metroplex, a growing caseload, the State economy, and limited funding to serve the disabled.

The Grand Prairie team has identified two overall issues of their hard-to-serve population on which they will focus their action plan: serving participants who are disabled or caring for a disabled person, and identifying clients with undiagnosed learning or mental health disabilities.

To combat these two major issues, the Grand Prairie team is pursuing two targeted strategies. Placing computers in the homes of disabled TANF participants is their main objective to address their first issue of participants with disabilities. To tackle their second issue of undiagnosed mental, emotional, psychosocial, and physiological problems, the Grand Prairie team has devised strategies of increased screening on the front-end.

In Dallas County, the Grand Prairie team has already begun placing computers into the homes of disabled participants. These computers come equipped with capabilities for Internet access. Grand Prairie has contracted with a local program entitled Business Access to provide education and job training programs via the Internet, such as defensive driving, GED courses, and job skills development programs. From their homes, these clients can search for jobs, develop job skills, and even find certain home-based employment. Internet access remains in the homes of participants for approximately one year. The Business Access program supplies a full-time online mentor that is available to users for trouble-shooting and help questions.

In Tarrant County, to address their second issue of undiagnosed mental health issues and learning disabilities, the Grand Prairie team has implemented screening tools for all TANF participants at their time of application. All participant screening occurs during the initial assessment and is conducted by certified mental health therapists and technicians. Individualized service plans are created for each participant that receives a diagnosis.

3.5 Miami

Miami team leader Ms. Edith Humes-Newbold began the strategic plan update session by providing the audience with an overview of Miami's unique organization structure where responsibility and oversight are provided by two board structures. The first board is a consortium, which is comprised of representatives from the five main municipalities from Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties (i.e. the Florida Keys). This consortium is responsible for the administrative and fiscal oversight for the South Florida Workforce system. The second board, which is responsible for strategic planning and policy decisions, consists of 51 percent of private sector representatives as required by the Workforce Investment Act (WIA).

In addition, South Florida Workforce is a consolidated service delivery system, which provides services to both welfare recipients and WIA customers. Initially, case management efforts of this system were integrated to serve both TANF participants and WIA customers. However, Miami found that this system was inefficient and ineffective because it required a case manager to have knowledge in the requirements of each program. Therefore, the system now uses a segregated case management system with a TANF participant/case manager ratio of 75:1.

The Miami team felt that their greatest strengths are the innovative programs in their system such as the seal and expunge program, transitional services, and diversion services. The seal and expunge program allows those TANF participants with specific types of criminal records the opportunity to have their records either sealed or expunged from public record. The transitional services program provides supportive services (i.e. child care, gas cards, etc.) to former TANF participants for up to two years after they leave the system. The diversion services program provides potential TANF participants with services to divert them from entering the system (i.e. child care, auto repair, and relocation).

Challenges that the Miami team faces include their efforts to bolster transportation and provide integrated services onsite. During the presentation, there was much discussion and many questions regarding Miami's efforts to collaborate with other agencies to address these issues. In addition, Ms. Humes Newbold addressed the fact that though their service offering of transitional assistance is a strength. This is because of the additional support provided to the former participant. It is also a challenge because it is not being utilized to the fullest by those eligible for the program. Therefore, the presenter addressed the need to develop better outreach and marketing models to promote the program, and the need for case management staff to provide the TANF participant and former participant with a richer overview of what services are available to them. These two needs will be the cornerstones of Miami's technical assistance request to Caliber Associates and the Federal partners of the Urban Partnership Initiative.

3.6 Minneapolis

Mr. Phillip Auclaire began the session with a detailed description of the Minneapolis team's structure and members. The Minneapolis team is comprised of five members, including one city staff, one State staff, and representatives from multiple community-based service providers. Mr. Auclaire also offered an overview of the Minnesota Family Independence program (MFIP) caseload in Minneapolis, and more broadly, Hennepin County. There are approximately 13,000 TANF participants being served in Hennepin County. This number of participants totals slightly more than half of the TANF caseload in the State.

The Minneapolis team felt that they were faced with numerous challenges, including the struggle to maintain individualized services during a State budget crisis, the difficulty of meeting the

Federal participation rate while at the same time serving participants with significant behavioral health problems, and the complexities in effectively identifying employment-limiting behavioral health problems among MFIP participants. Another significant challenge is the team's attempt to aggressively engage health maintenance organizations (HMOs) that cover MFIP participants.

In contrast, Mr. Auclaire also stated the many strengths of the Minneapolis team, which include a comprehensive service system, a dedicated and hard-working staff, the ability to provide intensive services to those with significant barriers, a wide variety of accessible service sites including ethnically-specific community-based organizations, and the benefits of being located in a very resource-rich community. An additional strength is the relationships that the Minneapolis team has developed with local foundations such as the McKnight Foundation.

The Minneapolis team's strategic plan focuses largely on the various aspects of serving clients with behavioral health problems. Minneapolis seeks to identify behavioral health problems as early as possible, to improve and redesign referral processes and assessments by HMOs that serve MFIP participants, and to increase the levels of treatment success and employment secured for clients with behavioral health problems. The strategy endeavors to increase identification through screening and training, and to improve referrals with HMOs through outreach and on-site assessments. In addition to self-screening tools, the Minneapolis team has also developed a behavior checklist for MFIP participants. Moreover, the Minneapolis team is piloting a program entitled Choices, which offers well-trained staff to facilitate the assessment process and provide various services such as vocational rehabilitation.

3.7 Oakland

Oakland team leader, Mr. Paul Leonard, opened the session by providing an overview of their team. The team consists of five members representing the Alameda County Social Services Agency, the National Economic Development Center, Aging and Adult Services, the City of Oakland, and the Unity Council. Mr. Leonard then provided a snapshot of their community. The city of Oakland's population totals approximately 399,484 people with a county population of 1.4 million people. The city's TANF population is 9,122 families while the county serves 16,759 TANF families.

The Oakland team describes their TANF system as "Flexible Work First." Oakland's TANF system is county-administered and known as "CalWORKs." Mr. Leonard lists the following as the team's strengths: visionary leadership from a new Agency Director, a willingness to "think outside the box" and implement innovative programs, and strong partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs).

Oakland's primary challenges are the loss of staff and resources due to State and local budget cuts, meeting the expectations of pending TANF reauthorization requirements, and shifting the focus of agency culture from eligibility to employment. These challenges combine to create an overall difficulty of helping hard-to-serve TANF families achieve self-sufficiency in the wake of budget cuts and dwindling resources.

Next, Mr. Leonard provided the audience with the Oakland team's strategic plan objectives, which include: providing transitional employment for multi-barrier clients, engaging employers in job placement and skill upgrade for TANF participants, collaboration and service integration between CalWORKs and Oakland's Workforce Investment Boards/One-Stop system, developing a viable MIS system for case management and program planning purposes, and integrating employment and treatment models to assist multi-barrier clients.

Currently, Oakland is involved in several activities that address the above areas. For example, Oakland has a combined paid work and education service model for limited English proficiency (LEP) participants and plans to apply this model to participants with other barriers, such as mental health and substance abuse. Additionally, the Oakland Workforce Investment Board is exploring the usage of Individual Development Account (IDA) dollars to fund paid work experience as opposed to vocational training. Oakland stressed the importance of engaging employers to increase their investment in supplying jobs to TANF participants.

Mr. Leonard concluded the session with a summary of three innovative initiatives (Health Care Sector Initiative, City-County Transitional Employment, and the Family Independence Initiative) that the Oakland team is implementing to meet their strategic plan goals.

3.8 Omaha

Omaha Team leader, Mr. Tim Koehn, provided the audience with an overview of the organizational structure of Nebraska's TANF program, which is split by three service areas that serve 19 counties each. The Omaha Urban Partnerships team consists of program administrators as well as community stakeholders such as the Mayor's office, the United Way, Girls and Boys Town, the Urban League, and the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. Omaha is a medium sized urban community with 20 percent of the State's population living within 500 miles of the city. Omaha also has five Fortune 500 companies located in its city limits.

Nebraska, unlike the majority of the States, has chosen to frame its implementation of TANF as a "Human Investment Model" versus the more common "Work First Model". The State's policymakers determined that it is more beneficial to their goal of self-sufficiency for TANF recipients to provide more time, services, and assistance at the participant's beginning phase of the

program versus the back-end. Therefore, Nebraska chose not to immediately place their TANF participants in employment and instead, focus more services and supports on the front-end.

The Omaha team felt their strengths were in the area of job entry, Food Stamps, workforce success, and family formation. In fiscal year 2001, Nebraska received a 2.9 million dollar bonus for being sixth in the nation for both job entry numbers and Food Stamp usage. In fiscal year 2002, they were second in the nation for workforce success.

Next, Mr. Koehn provided the audience with Omaha's perspective regarding the challenges they face. Mr. Koehn stated that the team has identified numerous challenges: a growing workload along with a change in demographics, the lack of staff (the service area has lost approximately 100 positions), and budget uncertainties due to TANF reauthorization. In addition, Nebraska has just recently lost their waiver status and is in the process of waiting for the State legislature to modify the State statute to match the Federal statute. Due to the time lag, Nebraska recognizes that they will not meet the Federal participation requirements this year.

Due to the lack of appropriate and needed staff, Omaha has contracted out their case management services to Goodwill and the Urban League. Assessment and orientation services are provided by Goodwill and are completed within the first 30-45 days. After assessment, the TANF participant may receive services from Goodwill, the Urban League, or State staff depending on the assessment results and the contractual requirements.

Mr. Koehn stated that the strategic service objectives of the Omaha team are to promote the benefits of the TANF program by implementing Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) awareness and educational programs, to assist clients with tax preparation, and to continue efforts to identify collaborative opportunities with other agencies so that they may provide all the needed services for their client population. Currently, the team is establishing relationships with the banking community to offer possible financial literacy and loan programs. Furthermore, Nebraska will begin tax preparation assistance in 40 sites and is working to develop a 1-800 number for additional assistance. The Omaha team is also beginning to identify agencies that can assist in providing services to the TANF participants, such as on-the-job training, community work experience, and life skills training.

3.9 Seattle

Team leader, Ms. Greta Kaas-Lent, opened the Seattle team session by providing an overview of the Seattle team, the major characteristics of the TANF caseload, and the administrative characteristics of the TANF system. The Seattle team's primary strengths include the diversity of its partners, the team's overall commitment to supporting families and removing barriers to self-sufficiency, and the team's ability to share the various resources available to them.

The Seattle team sees their primary challenge in serving TANF participants to be a lack of transportation resources and information. In the Seattle area, the best sources of jobs for TANF participants are primarily outside the city limits, and TANF participants lack access to these jobs because of transportation issues. Faith-based and community based organizations (FBOs/CBOs) that could be a resource to TANF participants also do not have the necessary information on these resources and possibilities.

To address these challenges, Seattle will be implementing a three-pronged approach, which includes providing information about transportation resources (including funding opportunities and transportation projects) to the faith- and community-based agencies, bringing human services, public transportation, faith, and community-based organizations together for a transportation forum, and implementing the various transportation strategies that have been outlined.

Ms. Kaas-Lent ended by detailing the Seattle team's various transportation strategies for the audience. One main strategy will involve meeting with county, city, and neighborhood-focused departments to discuss various transportation resources that are available. In addition, the Seattle team will organize meetings with faith-based and community-based agencies to discuss possible collaborations and funding opportunities and identify particular community projects that might be undertaken. Ms. Kaas-Lent concluded the session with a discussion regarding the Seattle team's intent to identify funding opportunities to support potential transportation projects.

3.10 St. Louis

During their strategic plan presentation, the St. Louis team began by discussing their TANF caseload, their city profile, and the composition of their city team. The St. Louis Urban Partnerships team is led by Dr. Karla Frye and totals nine members. Team members include two city staff, two State staff, and five non-governmental partners. St. Louis has a total population of approximately 348,189 citizens. The St. Louis team currently serves approximately 9,446 TANF participants, which represent 55 percent of the State's TANF caseload.

Team member Mr. Tom Jones describes the St. Louis TANF system as "complicated," "challenging," and "promising." Their primary strengths as a team include their commitment, high level of collaboration, and rich community resources that they can utilize for services and referrals. The main challenges that the St. Louis team faces are their large number of TANF participants to be served, an insufficient amount of funding for case management and child care, and the difficulties associated with coordinating community resources. During their presentation, the St. Louis team also mentioned the effects of State budgets on their services.

Unlike other city teams, the St. Louis team has not chosen a particular TANF population on which to focus their Urban Partnerships strategic planning efforts. Instead, this team has focused

their strategic plan more on reformation, restructuring, and capacity-building within their service delivery system. The three main objectives of St. Louis' strategic plan are to coordinate fragmented community services, to develop a better service delivery system, and to identify and obtain creative sources of funding. Presently, the St. Louis TANF system contains one full-service one-stop center and one satellite office.

To achieve these objectives, the St. Louis team plans to conduct a community needs assessment by examining community strengths and identifying community stakeholders. This needs assessment will lead to a broad-based community meeting that brings together stakeholders to map out a city-wide approach to TANF service delivery reform. The local Workforce Investment Board in St. Louis will take the lead in coordinating local workforce consolidation efforts. Furthermore, the St. Louis team plans to utilize Welfare to Work, TANF, and WIA funding and to collaborate with the HUD Hope VI Project to explore creative funding streams. The team will also investigate the possibilities of leveraging other resources, such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Regional Jobs Initiative.

4. ACADEMY LUNCHEON

The lunch session of the first full day of Academy II was comprised of two brief presentations moderated by Grant E. Collins II, Chief Program Officer, Office of Family Assistance. Ms. Maria Gomez, an Assistant Commissioner within the Minnesota Department of Human Services, gave the first presentation during which she discussed improving outcomes for families with multiple challenges. Following Ms. Gomez's presentation, Ms. Catherine Hogue of the Welfare-to-Work Partnership outlined her organization's role in serving TANF participants as a workforce intermediary.

4.1 Improving Outcomes for Families with Multiple Challenges

Mr. Grant E. Collins II began the lunch session by framing the discussion and thanking the team from Caliber Associates for organizing the national conference. Following Mr. Collins' brief remarks, Ms. Deborah Huskins, Director of the Hennepin County Department of Economic Assistance, introduced Ms. Maria Gomez by describing Ms. Gomez's past work experience and influential role within the State system.

Ms. Gomez strongly believes that the role of human service professionals is to connect families with the supports that they need. She stressed the importance of effective service delivery and commenced her presentation with a description of the Minnesota Department of Human Services.

Ms. Gomez centered her presentation on the provision of services to children and families with multiple challenges. In Minnesota, a series of studies are currently underway to explore the

needs of multi-barrier families within the economic assistance system. Ms. Gomez cited several initial findings from these reports, including a recent statistic that 55 percent of the TANF caseload in Minnesota can be classified as having multiple barriers such as homelessness, mental health issues, unemployment, substance abuse problems, and disabilities. For Ms. Gomez, such realities of the caseload require service professionals to identify families with these multiple needs quickly, integrate services, and create solutions early in the process before the family becomes too enmeshed in the system.

Ms. Gomez also focused a large part of her presentation on the importance of cultural competency when providing services to multi-barrier TANF participants. She outlined how many families do not want to reveal case details due to fear of losing money, lack of familiarity with the governmental systems in the United States, and fear of the authorities. Better client identification and more effective and subtle screening tools can assist service delivery to families that are reluctant to speak freely about their cases.

Continuing on the topic of multi-barrier families, Ms. Gomez stressed the importance of agency collaboration and integration of services. The presenting of barriers of many TANF participants will often force multiple and diverse agencies to work together. Ms. Gomez offered the statistic that as many as 70 percent of TANF families are also involved in the child welfare system at some point in their lives. This reality requires these systems to develop a joint ownership of the issues and solutions for these multi-barrier families. In the current times of State budget crises and fiscal constraints, it is more important than ever that systems become efficient, streamlined, and effective in the way they bring services to multi-barrier families. Due to financial constraints, service integration is not only the ideal for these families, but it also becomes the necessity.

Ms. Gomez ended her presentation by touching on the topic of connecting families to the community. She emphasized the importance of community-based agencies and neighborhood centers. She also outlined several upcoming initiatives in the State of Minnesota such as the Governor's proposal for universal engagement and the Family Friend and Neighbors Initiative.

4.2 The Role of a Workforce Intermediary

Ms. Lois Bell initiated the second half of the luncheon presentation with her introduction of Ms. Catherine Hogue, Quality and Compliance Manager of the Welfare-to-Work Partnership. Ms. Bell stated that Ms. Hogue's presentation would focus on how to work with the business community and private sector during tough economic times.

Ms. Hogue began her presentation by describing the history and functionality of the Welfare-to-Work Partnership. She listed their main clients and illustrated how their work is business-driven. Broadly, their organization was established by the business community to end the face of

welfare as we know it. Ms. Hogue depicted her agency as a "high impact organization" and discussed the expanded outcomes that the Welfare-to-Work Partnership has witnessed since its inception.

The Welfare-to-Work Partnership functions as a workforce intermediary. These organizations serve a liaison role between the private sector that demands employees and the public sector, which can provide TANF participants to work in various jobs. Through its role in connecting employers and TANF participants, the Welfare-to-Work Partnership seeks to tap the economic potential of the employment agreement for the individual, the business, and the community as a whole. Ms. Hogue described the service model of her organization and stated that robust community economic development occurs when the model works. Private businesses such as United, Sprint PCS, the United Postal Service (UPS), and Burger King are some of the major clients of the Welfare-to-Work Partnership. Hogue also used this section of her presentation to outline what a workforce intermediary is and is not. These types of organizations are not service providers. Instead, they learn to speak the disparate languages of the private and public sector and act in a consultant role as the "invisible connective tissue" that links the two sectors together.

When the Welfare-to-Work Partnership engages businesses as their clients, their selling points to these companies focus on social responsibility and an understanding of the need to meet a healthy bottom line. By looking at the needs and financial responsibilities of the private sector, this organization brokers agreements that connect TANF participants with the jobs that they need. Ms. Hogue read the mission of her organization and told a few success stories of beneficial job placements.

Ms. Hogue ended her presentation with descriptions of a few of the Welfare-to-Work Partnerships' specific projects, such as a demand-side Youth Offender Demonstration project through a Department of Labor (DOL) grant, their High Growth Job Initiative, and their work with ex-offenders. She also listed statistics about her organization's placement rates for TANF participants in businesses.

4.3 Questions and Answers

Question: Years ago during the booming economic times, people looking for jobs had sufficient choices. Today, those seeking work do not have a good choice for jobs. In Detroit, we had over ten thousand lay-offs in past months. How is this new trend affecting your work?

- **Ms. Hogue:** At the Welfare-to-Work Partnership, we make a concerted effort to look at different industries that are resilient to the tough economic times. We do not only focus on one industry. As we work in a diverse array of industries, we look at what those employers have to offer and listen to what they have to say. When there are layoffs in one business community, we target industries where there is actually growth.

Question: In Baltimore, because of the economic condition in our State, we have had to reduce services in certain areas. We also had to significantly reduce a contract with a university that did economic forecasting. Can the Federal government, such as the Department of Labor, obtain that economic forecasting information for us and disseminate it now that we cannot do it ourselves anymore?

- **Mr. Collins:** Various agencies within the Federal government do a significant amount of research, some of which includes predictive and forecasting research. We can provide you with guidance of where to locate some of those specific resources.

Question: Urban areas are the places where TANF participants tend to face the most difficulties. What self-sufficiency and employment-related services are there for women of child-bearing ages in urban areas? Baltimore has a much lower employment rate for this population. What can we do with these specific female clients of a certain age?

- **Ms. Gomez:** There is no doubt that the economy is a very important factor in everything that we do. The cycles of the economy will always be with us. The success of TANF will eventually by judged on how well we manage those cycles and how well we provide community supports during those cycles. If jobs are down, can we create seasonable jobs? Child care needs also should be considered. Our society values work and values everyone working, but how do those values bode for children developing without quality child care? One of the most important functions of human societies is to nurture, nourish, and socialize our children. I think with this population that you mention, child care needs still need to be resolved.
- **Ms. Hogue:** Women that we have placed have made more money in some cases than men.

Question: You described how the Welfare-to-Work Partnership was in four cities. Is there any effort to expand into other communities, and if not, provide technical assistance to other communities?

- **Ms. Hogue:** We are hopeful to expand further. We are also hopeful that the workforce intermediary model expands. One broad piece of guidance that I can give now is that you should look for workforce intermediaries on the Web and through your local Chambers of Commerce. If you live in a city where our organization is not located, try to find other workforce intermediaries that work in ways that are similar to our model.

Question: What is the funding source of the Welfare-to-Work Partnership?

- **Ms. Hogue:** The United States Department of Labor (DOL). We have been funded through past DOL grants, and we just received another DOL grant this year.

Question: Both of you discussed very clearly about the need for community partnership. When you talk about the measurable success of a community, where do you set the bar? How do you begin achieving the common goals of various sectors in a community? How does a community go about beginning to set its own bar?

- **Ms. Hogue:** Looking at the financial data of businesses and looking at community indicator data both help.
- **Ms. Gomez:** Report cards on communities are a good idea because they are based on measurable indicators. It is very important to constantly measure what is happening in the area of employment. Yet, there are more important indicators than just employment.

Children and youth indicators are also important. My focus is on the importance of indicators.

5. WORK SESSIONS

5.1 Effectively Using the New Hire Registry

Mr. Grant. E Collins II of the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) moderated the panel presentation comprised of Ms. Kate Jesberg, Ms. Donna Allen, and Mr. Steven Everett from the DC Department of Human Services' Income Maintenance Administration.

Employers are required to report essential employment information for every newly hired employee to a State New Hire Directory. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) requires States to operate a system for employers to report new hire information to the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE). The New Hire data, together with Quarterly Wage and Unemployment Claims data, enable OCSE to maximize enforcement of child support orders through the Parent Locator Service. This Academy II session described the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH) and how the DC Department of Human Services and other local TANF agencies can use this registry to support their service delivery efforts.

The Federal Parent Locator Service locates non-custodial parents for child support obligations and enforcement. Within ten days of employment, every newly employed person is reported to the NDNH. The purpose of the NDNH is to identify individuals who are earning wages but not meeting child support obligations. Data from the NDNH is available only to specific entities, including State welfare agencies. Many State welfare agencies, however, are not aware of the NDNH or encounter bureaucratic difficulties accessing this information. These barriers to access have been especially challenging in urban areas. Historically, welfare agencies experience difficulties tracking the employment status of participants and are typically unaware of clients who are working and earning an income. Data from the NDNH can provide critical information regarding the employment status of TANF participants. A leaver study, conducted by the Urban Institute using NDNH data, indicates a higher rate of employment and earnings among TANF clients than originally believed by welfare agencies. Using the NDNH, TANF agencies can identify clients who are employed, who are earning an income, and who are obligated to pay child support.

In 2001, the D.C. Department of Human Services (DHS) was interested in accessing information from the NDNH, particularly unreported wages and earnings of TANF participants. DC DHS found they were uniquely disadvantaged in their ability to obtain employment information because they did not have access to Federal or Virginia employment data. As a result of these and other obstacles, DC DHS requested assistance from the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Office of Family Assistance (OFA) in accessing NDNH data. After a lengthy process of negotiation, establishing security procedures, and obtaining approval by a data review board, the DC

DHS – Income Maintenance Administration entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services – OCSE in March 2003.

The DC DHS received their first match from the NDNH in June of 2003. The data included quarterly wage records, Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefit records, and W-4 records. Preliminary findings from the match indicate that:

- Ninety (90) percent of matches were clients who did not report their earnings to DC DHS – Income Maintenance Administration;
- Employers were generally responsive to the agencies request for verification;
- Fifty-two (52) percent of clients were unemployed by the time employment was verified; and
- Clients were primarily hired in retail/sales, food service, security, health care and government jobs.

The implications and benefits of the match include:

Additional information for work participation calculations;

- Potential TANF benefit savings (i.e., case closures, overpayments/recoupments in the short run);
- Opportunities to stabilize those no longer employed with transitional benefits; and
- Improvement of the Food Stamp error rate.

Using the NDNH has created several programming issues. First, managing the data is an arduous process. Data management requires independent verification from employers or follow-up with individual clients if employers cannot verify information. The verification process can take as long as three months. The NDNH data findings resulted in benefit reductions and about two-thirds of the matches were case closures. DC DHS, however, automatically provides stabilization services to clients with closed cases. There were also some initial privacy and protection issues regarding the NDNH data collected. MOUs between the agency and OCSE as well as security protocols have helped to address this concern. Plus, the fact that TANF agencies have access to other sensitive data (e.g., IRS data) reassure OCSE that NDNH and client information will be protected. DC DHS carefully safeguards confidential information of their clients through secure data transfer of files and staff centrally controlling information.

Recommendations from this session include that:

- States collaborate to obtain data of interest if they are unable to access information from the NDNH.
- States mitigate the issue by stressing the usefulness of the NDNH in enforcing child support obligations and processing overpayments/recoupments.

- States confer with other States regarding their negotiation process in accessing the NDNH.
- States can "de-politicize" the issue by marketing the use of the NDNH in ways that demonstrate benefits to clients and cost savings for agencies and by presenting the issue from an academic/research perspective.

States should not focus on using the NDNH as a punitive tool but rather as a method to "clean up" the TANF caseload and offer stabilization services to employed clients.

5.2 Teen Parenting

Ms. Benesch began the session by introducing Ms. Luanne Nyberg from the Hennepin County Department of Health and Community Initiatives. Ms. Nyberg framed her presentation on teen parenting with some statistics. She informed the audience that in 2000, the birth rate in Minneapolis was 52.9 per 1,000 teens between the ages of 15 and 17 and 70.6 per 1,000 among teens 18 and 19 years of age. The total estimate for the county was 1,700 teen mothers with an estimated 2,100 children. Of the 1,700 teen mothers, 802 are clients in Minnesota's welfare program entitled MFIP.

Ms. Nyberg gave a comprehensive overview of the history of Hennepin county's teen parenting program, "Teen Parent Connection," and the community's efforts to develop partnerships to address the issue of teen parenting. The collaborative includes such members as the Hennepin County Children, Family, and Adult Services Department, Hennepin County Economic Assistance, Hennepin County Community Corrections, Lutheran Social Services, and the Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) system. The program strives to promote educational success, simplify multiple service delivery service systems, develop teen parenting skills, create family and community bonds, and prevent further teen pregnancies.

Ms. Nyberg then introduced her presentation partner, Dr. Robert McCauley of the Minneapolis Public School System. Dr. McCauley spoke of the MPS' commitment not only to their teen parent population but to their children as well. MPS' serves 45 kindergarteners that are the children of teen parents in school readiness programs. In addition, the MPS system has developed a magnet program called "Broadway," which is a school for teen parents and pregnant teens. This program not only allows for the continued education of the teen parent, but also provides child care, parenting skills training, school to work internships, customized training, work experience, and remedial education. The school system recognizes that they have a high number of teen parents who are also TANF participants and therefore have co-located a number of TANF case workers in their high schools and are providing teen parent case management. This program has proven to be effective in keeping teen parents in school.

Ms. Benesch also introduced the next speaker, Mr. Rozario Slack from "First Things First" (FTF). Mr. Slack started his presentation with a video overview of his organization, which is a community-based non-profit located in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The goal of First Things First is to strengthen families and their relationships through the provision of innovative programming. For example, FTF implements a boot camp for dads where new fathers discuss pregnancy, birth, and how they can help their partners throughout the process. In addition, FTF has a number of programs addressing abstinence, relationship building, and teen fatherhood, which are implemented throughout the community. Mr. Slack addressed his belief that intervention and education geared towards young men as well as young women is the key to reducing teen pregnancy. He expressed the need for cultural and behavioral changes (dating habits of teens and their relationships) as a part of the prevention effort.

5.3 Case Management Tips and Techniques

Speakers: Mary Nakashian, Independent Consultant

Barbara Ramlow, Director, Institute on Women and Substance Abuse, University of Kentucky Center on Drug and Alcohol Research

Moderator: Jeanette Hercik, Caliber Associates

Reducing the TANF caseload requires not only sound agency policies but also effective front line practice. Case managers need to have access to a wide range of resources and need to develop better working relationships with other programs. This session presented a variety of case management strategies and models to help participants enhance their practice in meeting the needs of their TANF population.

Case management is a widely used term, but it is not necessarily a commonly understood concept. Some agency officials seek case management responsibility because they feel their agency is best suited to it or because they want to retain authority, influence, or funding. Other agency officials resist case management responsibility because it means more, and increasingly harder, work as the clients served by case managers have multiple and complex problems. Enormous changes brought about by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) have prompted welfare and other officials to revisit their thinking about the concept of case management. PRWORA has put pressure on State welfare, employment, treatment, and other agencies to address some of our country's most complex social problems such as substance abuse, mental illness, learning disabilities, and domestic violence. The legislation has forced welfare officials to learn about the prevalence of these problems among welfare recipients, and about the kinds of interventions that are required to help these families prepare for work. Thus, PRWORA, provides an important opportunity for officials to rethink the functions of case management, since case management lends itself to serving people with multiple problems and conditions who require

many services over extended periods of time and who often have trouble accessing the services they need.

There are many legitimate case management options, which leave TANF administrators with the responsibility for understanding the options that fit best with their environment, developing clear goals for case management, and developing agency infrastructures that support the goals and options they select. As they consider using case management as a tool for welfare reform, it is more important that welfare administrators select a definition of case management that supports the goals they have for clients and reflects their own organizational cultures.

Examples of definitions of "case management" include:

- A method or process for ensuring that individuals are provided needed services in a coordinated, effective, and efficient manner;
- Planning and coordinating a package of health and social services that is individualized to meet a particular client's needs; or
- Assessing the needs of the client and the client's family, when appropriate, and arranging, coordinating, monitoring, evaluating, and advocating for a package of multiple services to meet the specific client's complex needs.

The functions and roles of case managers should reflect the mission, goals, and capacities of the agencies where they work. Some agencies intend for case managers to "broker" services among different agencies while other intend for case managers themselves to provide services as well.

5.4 Work Place and Employer Support Strategies

Speakers: Joyce Bosscher, Family Independence Specialist, Michigan Family Independence Agency

Bruce Nauth, Senior Planning Analyst, Hennepin County Department of Training and Employment Assistance

Moderator: Karen Lynn-Dyson, Caliber Associates

Session moderator Ms. Karen Lynn-Dyson of Caliber Associates began this Academy II session with a few background remarks about work. She commented on the challenges TANF administrators face getting their customers employed, helping them remain employed, and helping them advance in their jobs. She also remarked on the difficulties that administrators face finding and retaining good employers. This session was designed to provide the audience with information about two innovative programs that are successfully working with and engaging employers.

Ms. Lynn-Dyson also framed the discussion by describing the numerous types of employment initiatives. She mentioned employer associations (workforce intermediaries) that

operate like the Welfare to Work Partnership. She also described the Workforce Innovations Network, a partnership among the National Association of Manufacturers, Jobs for the Future, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. This network of employers associations currently consists of 21 associations, which are offering a variety of services to local employers and workforce development agencies. The employer associations operating for the State of Connecticut and in Cleveland, Ohio are especially noteworthy.

Ms. Lynn-Dyson also spoke of the sectoral employment initiative of the Aspen Institute. The sectoral employment strategy was described in more detail by the session speaker Bruce Nauth, who outlined a health sector initiative in Minneapolis. Finally, Ms. Lynn-Dyson mentioned the efforts of the national office of Goodwill Industries, of the Families and Work Institute (working directly with employers to successfully employ low-income workers) and the Annie E. Casey Foundation's work around cultural competency that is targeted to human resources professionals working with low-income populations.

Cascade Engineering, Inc.

Cascade Engineering is based in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The firm has 1,100 employees and $215 million in annual sales. The firm is the recipient of many awards, including the Ron Brown award for corporate leadership. Cascade Engineering, Inc. became involved with the Minnesota Family Independence Agency because the company's CEO saw it as an opportunity to affect positive change in the community. The program, which the company runs in partnership with the Family Independence Agency, is called Work to Career or W2C. W2C's mission is to support unemployed and underemployed individuals as they move from welfare dependence to economic self-sufficiency.

The program's key factors to success are considered to be the company's culture, the systems of support it provides to the program's participants, employee benefits, and a focus on economic issues. The corporate culture also focuses on worthy goals, the 'seven habits of highly effective people,' and diversity.

The W2C program has an intake process during which Cascade Engineering makes a presentation at a local workforce development center. Caseworkers at the center assess the potential employee and Family Independence Agency specialists determine if the referral is appropriate for Cascade. Once hired, the new employee spends one week in orientation. Highlights of the orientation week include cultural assimilation, safety, diversity awareness, hidden rules, and the core competencies that are expected of the employee.

One full-time and one part-time specialist from the Family Independence Agency are located on the site of Cascade eight hours a day. They are available for counseling in all areas and can make

the necessary referrals to other agencies. Goodwill Industries also offers retention specialists who work at Cascade four hours a day, including night shifts. During the first two weeks of employment, the new employee also has a job coach. During the first year of employment, the Family Independence Agency specialists and the Goodwill Industry specialists provide daily feedback to one another and to the employee on his or her progress on the job. In addition to these intensive support systems, employees have access to various transportation, education and coaching, and mentoring support programs. Child care services are offered through an arrangement with a regional child care facility.

Work at Cascade Engineering offers a variety of career ladders for employees. Workers operate at four pay/skill levels, each level requiring a higher degree of technical and leadership competence. Some of the career ladders with the company include sales, engineering, production/inventory control, safety and performance, shipping and receiving, information systems, research, and development.

Key statistics for the program include:

- As of 2001, 91 W2C employees were working;
- Twenty-eight (28) W2C employees were totally self-sufficient; and
- A monthly W2C employee retention rate of 95 percent.

Twin Cities Regional Health Care Program

Dr. Nauth began his presentation by outlining the workforce shortage in Minnesota, particularly the shortage of heath care workers. For example, he noted that for Minnesota, there are 90 percent fewer new workers in 2010 than in 1970 and that 80 percent of the workforce is now working. He went on to note the increase in hospital visits, the widening gap between the supply and demand of Registered Nurses (RNs), and the largest number of job openings in the health care sector to be in the professions of nursing aides, licensed practical and vocation nurses, (LPN/LVN), home health aides, and other health care support workers. Some of the top ten health care occupations with job vacancies include nursing aides and attendants, LPNs, LVNs, and health care support workers.

The health services industry is expected to grow by 20 percent in the near future (with knowledge jobs), and 1 in 10 of the jobs expected to be created in Minnesota will be in health care. The fastest growing sector of the industry is home-based health care, although an additional 18,000 job openings are predicted to emerge in offices and clinics.

The Twin Cities Regional Health Care Program was created to begin to address some of these trends and statistics. The program was formed by a series of partnerships, involving six metro

workforce service areas, seven major healthcare facilities, a wide range of secondary and college institutions, and two major labor unions. The program targets a group of highly skilled (degree or five years of post secondary education) immigrant workers who are eligible for special funding through the H1B Visa program offered by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The H1B project currently serves 541 persons and provides targeted training in occupations such as mater's level nurses, registered nurse, LPNs, radiological technicians, phlebotomists, medical technicians, and medical coders.

Dr. Nauth pointed to a series of issues that have been important to the process of implementing this partnership with the H1B program. The issues include communication and coordination, capacity and access, and the development of customized training. Continuing challenges for the program include working among multiple agencies and deciding which healthcare shortage areas to focus on. The program is also grappling with ways to maintain the partnerships in order to develop new proposals to increase healthcare training opportunities and is seeking to establish additional partnerships with new agencies.

For the future, the program is also beginning to partner with schools to get youth involved with health careers, seeking ways to work with retirees and with legal immigrants and to begin to work with Hispanic, African-American, and Asian communities. Some of the policy issues the program is currently facing include finding ways to: re-define the tuition reimbursement policy; address the high turnover in health care staff; improve the work environment; and educate policymakers and communities about the needs and challenges.

6. ACADEMY DINNER: PARTNERING FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Ms. Lois Bell began the dinner session of the first full day of the Academy II with a thorough introduction of Ms. Deborah Blanks, Executive Director of the Social Development Commission in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Ms. Bell described Ms. Blanks' work experience and stated that the dinner speaker this evening would provide the audience with an intimate look at the impact of culture and dynamics and their ability to create sustainable community partnerships.

Ms. Blanks framed her presentation by outlining topic areas such as culture, poverty, the notion of progress, change, collaboration, community partnerships, and developing an understanding of the human condition. Weaving in readings of both poetry and prose, Ms. Blanks provided the audience a rich and thought-provoking discussion, grounded in her description of her organization, the Social Development Commission located in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Ms. Blanks often spoke broadly and conceptually about general topics of poverty, change, and the challenges of collaborations.

The Social Development Commission (SDC) is a social service coalition in Milwaukee, Wisconsin that has grown to include over forty diverse participant agencies. It is funded through a variety of sources, including private foundations, and has grown to support a $33 million annual budget. SDC receives the services of over 200 volunteers. It focuses on integrated service delivery, filling gaps, leveraging resources, and linking services to move individuals toward self-sufficiency. One integral service that the SDC provides is managed financial literacy training.

Ms. Blanks stressed the importance of community partnerships and collaboration by talking about the power of teamwork. She discussed the necessity of shared responsibility for a particular outcome and emphasized the decision to place the success of the team above one's individual needs. She explored how the notion of change can be scary at times, and stated that humans have the tendency to find comfort in the status quo. However, although change can be intimidating, sometimes there is intrinsic benefit in forcing an individual or an agency to break out of their comfort zone. Procrastinating change and speeding into progress unprepared both yield negative results. Ms. Blanks asserted that in today's complex world with so many challenges, we must be willing to step out into the unknown, overcome our fears, and embrace change. Specifically, human service agencies must find creative ways to collaborate successfully. If agencies truly respect those with whom they collaborate, they will trust others to lead at times and will share power with others.

Ms. Blanks also used vivid and detailed anecdotes to warn against the adverse ramifications of making policies without fully understanding the rich cultures of the people that those policies affect. She articulated the subtle positive and supportive cultures that exist in neighborhoods that are easily over-looked by short-sighted policies. She fervently stressed the point that leaders must be willing to listen, learn, and follow direction from those they seek to help. The infrastructure of neighborhoods needs to be understood and utilized. Building trust in community work requires that residents' views be valued and heard. For Ms. Blanks, policymakers should solicit the counsel of elders, neighbors, and respected neighborhood leaders. On the topic of youth, Ms. Blanks stressed the importance of teaching our youth about history and incorporating the voices of youth in community decisions as well. She stated that history can be used if we stop to figure out what has happened in the past so we can learn lessons and avoid past mistakes.

Ms. Blanks ended her presentation with a reiteration of her main points, stressing again the beauty of collaboration, the necessity of teamwork, the lessons from history, and the value in leading by listening. Through it all, we must build a partnership that can continue to implement change and achieve significant outcomes. She ended with her own quote: "There is no instant cure for dying hope. No endless search for misplaced trust. No safety net for age old fears. No finders fee for long lost dreams. Still, we must be the shining light that beckons to our tired, our weary, and our huddled masses yearning for prosperity. Because while charity and pity may be well-intentioned, there is no substitute for prosperity…As Langston Hughes once asked, 'Am I not America too?' If

that is true, then the American dream must be achievable by all, regardless of race, gender, or ethnicity. Only then can America the beautiful also be America the great."

7. SITE VISITS

7.1 MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center

The MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center is one of four large workforce centers within Hennepin County and provides a number of services not only to the TANF population but also to general job seekers and the employer community as well.

Hennepin North is a full service center with multiple partners housed within their facilities to ensure comprehensive service delivery. Partners and their programs include unemployment insurance, rehabilitation services, services for the blind, HIRED (provides employment, training, and case management services to the TANF population), Hennepin County Economic Assistance (partners with HIRED to serve the TANF population), and the North Hennepin Community College (which provides customized training, computer classes and certifications, and continuing education). Below is a listing of the center's services:

- Workshops (creative job search, resume strategies, interviewing techniques, networking, and dealing with job loss);
- North Hennepin Community College (The Center for Training and Development, and evening and Saturday classes);
- Job Club support groups (networking techniques and expert speakers);
- Vocational guidance (aptitude, interest, proficiency, and career exploration);
- Veterans services (placement, career counseling, and rehabilitative services);
- Rehabilitation services (career counseling, assessment, placement, training, and assistive technology); and
- Unemployment insurance (application, temporary wage replacement, reporting requirements, and placement).

In addition to their programs, Hennepin North has career resource center that is equipped with personal computers, word processing software, fax machines, Internet job banks, a resource library, classified ads, business publications, labor market information, and information on training opportunities. There are also job postings, brochures, and a variety of resource materials and tools located throughout the center for easy customer access. Hennepin North also provides a myriad of employer services including recruitment, interviewing space, outplacement services, seminars, labor market information, a quarterly employer newsletter, job fairs, and customized training.

7.2 Rise, Inc.

Rise, Inc. is a community-based employment program that offers various services to multiple hard-to-serve populations, including job training, job readiness, and direct employment. This vocational rehabilitation program began operations in 1971 under the basic principle that 'everyone should have a job, but it is up to community-based agencies to provide job supports.' Ninety percent of Rise, Inc. programs are community-based. Rise, Inc. includes over seventeen business office locations throughout the State of Minnesota that serve the Twin Cities metropolitan area as well as the smaller urban and rural areas in Central and East Central Minnesota.

This private, nonprofit organization is governed by a ten member, volunteer Board of Directors. John Barrett is the current Director of the program. The mission of Rise, Inc. reads: "Rise supports people who have disabilities and other barriers to employment so they may achieve their personal measure of vocational achievement, integrated employment, self-sufficiency, safe, and affordable housing, and belonging in their communities." Core focus areas of Rise, Inc. are unemployment, underemployment, and community integration.

Rise, Inc. uses multiple service models to provide responsive and flexible services to its diverse clientele. In one model, Rise, Inc. offers job placement services for individuals. The second model involves job placement of clusters of two to three individuals at 'group sites' where they can work together on the job. This model is particularly effective for clients with certain mental health issues because it affords them the social supports and companionship of a small group. A third service model offers direct employment to individuals with barriers to job attainment. In this model, Rise, Inc. runs a large factory that provides assembly line jobs and directly employs clients for a transitional period of time. They contract with large corporations such as Target for business operations and products.

In 2002, Rise, Inc. served a total of 3,041 individuals with barriers such as developmental disabilities, serious and persistent mental illnesses, learning disabilities, traumatic brain injuries, and dual sensory disabilities. Moreover, Rise, Inc. employs 304 service staff. Core program service strategies include: person-centered career planning, vocational evaluation, competitive job placement, job coaching, customized job training, supported employment, school-to-work transitional employment, and welfare-to-work services. Rise, Inc. also conducts targeted outreach to populations with barriers such as limited English proficiency (LEP), cultural immersion issues, lack of education, lack of transferable job skills, transportation issues, and undiagnosed disabilities.

In addition to its core focus of employment-related services, Rise, Inc. offers multiple other program service strategies, including: homelessness outreach, family homelessness prevention,

affordable housing services, transitional housing, supported living services, mental health case management, and respite care.

7.3 Employment Action Center

Twenty-one Academy II participants attended the site visit to the Employment Action Center (EAC). Site visit participants learned about the EAC and the variety of programs offered to help individuals and families achieve self-sufficiency. Highlights of the visit included a demonstration of the ESL – Voice Recognition program and a tour of the facility that allowed participants to observe clients in various programs.

The EAC is a nonprofit, community-based organization that has provided employment services for over 25 years. Minneapolis Family Independence Program (MFIP) clients are mandated to work with an employment service provider and develop an employment services plan. Since 1985, EAC has offered a variety of programs to MFIP clients. Most notably, the EAC's WINGS program focuses on front-end assessment to identify barriers to work. This program includes four locations serving MFIP clients and their mission is to encourage work, eliminate poverty, and reduce dependency on welfare. Examples of specialized services offered through the WINGS program include:

- Job placement, development, and coaching;
- Supported work;
- Volunteer internships;
- Career search;
- Resume writing;
- Family advocacy;
- Housing referrals;
- Budgeting;
- The Food Stamp program;
- Transition child care; and
- Debt consolidation.

In addition to State agency funding, EAC receives generous funding from the McKnight Foundation to provide specialized services to MFIP clients. The EAC has several programs specifically designed to assist clients with working toward and maintaining self- sufficiency: Supported Work, Minneapolis Model, Young Dads Program, ESL Software – Voice Recognition Program.

EAC's Supported Work program was established in 2001. The Supported Work program offers opportunities to clients seeking immediate employment, support services to employers, and continued assistance as successful candidates transition into permanent employment. Placement services are at no cost to the employer. Employability assessments, onsite job coaching, job search services, and employment workshops are available to program participants. Participants volunteer in a placement for two to four weeks, transition into the supported work phase for three months and then are assessed by the employer for permanent employment. Supported work placements are primarily in the retail, food service, and hotel industries. Employers do not guarantee permanent employment but an understanding exists that program participants are considered as first priority in filling vacant positions. There is also an explicit agreement from the employer that clients will not be used to fill vacant positions or laid-off workers during their participation in the program. The Supported Work program has a placement rate of seventy-five percent. A significant advantage of the program is their ability to act as an intermediary between the employer and client and offer supportive services throughout the placement.

Funded by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), the Minneapolis Model is similar to the Supported Work program. This program focuses on job retention and career advancement in the health care industry. The Minneapolis Model serves low-income and long-term MFIP clients but also provides supportive services to closed MFIP cases. The program boasts a strong base of employers and a strong relationship with two health care training facilities. Local community colleges also developed an ESL training curriculum that includes ESL – Voice Recognition Software.

The ESL – Voice Recognition program is designed to assist the acquisition of English literacy skills. Working with each individual student in a tutor-like style, the software employs several methods endorsed by experienced literacy trainers. These methods include:

- Repetition;
- Independent practice;
- Self-evaluation;
- Consistent language;
- Modeling pronunciation; and
- Identifying pronunciation errors.

Wearing a combination headset/microphone, students work with the software "e-books" at an individually determined pace. Reading levels can be adjusted by the instructor or can be set to "self-adjust" based on the student's progress. Each e-book contains 10-30 words unique to the subject matter. E-books use clear and simple language, definitions, and examples of technical vocabulary as well as graphics to illustrate concepts. Each e-book represents opportunities to practice words, read sentences, and answer questions to the content. Participants of EAC's literary

services and ESL – Voice Recognition Software have experienced many positive outcomes such as literacy gains and successful completion of occupational training.

The Young Dads program serves non-custodial fathers between ages 16-29. This 19-week program helps young fathers achieve stability and self-sufficiency in their lives and in their relationships with their children. Ninety percent of program participants are African-American. Many of the young fathers in the program face unstable housing, are homeless, or have criminal records. Program participants are typically referred to the Young Dads program through family court, probation, domestic violence service providers, or child protective services. Some examples of services offered through the Young Dads programs include:

- Father and child activities;
- Parenting skills;
- Career development;
- Training and employment;
- Child support;
- Paternity establishment;
- Legal aid;
- Housing;
- GED;
- Peer support; and
- Court-ordered anger management.

7.4 Site Visit Report Out

Facilitator: Kent Peterson, Caliber Associates

During this session of the Academy II, Mr. Kent Peterson facilitated an interactive discussion that gave participants a chance to reflect on lessons learned from the three concurrent site visits. Because no one person could be at all three sites at the same time, the session also provided an opportunity for attendees to share their experiences and compare and contrast the three sites. Mr. Peterson grouped participants into three clusters based on the site visit that they attended. He posed three questions for each group to answer:

- What surprised you about your site?
- What solution or practice did you see that meets a challenge that you have in your city?
- What did you expect to see but did not?

After a group brainstorming process during which each cluster was given time to respond to the three framing questions, one representative from each cluster reported their answers to all session participants. During these 'report-outs,' discussions touched on promising practices, challenges, and

solutions identified from the site visit. Mr. Peterson noted that the report-out session's success would be achieved if each team member could walk away with half a dozen service ideas in his/her head to take back home.

MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center

The majority of session participants attended this site visit to a local one-stop center which provides a wide array of different services. The group reported that numerous aspects of the visit were surprising to them. First, the location of the one-stop was unexpected. It was located in the suburbs of the Twin Cities in an industrial zone near other businesses. The size of MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center was also moderately surprising. The group reported that not only was this particular location a fairly large-sized facility, but this site also supports different locations throughout the metropolitan area. Lastly, the use of audio-assisted computers was impressive to the group.

MDES Hennepin North is a one-stop that is comprised of 22 different nonprofit organizations. The Academy II participants that visited this one-stop were pleased with the collaborative team approach that MDES Hennepin North used to foster cooperation between the numerous nonprofits. Such effective collaboration was described as a solution to meet the needs of multiple city teams. Moreover, this cluster was particularly enthusiastic about the processing file management system that they observed at MDES Hennepin North. This MIS system allows workers to obtain access to client data on a secure database and alleviates the need for burdensome amounts of paperwork.

The team representative reported that their group was disappointed not to see on-site eligibility services offered at the one-stop. Due to this service gap, clients must enter the system downtown before they can receive services from MDES Hennepin North. The lack of on-site daycare also surprised the team.

Rise, Inc.

The group of Academy II participants that visited Rise, Inc. were surprised to see that this nonprofit actually employs clients directly on site. Also, they did not expect to see the diversity of the clientele of Rise, Inc. as they witnessed immigrants, welfare-to-work clients, and individuals with serious disabilities all working side by side in assembly line fashion. Moreover, the group was impressed with the sheer size of Rise, Inc. The group representative described the location as "humongous."

The group representative also reported that Rise, Inc. offered numerous service solutions that met the needs of the city teams back home. The city team representatives that visited Rise, Inc. agreed that the high percentage (ninety percent) of minority staff in the welfare-to-work program

was a definite plus. The team also highlighted the benefits of Rise's 90-day job transition program. To discourage dependence or falling into a routine, Rise, Inc. does not allow direct employee clients to maintain employment there for more than approximately three months. This policy encourages clients to continue to strive toward self-sufficiency during their period of transitional employment with Rise. Other observed service solutions included Rise's job mentoring, job coaching, and summer youth employment program for high school youth. Classrooms were the only thing that this site visit team expected to see but did not. They did not expect that Rise, Inc. would be totally employment-focused.

Employment Action Center (EAC)

The team that visited the EAC was primarily surprised by the high-technology capabilities of the nonprofit. An impressive software package for English as a Second Language (ESL) clients thoroughly impressed the group. This work-related program utilizes voice recognition software to guide clients through various training courses on topics such as how to fill out job applications and how to apply for a Driver's License. The EAC also offers a Driver's Training service model that uses a high-tech driving simulator to help people learn how to drive. The site visit team also did not expect to see the large staff amount of the EAC.

As a program that offers solutions and meets needs, this group highlighted EAC's Young Dad's program, which serves individuals ages 16-29. This program provides services related to housing, securing employment, paying child support, filing court petitions, and other general assistance. The group also spotlight EAC's Project Uplift, which is a forklift operation training program. The group expected a visit that only touched on broad service concepts in a short amount of time, and thus were impressed by the level of specificity of their visit.

8. INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO PROMOTE HEALTHY MARRIAGES

Mr. Grant E. Collins II moderated this Academy II session entitled, "Innovative Approaches to Promote Health Marriages." Panel presenters included Ms. Mary Myrick of the Oklahoma Marriage Initiative and Mr. Rozario Slack of First Things First in Tennessee.

8.1 The Panel Presentation

The healthy marriage agenda focuses on promoting the well-being of children and encouraging healthy marriage among couples by helping them develop the skills and knowledge to form and sustain healthy marriages. Research has shown that, on average, children raised in households headed by married parents fare better than children who grow up in other family structures. The goal of the Healthy Marriage Initiative is to reduce the divorce rate, strengthen families, and reduce dependence on government programs. This session highlighted a State and a community-based model, both of which use innovative strategies to promote healthy marriage.

There is some misunderstanding and mythology surrounding the Healthy Marriage Initiative. The Healthy Marriage Initiative is not Federally-mandated but is a base of separate funding from the State's TANF block grant. Moreover, the marriage agenda is not a personal or specific discussion, but rather one that is applicable to everyone regardless of single or married status. On average, research demonstrates that adults and their children are happier and healthier in marriage. This finding, however, does not discount the strengths and successes of single parents who have and are raising healthy children. As outlined within the Healthy Marriage Initiative, the purpose of the initiative is defined as "to help couples who choose marriage for themselves develop the skills and knowledge that will help them form and sustain a healthy relationship". Critical questions include: If people *choose* marriage, can we support these couples with their choice to marry? Can we give them the skills and education to strengthen their marriage? Marriage is not a panacea; however marriage does present the best way to be involved in children's lives and to form healthy relationships.

Healthy marriage proponents want to normalize the discussion about healthy marriages. This initiative is not an attempt to "get people married" but rather an endeavor to change and reframe people's thinking about marriage. As an example, Oklahoma has commenced a State Healthy Marriage Initiative and reframed its perspective on marriage. Social service professionals in Oklahoma examined the TANF caseload and asked, "What is the nature of their personal relationships? Who is married or single?" Oklahoma found that forty-one percent of TANF clients had been married and thirty-one percent were married. These were surprising numbers for Oklahoma. The discovery of these statistics forced professionals and policy-makers in Oklahoma to consider that perhaps they had an incomplete picture of their TANF population and the types of services they could offer to support families. The Oklahoma Marriage Initiative provides marriage and healthy relationship activities to a wide range of individuals, organizations, and cultural groups. Over 1,000 people have been trained to conduct marriage classes, which are offered in high schools, churches, prisons, TANF workforce centers, and other locations. The most significant outcome is clients' reports that marriage education gives them "hope" and a different perspective on marriage.

Mr. Slack, through his work in Tennessee, found that the ninety percent of prisoners participating in prison parenting class were married. As a result, a Tennessee prison elected to provide an eight-week fatherhood and healthy marriage program for incarcerated individuals. Mr. Slack suggested that programs consider marriage activities in the broader range of available services. Fatherhood, parenting, and marriage programs are viable and applicable services for TANF clients. It was recommended that programs integrate a "relationship or marriage" component into existing services. For example, prisons can consider piloting a marriage program in a piece of their larger system. Oklahoma collaborated with the Department of Corrections to conduct three pilot classes in their prisons. This pilot yielded interesting results regarding recidivism. They found that the

primary factor for recidivism involved the types of relationships and supportive networks prisoners returned to upon their release.

The current Administration is still exploring what programs work and what programs are unsuccessful, thus funding for healthy marriage activities is currently provided though demonstration grants. The Administration, however, will be offering $100 million via a Federal match to States who choose to offer marriage activities. $100 million will be set aside to community-based organizations in a competitive award process to promote healthy marriages. There are no definitive answers regarding the effectiveness of healthy marriage activities until communities implement programs, monitor progress, and produce results for analysis.

8.2 Questions and Answers

Question: How did Oklahoma establish their priorities among a wide range of services?

- **Ms. Myrick:** Oklahoma used ten percent of their reserve and applied it to prevention services. This amount actually totaled about 1 percent of their total budget. Currently, Oklahoma spends about $3 million a year on their healthy marriage initiative. They hope for additional funding for prevention activities.

Question: How has Oklahoma measured the success and impact of the healthy marriage initiative on sustaining healthy families and the well being of children?

- **Ms. Myrick:** It is difficult to discern how one program impacts a variable in the context of other programs. Research is underway in an attempt to flesh out these issues. Research, however, needs to focus on improving programs, documenting the process and gaining lessons learned for best practice.

Question: Are faith-based organizations involved in Oklahoma's Healthy Marriage Initiative?

- **Ms. Myrick:** Faith-based organizations are involved in Oklahoma's marriage initiative. There are, however, erroneous assumptions about the role faith based organizations play in promoting or supporting marriages. It is falsely assumed that all faith-based organizations provide marital counseling or support. This is inaccurate as some faith-based organizations are a critical partner with couples while others do not provide this support due to inadequate resources or skill. In Okalahoma, some faith-based organizations are changing their paradigm on how to conduct pre-marital counseling.

9. ACADEMY LUNCHEON: THE HEALTHY MARRIAGE INITIATVE

While the previous session of Academy II touched on the topic of healthy marriages through a panel presentation of two innovative models in Oklahoma and Tennessee, this luncheon presentation occurred before the entire Academy II audience and went into further detail about the Administration's Healthy Marriage Initiative.

Ms. Brenda Benesch began the lunchtime presentation with a brief introduction of Mr. Grant Collins. Mr. Collins then gave a thorough presentation of various aspects of the Healthy Marriage Initiative.

9.1 The Federal Healthy Marriage Initiative

Before beginning his presentation on marriage, Mr. Collins framed the context of the discussion with some relevant background information about welfare reform and TANF. He reiterated that the TANF program is administered by the Office of Family Assistance and is the cash assistance program for the country. Annual TANF block grants to States amount to $17 billion. Mr. Collins outlined the four main purposes of the TANF program, reminding listeners that TANF seeks to achieve broader goals than solely to provide economic assistance to families. TANF also aims to prevent out-of-wedlock pregnancies and to encourage the formation of two-parent families. The Healthy Marriage Initiative supports these two often over-looked goals of TANF. Mr. Collins stressed that welfare reform was always about strengthening families to the highest degree possible.

Mr. Collins also described the many components of the current TANF reauthorization proposal being considered by Congress. Some of these components include: strengthening the Federal-State partnership, maximizing work activities, improving program performance, facilitating program and service integration, enhancing child support enforcement, and encouraging abstinence and teen pregnancy prevention all within the over-arching purpose of promoting the well-being of children and families.

Mr. Collins agreed that government should not be in the business of creating bad marriages. He did, however, cite numerous research findings that suggest the positive outcomes associated with healthy marriage. Mr. Collins emphasized that the data is clear: on the average, children raised by married couples are more likely to experience numerous positive outcomes than children raised by single parents. He enumerated some of these positive outcomes to be a reduced likelihood of suffering from behavioral problems, a reduced likelihood of committing a crime or spending time in jail by age 30, and a reduced likelihood of being victims of physical and sexual childhood abuse. Moreover, 74 percent of the government money spent on child welfare focuses on single-parent families.

Mr. Collins elaborated the Federal reasoning behind providing money for demonstration programs instead of earmarking the TANF block grant. The Federal government aims to learn from the States and use the wisdom of the States to explore new programs, much in the same way that States innovated around work. He also corrected myths surrounding the Healthy Marriage Initiative about funding and allocations of Federal money. Mr. Collins encouraged States to create competitive proposals to the Federal government and generate ideas around marriage. He emphasized the considerable flexibility that this initiative contains: a city can apply, as can a county,

or a collection of counties. This Federal initiative is structured to allow communities to decide for themselves the best way to promote healthy marriage, so they can be competitive with other communities across the nation.

In closing, Mr. Collins brainstormed many ideas for the audience that would constitute a general set of allowable marriage promotion activities. These include:

- Public advertising campaigns: flyers, billboards, and media;
- Marriage education: both in schools and for adults;
- Premarital education and counseling; and
- Mentoring programs.

He also ended by correcting myths about what the Healthy Marriage Initiative is not. This initiative was never about marrying off welfare recipients, nor has it ever been a Federal dating service. Rather, this initiative is about imparting skills and knowledge to those individuals who have chosen marriage and what it really means to the well-being of children. It is an initiative that is focusing on marriage, within the over-arching purpose of TANF to promote the well-being of children.

9.2 The African-American Healthy Marriage Initiative

Ms. Joyce Thomas, Regional Administrator for ACF Region V, followed Mr. Collins presentation with a discussion on the African-American Healthy Marriage Initiative (AAHMI) on the behalf of the President and ACF's Healthy Marriage Initiative. She reiterated and elaborated many of Mr. Collins points about the purposes of TANF, the benefits of marriage, and the overall focus on child well-being. She framed her presentation from the angle of a State Administrator who supports the healthy marriage initiative, both from a Federal perspective and also in her State.

Ms. Thomas stressed the notion of choice as it applies to the healthy marriage initiative. She sought to correct the misconception that this project is somehow about forcing people to get married. On the contrary, the operative word in this proposal is choice. This initiative will provide support to families who choose marriage, while not withdrawing support for single parents. Ms. Thomas also recognized that the healthy marriage initiative does not claim to be the panacea for poverty or the single solution for the social ills in America. Instead, this initiative is thought of as one more tool in families' toolkits that can be used to strengthen families and foster positive outcomes for children.

One of the positive developments within the healthy marriage initiative is the creation of broad-based community coalitions on marriage that will explore and demonstrate the implementation of the initiative. Ms. Thomas described the Grand Rapids, Michigan healthy

marriage waiver, which works in conjunction with child support, TANF, faith-based organizations, and community-based organizations to provide marriage enrichment activities through counseling, mentoring, employment services, and other social service programs for couples who choose marriage for themselves. She also touched on Virginia and Idaho as two other States that have already receiving funding.

One cornerstone of Ms. Thomas' presentation focused on correcting the misconception that the healthy marriage initiative is only for mainstream, middle class, Caucasian Americans. She stressed the importance of the African-American Healthy Marriage Initiative as well, which formed to combat certain societal trends such as the reality that African-Americans are less likely than any other American ethnic group to ever marry. As recently as 1960, as many as 75 percent of African-American children were born to married couples. At present, the data indicates that 69-70 percent of African-American children are born to single heads of households. Furthermore, the data also suggests that African-American children are only half as likely as Caucasian children to live in a married couple household.

The AAHMI is a component of the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Healthy Marriage Initiative (HMI). It supports all the same principles and purposes as the broader HMI, but specifically targets the African-American community. The AAHMI is conducting a variety of activities to support marriage for African-Americans. First, AAHMI supports educational forums, roundtable discussions, and community partnerships to foster healthy marriages for African-Americans. One initial roundtable discussion has already occurred in Washington, D.C. in August 2003. The AAHMI also collaborates with Essence Magazine and key players in industries such as rap, music, and entertainment. Moreover, the AAHMI has formed partnerships with historical black colleges and working with students to change curricula in schools. AAHMI runs a listserv to disseminate information across the nation, and it funds institutions to conduct tailored and targeted research on African-Americans and marriage. The AAHMI also has generated a substantial amount of national interest and has identified 31 communities throughout the nation that are interested in establishing partnerships with the AAHMI. Lastly, the AAHMI is sponsoring three forums to discuss various aspects of how the AAHMI can promote marriage within the African-American culture. The first already occurred in November 2003 in Atlanta, Georgia. The second is scheduled to occur in Dallas, Texas in January 2004, and the third is scheduled to occur in Chicago, Illinois in April 2004.

9.3 Questions and Answers

Question: Is the HMI targeted for those that have already chosen marriage and selected a partner or is it intended to get people to want to marry? To me, those are very different audiences. What is the primary audience of this marriage initiative?

- **Mr. Collins:** Our goal really is to help those who have chosen marriage for themselves to maintain those skills and relationships. As I indicated before, this initiative is not

about setting up services to help individuals get married. This initiative focuses more on educating communities about the benefits of healthy marriage. The initial focus of this initiative is on maintaining those couples who have chosen marriage.

Question: Within the reauthorization proposal before Congress, what is the relationship between HMI funding and funding available for fatherhood programs? The purposes of these two pots of funding seem to be related, so why is the funding kept separate? I see both as part of a larger whole.

- **Mr. Collins:** The purpose of the marriage demonstration money is for the Federal government to learn from innovations in the States. If States want to integrate a fatherhood component into their marriage initiative, they have the flexibility to do that.

Question: Which is this Administration prioritizing more: fatherhood or marriage? For me, the fatherhood aspect is as important or more important than the focus on marriage.

- **Mr. Collins:** The beauty of the HMI is that it affords States and communities the flexibility to focus on whichever aspect of healthy marriages that they feel is the most important. If you feel fatherhood is the cornerstone, this initiative provides you with the flexibility to tailor your State or community proposal in that fashion.
- **Mr. Slack:** We do not have the luxury of making marriage initiatives and fatherhood initiatives mutually exclusive. If you see these joint projects on the same continuum, you can do both, under either guise. If you see them as linked, link them.
- **Ms. Thomas:** The government does not view the marriage initiative and fatherhood initiatives as mutually exclusive. We agree that the purposes of both are related. I can assure you that proponents of fatherhood are very much a part of the discussion on healthy marriages, at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Question: One of the great disincentives to marriage are accumulative child support arrears. How will this Administration address this disincentive?

- **Mr. Collins:** There is sufficient flexibility in the proposal to allow your community to focus your efforts on whatever aspect of marriage that you feel is the most important.

10. WORKSHOPS

10.1 Specialized Service Program Strategies

Speakers: Anne Lafferty, Interim Program Manager, Lutheran Social Services

Travis Zimmerman, Director of the Minnesota Family Investment Program, American Indian Operational Industrialization Center

Moderator: Lien Bragg, Caliber Associates

This session addressed strategies for working with unique ethnic populations, such as refugees and Native Americans. Panel presenters discussed cultural diversity and innovative solutions for working with diverse TANF populations.

Lutheran Social Services operates Tier I and II (intensive services) within the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and a supported work program for a largely limited English-speaking population – predominantly Hmong and Somali. In addition to employment services, they provide resettlement services for newly arrived immigrants. In their employment services division, a pilot program was implemented that offers specialized services to clients. Case managers serve a caseload of twenty-five clients, of which approximately half are refugees. The pilot program is funded through MFIP and is only available to Tier II MFIP clients. Tier II clients are primarily those designated as hard-to-serve or long-term welfare recipients. The ethnic diversity of the Lutheran Social Services staff maximizes the agency's ability to provide culturally competent services.

Some of the services provided to clients include job skills workshops, job search, job coaching, transportation, and volunteer opportunities. Their most critical service is the Supported Work program. In this program, clients undergo a comprehensive assessment that examines areas such as personal and structural barriers, health status, education, family supports, etc. In cases where mental health issues are identified, a staff psychologist is available to conduct psychological evaluations. The program has found that many refugee clients suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). In addition, learning disabilities are frequently identified among their client population. An assessment instrument is used to determine if clients with limited English proficiency (LEP) are actually learning disabled. There is also an ESL assessment, but the program has found that some of their clients do not read or write in their primary language. The program also assists clients with accessing Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and will conduct a basic skills assessment to determine if clients have transferable skills. The most common job placements among their clients are as a home health aid or in home child care.

The mission of the American Indian Operational Industrialization Center (OIC) is "to provide training, employment and economic development opportunities for unemployed and underemployed American Indian people in a culturally conducive atmosphere that addresses the needs of the whole person and families." American Indian OIC has 200 contracted slots with a client population that is comprised of 70 percent American Indian and 20 percent Somali. Case managers serve a caseload of approximately 75-80 clients. The American Indian OIC has operated for twenty-five years, and it is the only American Indian OIC in the country. Statistical data show that:

- On a per capita basis, American Indians have a prison incarceration rate of approximately 38 percent higher than the national rate.
- American Indians experience per capita rates of violence twice as high than the general population.
- Nationwide reservation unemployment is 50.42 percent as compared to the 6.3 percent for the total U.S. population.

- As compared to the general population, American Indians are behind on education, health, and median income.
- Between 1996-2000, the number of American Indians on MFIP rose by 14 percent, representing the only racial/ethnic group whose numbers increased during that time period.
- In Minnesota, American Indians on MFIP have the lowest exit rates off of welfare and the highest rates of MFIP recipients that are unemployed.

Mr. Zimmerman outlined how American Indians face three levels of barriers to self-sufficiency: personal barriers such as transportation, childcare, housing, mental health, and substance abuse; systems barriers comprised of culturally unaware service providers and the lack of culturally specific programming; and societal barriers involving societal and institutional racism, discrimination, and oppression.

The cultural values of American Indians are not integrated into, or congruent with, values of the current welfare system. For example, savings and checking accounts are not important to American Indians because they do not believe in saving for the future but rather living in the present. Also, the communication styles between the Anglo and American Indian culture are vastly different. For example, American Indians are modest by nature and not comfortable or familiar with promoting their attributes or accomplishments, which can be difficult for them when interviewing with employers. Finally, popular stereotypes about American Indians reinforce erroneous beliefs about, and culturally insensitive practice with, American Indians in the welfare system. For example, many people assume that there is a great degree of homogeneity among American Indians, when there are actually over 50 different tribes. Moreover, the stereotypical behaviors of alcoholism and gambling are assumed to be prevalent in the American Indian culture. These stereotypes have the potential to cause TANF case managers to believe that American Indians do not need or deserve government assistance.

Mr. Zimmerman's presentation asked the question: how can American Indians be successful in TANF programs? His answer focused on integrating cultural values into case practice that are more in line with American Indian beliefs so that clients feel valued by and trust in a system that has historically not aligned with their cultural beliefs practices. Mr. Zimmerman's other recommendations for working with American Indians include:

- Build trust and a personal relationship;
- Demonstrate genuine concern and caring;
- Be sensitive to cultural experiences and beliefs;
- Communicate effectively by using more personal forms of interaction;
- Be mindful of one's tone of voice and eye to eye contact;
- Avoid generalizations and stereotypes;
- Admit lack of awareness and be willing to learn;

- Accept differences; and
- Build on strengths.

10.2 Non-Custodial Parents

This session of Academy II was moderated by Mr. Al Maurice Fleming of the Office of Family Assistance (OFA). Mr. Fleming began the session with some introductory remarks and introductions of both speakers. Mr. Andrew Freeburg, Executive Director of the Minneapolis FATHER project, first presented on a summary description of his program. It is one of 10 national demonstration sites. The project was created in the 1990s with support from the Ford Foundation and the DHHS Office of Child Support Enforcement (OSCE). In Minneapolis, the project was developed through a partnership involving the Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board and two other local and city government agencies.

The overwhelming challenge of the project has been to engage men and involve them in the program. Referrals to the program come from two full-time outreach workers who work closely with local paternity courts and local job banks to identify participants. Men who participate range in age from 18 to 30 and average two children. Only 50 percent of the men have GEDs, and 50 percent have misdemeanors on their criminal records. In addition, a high percentage of the participants are likely to be substance abusers, although this trend is not confirmed in a formal way. Eighty percent of participants are African-American, and ten percent are American Indian. There are 50 participants in each beginning session, and the program is one year in duration from the time of placement. Participants, however, are encouraged to continue a connection to the program after their one year of active program participation.

The program begins with a one-week orientation during which the message is stressed that men are first and foremost fathers. The program then moves to other modules such as employment and training, counseling, job support, parenting education and child development, and support groups which are offered two days a week. The program emphasizes the importance of the group support experience and works to build and nurture self-esteem and to help men with establishing paternity.

Important components of the program include: having a staff attorney, working on child support, employment, and training issues, and having a case management staff in place. Case managers do accompany participants to court and 60 percent of the participants work with job counselors employed by the program. Program achievements include having enrolled 400 men (since 1999), with approximately 125 enrolled each year.

Additional program components include working with participants to end their child support arrearages (in part, by developing a forgiveness program through the project), and working

to help participants re-instate their driver's licenses (under waiver arrangements with some restrictions)

New highlights to the program include the addition of a GED program. Other additions under consideration include adding additional attorneys to the staff, perhaps adding a pregnancy prevention education piece (by working with public health nursing staff), and an effort to help participants expunge criminal records.

Sentencing to Service Program

This program was created in January 2000 and has served 101 men who are incarcerated in minimum security prisons. The focus of the program is training these men in the construction trades, specifically residential home construction. Funding partners in the effort have included the Hennepin County Community Corrections, Minnesota Employment and Training, and the local Labor Relations Board. Habitat for Humanity is the primary partner in the home construction phase of the program.

The program began by working with 80 abandoned homes. The program draws its participants from three minimum security prisons. Between 35 and 45 men are interviewed at the prison to fill the seven slots that comprise a program work-team. One crew foreman is assigned to the seven person crew. Crew foremen, who have been some of the harder positions to fill in the program, are generally retired carpenters. The program recently began its first all female crew comprised of five individuals. (It is the fifth crew to begin during the life of the program).

The Sentencing to Service Program is a six to eight week training program. The first two weeks are an introduction to the trades. Once the training is completed, program participants work for six and a half months constructing an entire house. During this phase, program participants work on life skills along with learning construction skills. During this final phase of the program, participants can remain in the program up to one year and continue on home construction. Most of the participants who remain in the program still have remaining prison time to serve. Many of the participants who graduate from the program after the one year mark are hired by local contractors and are paid a flat rate of $460 a week. While working in the program, participants are paid one dollar an hour. The program costs between $100,000 and $110,000 a year to operate, or roughly $8,000-$10,000 per participant. Seventy-five percent of the program participants are minorities, and no sex offenders are granted admission to the program.

Some of the program's important outcome statistics include:

- Sixty-five (65) percent of the men who have entered the program succeed (i.e., they do not return to prison and they obtain full-time jobs).

- Forty-one (41) of the 101 men who have completed the program are working in construction trades.
- Twenty-one (21) women began in the program, 18 completed the program. 11 of the 18 are in the construction trades and three are union carpenters. Union carpenters can make between $28 and $38 an hour.

10.3 Defining the Optimal Workforce System

In her role as Director of Policy for the South Florida Workforce Board, Dr. Nancy Weinberg conceives of strategic planning as the research component of public policy. Because the workforce system is an organic entity which is constantly evolving, organizations need to be reflective of their workforce system on an ongoing basis. In addition, policy research is geared at a systems level and is closely interrelated to the strategic planning process.

Dr. Weinberg provided an overview of the individual processes of policy research, and identified the following research questions: what is the workforce organization doing; how is the organization doing things; and what changes could improve the local workforce system. In addition, she discussed her data collection method in which she held individual interviews and focus groups with four identified stakeholders (e.g., administrative staff, service providers, workforce clients, and employers). She described the various components of her initial policy report, including: descriptive information about the local community; the importance of establishing goals and priorities; an assessment of the structural elements of the workforce system; an assessment of South Florida Workforce's activities; and a discussion regarding community linkages.

Dr. Weinberg then concluded her presentation with a piece on next steps, which are to refine the descriptive picture of the system, identify ways to incorporate additional stakeholders into the system, in depth studies about issues raised in the first phase of the report, and additional issues raised in future descriptive assessments.

Dr. Weinberg then introduced her presentation partner, Mr. Ramon Martinez, who stated that the overarching purpose of his presentation was to outline a framework for strategic planning that the other cities could use in their community to define the optimal workforce system. Mr. Martinez then articulated an overview of the South Florida Workforce strategic planning process, which is a three-phase model (think, translate, and implement).

Mr. Martinez offered the justification for the strategic planning process as a need to plan for change, manage for results, and gauge customer support. He then offered an overview of the South Florida Workforce System Strategic Planning Model, which includes the following components:

- Internal and external auditing;
- Project a winning profile (identify strategic issues);

- Develop a mission, core values, and vision;
- Formulate a grand strategy;
- Prepare a strategic plan; and
- Implement and evaluate the plan.

Mr. Martinez described each of the planning components and addressed the stakeholders involved in the strategic planning process, which are the organization's board of directors, the planning committee, and the strategic planning workgroup.

This session concluded with numerous questions from the audience and an exchange of contact information where the audience could contact Dr. Weinberg and Mr. Martinez for further discussion.

10.4 Strategies to Meeting the 20 percent Limit

Mr. Grant E. Collins II moderated this Academy II workshop entitled "Strategies to Meeting the 20 percent limit." Mr. Collins framed the context for the session by describing how urban areas tend to comprise a large proportion of their State's TANF caseload. Specifically, the ten cities of the Urban Partnerships Initiative were chosen due to their high TANF caseloads and their disproportionate amounts of cases in their respective States. Mr. Collins stated his hope that this Academy II session would provide innovative strategies and guidance for the participating cities on how to meet their 20 percent limit of hardship exemptions.

Following Mr. Collins' introductory remarks, Mr. Doug Howard gave a detailed and thorough presentation about the 20 percent limit that drew on his extensive experience in State TANF agencies. Mr. Howard was a former TANF Director for the State of Michigan and has gleaned a great deal of knowledge about program administration throughout his career. Mr. Howard emphasized the overall point that his presentation would not provide any concrete quick-fixes for each State regarding the 20 percent limit. While he could describe the experiences of other States grappling with the same problem, ultimately, each State's answer will be different and must be tailored to the specific context of that State.

Mr. Howard began his presentation with some background information about welfare reform and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) passed in 1996. PRWORA included a number of provisions, one of which was the notion of time limits. This legislation established a 60-month lifetime limit on the receipt of Federal cash benefits, and the "clock" started counting these limits for each State in or between September 1996 and July 1997. Mr. Howard provided the statistic that approximately 55 percent of families in the national TANF cash caseload are subject to time limits. The 20 percent limit refers to the PRWORA

provision that 20 percent of the average monthly caseload can be exempted from time limits under State defined hardship.

Mr. Howard described the types of TANF cases that are exempted from Federal time limits. Child-only cases, non-assistance cases, State-only funded cases, and certain pregnant minors represent a few groups that are not subject to Federal time limits. Mr. Howard also elaborated on different types of State time limits and the number of States that have adopted each type:

- Lifetime - These States strictly apply the 60 month time limit;
- Fixed period - These States apply time limits to a subset of the lifetime limit, such as 24 months in a 60 month period; and
- Automatic versus reviewed - In these States, a review process occurs before time limits are started.

In his discussion, he also articulated the State flexibilities surrounding options to extend time limits such as the ability for TANF clients to 'earn back' time that has elapsed through a State-determined stipulation. States also have extended time limits through 'stop the clock' or 'time out' policies. As he went through each item, Mr. Howard explored the pros and cons associated with each State policy.

During one portion of his presentation, Mr. Howard discussed the potential TANF reauthorization issues that are associated with or related to Federal time limits. These issues mostly involve State flexibility in the use of Maintenance of Effort (MOE) money and State reporting requirements. The caseload reduction credit is another reauthorization issue that Mr. Howard predicted will most likely be reduced, phased out, eliminated, or re-indexed. Congress wants to make sure that State TANF programs are being implemented consistently, and the General Accounting Office (GAO) is monitoring implementation of the 20 percent limit and the use of Separate State programs. Furthermore, Mr. Howard forecasted that in terms of increased work rates, the increase from 50 percent to 70 percent will most likely pass.

Individuals and cases that most often exceed Federal time limits for TANF cash assistance include:

- Persons with severe barriers and multiple, intensive service needs;
- Those who 'cycle' on and off TANF; or
- Families with little evidence of barriers but have a poor or non-existent work history.

Mr. Howard cited a July 2002 study conducted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) that researched trends in case characteristics for those that hit Federal time limits. Findings from this study suggest that as compared to families who exit welfare for other reasons, TANF cases that reach time limits tend to:

- Be larger families;
- Use public or subsidized housing at higher rates;
- Are less likely to have a high school education;
- Represent a higher proportion of African-Americans; and
- Have low income levels.

States have successfully excluded 11 percent of families with adults who receive State/Federal cash assistance from Federal time limits. Mr. Howard described three strategies that States have used to achieve this percentage of exclusion: waivers from the pre-welfare reform era (43 percent of cases); the Federal 20 percent hardship limit (11 percent of cases); and State-only funds (45 percent of cases).

Mr. Howard described the 20 percent hardship exemption as "essentially a remediation strategy" but challenged States in attendance to find ways to prevent the need to fully utilize the 20 percent. In this sense, Mr. Howard explored the strategic differences between using the 20 percent exemption as a remediation strategy or a prevention strategy. He also elaborated the differences between exemptions and extensions for the TANF caseload and State reasons for choosing either approach.

Mr. Howard ended his workshop presentation by providing the audience with two main strategies for addressing the 20 percent hardship exemption: a family engagement focus and a service focus. Under the family engagement focus, Mr. Howard offered four solutions:

- Engage the whole family in services instead of only one member of the family;
- Encourage families to break routines, so they do not get used to staying at home and not working;
- Find motivators for families to begin work, such as the desire to provide for children; and
- Talk to families and listen to their needs.

Solutions offered from the service focus include:

- Home Visits - Although they may be time and labor intensive, they teach case workers a lot about families and focus services on quality instead of quantity.
- Intensive case management - Must be continuous and include frequent assessments.
- The Sheltered Workshop Concept - Focuses on exposure to new services and breaking routines.
- Encourage families to engage in community service - Serves to help them break the routine of not working.
- Referral services - Helps families build networks and eventually find work.

- Engage faith-based organizations (FBOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) in referrals, outreach, and capacity-building.
- Attitude is important - Always strive for success and truly believe that all cases can be engaged in progress and work.

11. CITY TEAM-BUILDING

During this session of the Academy II, open-ended time was allotted for city team-building activities that the cities could design at their discretion. The majority of city teams met amongst themselves in their team suites to discuss lessons learned thus far into the Academy II. Some city teams held discussions to integrate new insights gained from different sessions of Academy II into their strategic plans. The teams conferred about their strategic plans and formulated strategies, roles, and action items for the remainder of Academy II.

12. CITY-TO-CITY DIALOGUES

These simultaneous morning sessions provided opportunities for city teams to engage each other in small group discussions in their team suites. In these informal settings, each city hosted a discussion to share their highlighted programs, strategic plan, implementation strategies, and lessons learned. These venues fostered rich dialogue and interaction between cities as the city teams were able to ask questions and provide recommendations to each other. City teams conversed around innovative practices, solutions, common challenges, and barriers to services. These sessions gave cities the chance to elaborate certain aspects of their strategic plan or highlight different parts of their strategic plan that they may not have had time to cover during the Strategic Plan Updates (see Section 3). The city-to-city dialogues also afforded cities the opportunity to ask questions and problem solve together about strategy as described in previous sessions of Academy II such as the workshops, breakouts, panel presentations, and site visits. The following list describes the topic area that each city discussed:

- **Atlanta:** Developing plans for an employment services delivery system.
- **Baltimore:** Housing, TANF, and WIA collaboration.
- **Detroit:** Removing barriers through information exchange.
- **Grand Prairie:** Strategies for serving TANF participants with disabilities.
- **Miami**: Domestic violence programs.
- **Minneapolis**: Behavioral health screening and access to HMO-based assessment services.
- **Oakland**: A health care sector initiative.
- **Omaha**: Developing EITC partnerships.
- **Seattle**: Partnering with the faith-based community organizations.

- **St. Louis:** Co-location of service providers for case management.

13. NEXT STEPS

In this session facilitated by Kent Peterson, cities participated in an interactive discussion regarding their next steps based on the information gathered during discussions held at Academy II. Each city answered the following question: "What is important for you to do when you return?"

An announcement from Mr. Dail Moore, Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE), was made prior to the start of this session. The OCSE developed a "Collaboration Training Packet" designed to improve services for TANF participants and performance measures for district and regional managers in child support, TANF, and workforce development. A pilot training on the packet is scheduled to occur in Philadelphia with seven to eight more trainings projected to occur in other cities. The training sites will be selected based upon the feedback of regional offices and State directors in all three divisions. If interested in attending the Philadelphia training, cities are to contact their State Director or Mr. Dail Moore at (202) 401-3438 or dmoore@acf.hhs.gov.

Mr. Grant Collins concluded the session by stating that cities need to interface more with one another via technology. Mr. Collins asked if cities would be interested in having a secured learning environment similar to the one offered through the Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network (www.peerta.acf.hhs.gov). He asked if this environment would be a helpful medium for facilitating communication between the cities with each other and with the Federal partners. This vehicle would not replace the Academy but would serve as another tool for communication. Cities responded with interest and asked for training on how to use a secured learning environment. Cities also mentioned that the Urban Partnerships Initiative list serve has been helpful with conveying information and keeping them on task with the Urban Partnerships Initiative.

The Next Steps identified by each city team are:

13.1 Atlanta

- Hold a follow-up meeting with their community partners to share information gained from Academy II;
- Expand relationships with their workforce system;
- Focus on life skills training, technology enhancement and case management training;
- Leverage existing resources and pursue foundation funding;
- Purchase ESL Software package; and
- Expand and build partnerships with Atlanta's Fatherhood Initiative.

13.2 Baltimore

- Complete their strategic plan;
- Bring additional partners to the table to address policy issues;
- Host Academy III in Baltimore; and
- Obtain buy-in from community partners as they begin implementation of their strategic plan.

13.3 Detroit

- Move subcommittees forward and establish a regularly set schedule for meeting times; and
- Locate community resources, fill gaps in services, and identify policy changes in each of the six subcommittees.

13.4 Grand Prairie

- Share information from Academy II with community partners;
- Review the "Foundation Funding" TA packet;
- Conduct cross agency training to improve interagency communication;
- Access the National Directory of New Hires Registry;
- Consider providing healthy marriage activities to ex-offenders; and
- Request technical assistance from OFA to launch a healthy marriage initiative.

13.5 Miami

- Add an electronic counter to determine the number of persons using their One Stop;
- Establish a relationship with Minnesota and Detroit to discuss their RFP and contracting process;
- Consider adapting Atlanta's employee incentive initiative to reward their partners for collaborating;
- Implement the practice of dually enrolling WIA and TANF clients;
- Develop additional literature to promote One Stops;
- Provide labor market information for One Stop clients;
- Access National Directory New Hire Registry; and
- Reestablish relationship with the Welfare to Work Partnerships.

13.6 Minneapolis

- Identify partners and begin the dialogue regarding the healthy marriage initiative;
- Contact Omaha regarding their EITC initiative; and
- Consider ways they can use multiple funding streams to support programs and service delivery.

13.7 Oakland

- Reconvene partners and expand their partnerships to include those focused on economic development and job creation;
- Focus more effort on their transitional work program;
- Identify other opportunities to combine education with unsubsidized work;
- Consider promoting healthy nutrition and food stamps through their public market initiative; and
- Consider using set aside wages and placing it into a training fund.

13.8 Omaha

- Review team membership and recruit a housing representative;
- Solidify team's strategic plan;
- Obtain a copy of Minnesota's MDRC report;
- Include additional technical assistance requests that include building collaboration with WIA; and
- Review existing data for program improvements.

13.9 Seattle

- Include faith- and community-based organizations in their transportation initiative;
- Provide training on using the self-sufficiency calculator;
- Consider programs aimed at strengthening families and fatherhood initiatives; and
- Integrate WIA and TANF systems.

13.10 St. Louis

- Develop strategies for serving refugee populations and improving services to multi-barrier clients;
- Expand partnerships with the refugee community and service providers assisting multi-barrier clients; and
- Invite a legal services representative to their team.

14. CLOSING SESSION: RETIREMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT WORKFORCE

This session addressed the large number of retirements taking place within the Federal, State, and local governments and the impact of these retirements on human service programs. Ms. Stewart, Executive Director, CPS Human Resources Services, also discussed current and future challenges to transitioning the institutional knowledge and history from retiring workers to new workers. She brainstormed innovative strategies for maintaining a continuity of program history, service delivery, and approaches for combating worker burnout, low morale, and low retention of human service workers.

America is rapidly approaching a crisis in its workforce, triggered by the convergence of two demographic trends: the growing number of aging "Baby Boomers" in the population and the much smaller number of younger people who follow behind them. These changes are beginning to emerge in the workforce. The proportion of older workers is expected to increase an average of four percent per year from 2000-2015 while the proportion of younger workers is shrinking. Given these divergent trends, this discrepancy of older to younger workers will increase as years go by.

Some sectors are experiencing the impacts of these trends much sooner than others. Along with government, these trends exist strongly in education, public administration, manufacturing, transportation, and health care. No other sector, however, is impacted more forcefully or more imminently than government.

CPS Human Resource Services investigated the full extent of the problem and identified government agencies that are seeking or have identified innovative practices to combat their aging workforce. CPS Human Resource Services participated in a comprehensive study conducted by Dr. Mary Young of the Center for Organizational Research (OCR), a division of Linkage Inc., to explore the "age bubble" issues in healthcare, government, and utilities. Other partners in the study included the National Association of State Personnel Executives (NASPE), the International Personnel Management Association (IPMA), and the Council of State Governments (CSG).

The research was designed as an exploratory study to investigate two questions:

- What is the scope of the aging workforce and approaching retirement wave within the government sector?
- What innovative solutions have jurisdictions implemented to address those challenges and with what impacts?

Dr. Young embarked on a rigorous search for agencies currently addressing these daunting challenges and subsequently chose twelve jurisdictions representing different levels of government and a variety of approaches to meeting the challenges of an aging and retiring workforce. Ms. Stewart presented findings from this study in this session of Academy II. In the twelve jurisdictions profiled, the study found that the following factors contributed to the current human capital crisis:

- Downsizing and budget cuts resulting from declining economies in the late 1980s and early 1990s reduced the ongoing infusion of younger employees in the workforce. Seasoned employees are more likely than newer (i.e., younger) employees to keep their jobs; such reductions skew the overall age distribution toward the upper end of the range.
- To trim budgets, jurisdictions may have instituted early-retirement programs to encourage their most seasoned and highly paid employees to leave the workforce.
- The declining appeal of public service.

- Human resource practices and policies have hindered jurisdictions competing with the private sector for qualified employees. For example, cumbersome application processes, civil service, and merit system regulations that limit the selection pool, arcane job classifications, and rigid compensation rules contribute to the public sector's struggle to hire qualified employees.
- Retirement policies which are too inflexible to permit phased retirement.
- Reductions in training and development budgets, which, over time, result in an inadequate pipeline of younger workers to replace older ones as they retire, particularly in leadership positions.

The study identified a number of factors that may delay or offset the challenges the government sector is facing:

- Reduced private sector hiring and the infusion of laid-off employees into the labor market have increased the potential candidate pool for government-sector job openings.
- Retirement-eligible employees may choose to continue working due to the current economy.
- Public sector's relative job security makes it easier to recruit new employees, especially those disenchanted by the "disappearing" of private sector companies and jobs.
- The rising costs of health benefits has led some older employees to defer retirement to forestall paying higher health insurance premiums or co-pays.
- Increasing attractiveness of public service work due to the events of September 11th.

Thirty counties in California were among the jurisdictions studied regarding recruitment and retention of public service workers. In California, the vacancy rate for licensed clinical social workers or MSW's was 22 percent. To fill this vacancy rate, the State of California would have to hire every Californian graduating with a social work degree for the next three years. Barriers to recruiting and hiring social workers include:

- Low pay;
- High turnover and burnout;
- Budget cuts;
- Smaller counties offer fewer benefits;
- Declining student enrollment in social work programs;
- Negative media coverage; and
- Contentious casework.

In an effort to address California's shortage of social workers, the thirty counties combined their efforts and won supplemental state funding totaling $413,000 in Year 1 and $269,000 for Year 2. A collaborative strategy was implemented and involved hiring a Senior Personnel Management

consultant for recruitment and outreach, conducting focus groups and surveys to develop a competency model, hiring a public relations consultant to develop a promotional campaign, developing a faster, on-line application process, and building a Web site with information about and links to social work jobs, professional issues, career development, and degree programs. This strategy resulted in a much larger applicant pool and more qualified candidates. California's initiative also established a database of retired social workers to fill part time or temporary social work positions as well as a resource guide on promising practices in recruiting and retaining social workers.

Ms. Stewart highlighted other insights then can be drawn from this study regarding recruitment and retention of public sector employees and the aging retirement workforce. Some of these insights include:

- Everything begins with workforce planning, which involves scanning/assessment, examining supply and demand, conducting a gap analysis and taking action.
- Across jurisdictions there are variations in execution but not in planning workforce systems.

Workforce planning should not just focus on the size of the workforce but should also focus on the shape of the workforce.

- Larger aging-and-retiring workforce challenges do not always require bigger workforce plans. Organizations can develop a strategy for addressing large-scale challenges by determining where to focus their efforts.
- Some jurisdictions view the retirement wave as a short-term solution for budget cuts despite the negative long-term impacts.
- Reduced budget and hiring freezes offer an opportunity for jurisdictions to assess future workforce supply and demand. And develop a contingency plans to close the gap.

Jurisdictions that were least phased by the challenges of an aging-and-retiring workforce:

- Possess good data;
- Analyze previous trends to develop accurate jurisdiction specific forecasts;
- Selectively focus on their most critical positions; and
- Continuously refine analyses, forecasts, and plans.

Often, the public sector looks to the private sector for innovative management practices. The public sector also frequently views itself as a poor relative to the private sector. By addressing, however, the human resources challenges posed by the aging workforce, the public sector is at the leading edge of an important demographic trend that most private-sector employees have yet to confront. Five years from now, the private sector is likely to look to the public sector for the lessons learned in meeting the challenges of an aging-and-retiring workforce.

APPENDIX A:

FINAL ACADEMY II AGENDA

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

Agenda

Sunday, October 26, 2003

4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Registration
Minneapolis Ballroom Salon C Foyer

6:00 PM to 7:30 PM

Welcome Reception
Minneapolis Ballroom Salon C

Academy II participants are invited to an early evening of light refreshments as they network with city team members and the Federal partners. The Federal partners will kick-off Academy II with a warm welcome that includes an overview of the Urban Partnerships Initiative and Academy II.

Speakers: Andy Bush
Office of Family Assistance

Jim Gatz
Office of Community Services

Moderator: Grant Collins
Office of Family Assistance

Facilitator: Kent Peterson
Caliber Associates

7:30 PM

Dinner on your own

Monday, October 27, 2003

7:30 AM to 8:00 AM **Continental Breakfast**
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom C Foyer

8:00 AM to 10:00 AM **Dialogue with Federal Partners**
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom C

Helping low-income families achieve self-sufficiency requires the collaboration of Federal, State and local agencies to leverage resources, craft solutions, and achieve positive outcomes. In this interactive plenary session, the Federal partners will dialogue with cities about key issues affecting TANF programs and the Federal response to those challenges.

Speakers: Roberto Salazar
Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services

Mr. Jerry Patiuk
Department of Housing and Urban Development, Family Self-Sufficiency

Grant E. Collins II
Office of Family Assistance

Moderator: Lois Bell
Office of Family Assistance

Facilitator: Kent Peterson
Caliber Associates

10:00 AM to 10:15 AM Break

10:15 AM to 12:15 PM **Strategic Plan Updates- Part I**

In separate breakout sessions, selected representatives from each city will share their strategic plans. City teams will share their challenges, solutions identified, lessons learned, and the development of any implementation strategies. City team members are encouraged to attend any and all sessions. Collectively, peers can identify commonalities and offer solutions to help each other strengthen their strategic plans.

Atlanta, Director's Row 1
Baltimore, Director's Row 2
Detroit, Director's Row 3
Grand Prairie, Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C
Miami, Miami Team Suite

Moderators: Identified City Representatives

12:15 PM to 1:45 PM **Lunch**

Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon B

Speaker: Maria Gomez
Minnesota Assistant Commissioner Human Services

Moderator: Andrew Bush
Office of Family Assistance

1:45 PM to 2:00 PM **Break**

2:00 PM to 3:45 PM **Strategic Plan Updates- Part II**

In separate breakout sessions, selected representatives from each city will share their strategic plans. City teams will share their challenges, solutions identified, lessons learned, and the development of any implementation strategies. City team members are encouraged to attend any and all sessions. Collectively, peers can identify commonalities and offer solutions to help each other strengthen their strategic plans.

- Minneapolis, Director's Row 1
- Oakland, Director's Row 2
- Omaha, Director's Row 3
- Seattle, Seattle Team Suite
- St. Louis, Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C

Moderators: Identified City Representatives

3:45 PM to 4:00 PM **Break**

4:00 PM to 5:30 PM **Work Sessions**

There will be four sessions running concurrently

Session 1: **Effectively Using the New Hire Registry to Enhance Family Self-Sufficiency**
Director's Row 1

Employers are required to report essential employment information for every newly hired employee to a State New Hire Directory. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) requires States to operate a system for employers to report new hire information to the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE). The New Hire data, together with Quarterly Wage and Unemployment Claims data enable OCSE to maximize enforcement of child support orders through the Parent Locator Service. This session will describe the New Hire Registry and how the local TANF agencies use the

Registry to support their service delivery efforts, and the nuts and bolts of getting started.

Speakers: Kate Jesberg
District of Columbia Income Maintenance Office

Steven Everett
District of Columbia Income Maintenance Office

Moderator: Grant Collins
Office of Family Assistance

Session 2: Teen Parenting

Director's Row 2

Teenage mothers in TANF caseloads present special challenges to State and local agencies. Teen parents also experience barriers to accessing and remaining in the TANF program. This session will offer innovative practices in providing TANF services to adolescent parents and discuss strategies for outreach and teen pregnancy prevention.

Speakers: Rozario Slack
First Things First, (TN)

Luanne Nyberg
Teen Parent Connection (MN)

Moderator: Brenda Benesch
Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation

Session 3: Case Management Tips & Techniques

Director's Row 3

Reducing the TANF caseload requires not only sound agency policies but also effective front line practice. Case managers need to have access to a wide range of resources and a better working relationship with other programs. This session will present a variety of case management strategies and models to help participants enhance their practice in meeting the needs of their TANF population.

Speakers: Mary Nakashian
Case Management Consultant

Barbara Ramlow
Targeted Assessment Project (KY)

Moderator: Jeanette Hercik
Caliber Associates

Session 4: **Work Place and Employer Support Strategies**
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C

Understanding one's employer base and supporting those who employ TANF clients are two simple strategies in creating long-term self-sufficiency. Participants will learn about cross cutting strategies for engaging employers and unique employer support models aimed at retaining and upgrading the skills of TANF clients.

Speaker: Joyce Basscher
Kent County Family Independence Program (MI)

Dr. Bruce Nauth
Hennepin County Dept. of Training and Employment Assistance (MN)

Moderator: Karen Lynn Dyson
Caliber Associates

6:00 PM to 7:30 PM **Academy Dinner, Innovative Strategies for Engaging Potential Employers**
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon B

Mr. Carroll will address innovative strategies for engaging employers and opportunities to support employers' efforts to obtain and retain former TANF clients through career advancement opportunities, additional trainings, and employee assistance programs.

Speaker: Rodney Carroll
The Welfare to Work Partnership

Moderator: Lois Bell
Office of Family Assistance

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

7:30 AM to 8:00 AM **Continental Breakfast**
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C Foyer

8:00 AM to 10:45 AM **Site Visit**

Site One- One Stop Career Center: ***MDES Hennepin North WorkForce Center***

The Workforce Center has co-located service providers including: MFIP (TANF) offered by MDES and HIRED (a private non-profit), State Rehabilitation Services, State Services for the Blind, Workforce Investment Act, Dislocated Workers Programs, Job Services and Hennepin County Financial Workers**.**

Site Two- Supported work Provider*: Rise, Inc.*

Rice, Inc. is a comprehensive supported work service provider serving hard to serve TANF clients as well as individuals with all manner of disabilities.

Site Three- Agency offering a variety of special needs programs*: Employment Action Center*

EAC, a division of Resource, Inc., offers a variety of services to hard to serve TANF clients, healthcare training programs, non-custodial parents program, new immigrant programs, and supported work programs.

10:45 AM to 11:45 AM

Site Visit Report Out
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C

This session will review what was learned at each of the site visits. Discussion will include best practices, challenges and solutions identified from the visit.

Moderator: Kent Peterson
Caliber Associates

OR

Innovative Approaches for the Healthy Marriage Initiative

Director's Row 2

The healthy marriage agenda focuses on promoting the well-being of children and encouraging healthy marriage amoung couples by helping them develop the skills and knowledge to form and sustain healthy marriages. Research has shown that, on average, children raised in households headed by married parents fare better than children who grow up in other family structures. The goal of the initiative is to reduce the divorce rate, strengthen families, and reduce dependence on government programs. This session focuses on a State and community based model, which uses innovative strategies to promote healthy marriage.

Speakers: Mary Myrick
Oklahoma Marriage Initiative

Rozario Slack
First Things First, (TN)

Moderator: Grant Collins
Office of Family Assistance

11:45 AM to 1:15 PM **Academy Luncheon: Healthy Marriage Initiative**
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon B

This luncheon will address possible strategies for promoting healthy marriages among the TANF client population.

Speakers: Grant Collins
Office of Family Assistance

Joyce Thomas
African American Healthy Marriage Initiative
Administration for Children and Families, Region V

Moderator: Jim Gatz
Office of Community Assistance

1:15 PM to 1:30 PM **Break**

1:30 PM to 3:00 PM **Work Sessions**

Session 5: **Specialized Service Program Strategies**
Director's Row 1

This session will address strategies for working with unique populations, such as refugees and Native Americans. This session will review cultural diversity and innovative solutions for working with a diverse TANF population.

Speakers: Anne Lafferty
Lutheran Social Services
Refugee MFIP Services

Travis Zimmerman
American Indian OIC

Moderator: Al M. Fleming
Office of Family Assistance

Lutheran Social Services operates Tier I and II (intensive services) MFIP and Supported Work for a largely limited English population – predominantly Hmong and Somali. In addition, they are a provider of resettlement services for newly arrived immigrants.

American Indian OIC is an MFIP provider located in an urban Indian neighborhood. Their mission is "to provide training, retraining, employment and economic development opportunities

for unemployed and underemployed American Indian People in a culturally conducive atmosphere that addresses the needs of the whole person and families." They are a school of business and office technology as well as a provider of TANF and WIA services.

Session 6: Non-Custodial Parents
Director's Row 2

This session will address innovative strategies for engaging non-custodial parents in a family's efforts to obtain self-sufficiency.

Speakers: Andrew Freeberg
The Minneapolis FATHER Project

Bob Hunter
The Sentencing to Service Homes Program

Moderator: Courtney Kakuska
Caliber Associates

***The Minneapolis FATHER Project*,**
is a collaboration between the Employment Services system, the local child support agency, and several community based organizations, which provides a holistic set of program services focused on parenting, fatherhood, family and child support issues as well as employment**.**

The Sentencing to Service Homes Program is collaboration with the County Corrections and Habitat for Humanity. Minimum-custody offenders are given an opportunity to learn carpentry skills by rehabilitating old homes or building new ones. Upon completion they are offered union-scale employment resulting in a solid career opportunity as well as the ability to pay child support upon release.

Session 7: Strategic Planning: *Defining the Optimal Workforce System*

Directors Row 3

The session will provide an overview of the strategic planning methodologies and processes. In addition, there will be facilitated decisions regarding the challenges to strategic planning and solutions for developing an appropriate strategic plan and the linkage to the performance management system required by the legislation.

Facilitators: Ramon Martinez
Nancy Weinberg
South Florida Workforce

Moderator: James Butler
Office of Family Assistance

Session 8: Strategies to Meeting the 20% Limit

Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C

States, counties, and cities around the country have had a great deal of success in moving families from welfare to work. At the same time, there are a number of families who have used or are about to use up benefits under time limits. States have the option of exempting up to 20% of their caseload from time limits. This session will address some of the issues around these families, including the dilemmas of State and local governments in deciding whether certain families should be exempt or engaged in work activities.

Speakers: Doug Howard
Program and Management Consultant

Grant Collins
Office of Family Assistance

3:00 PM to 3:15 PM **Break**

3:15 PM to 5:30 PM **City Team Building**
City Suites

This session will stimulate conversation to allow cities teams an opportunity to redefine their strategic plans, identify additional resources and strengthen their established collaborations.

Moderators: City Representatives

5:30 PM **Dinner on your own**

Wednesday, October 29, 2003

7:30 AM to 8:00 AM **Continental Breakfast**
City Suites

8:00 AM to 10:00 AM **City-to-City Dialogues**
City Suites

The City-to-City dialogue will run concurrently. Each city will host a discussion in their team suites. The members will have an opportunity to share with participants their highlighted programs, implementation strategies and lessons learned.

Atlanta Suite: Newly developed Employment Services Delivery Plan

Baltimore Suite: Housing, TANF, and WIA collaboration

Detroit Suite: Information Exchange as Barrier-Tool Removal

Grand Prairie Suite: Strategies for serving the hard to s serve

Miami Suites: Domestic Violence Program

Minneapolis Suite: Behavioral health screening and access to HMO-based assessment services

Oakland Suite: Health Care Sector Initiative

Omaha Suite: EITC Partnership with United Way of the Midlands and Omaha Chamber of Commerce

Seattle Suite: Transportation strategy for partnering with the faith based community

St. Louis Suite: Co-location of service providers for case management and employment

Facilitators: Urban Partnership Staff and Moderators

Moderator: Identified City Representatives

10:00 AM to 10:30 AM **Break** (Final opportunity for hotel check-out)

10:30 AM to 12:15 PM **Next Steps**

Cities will participate in an interactive discussion surrounding their individual next steps based on the information gathered and discussions held at the Academy as well providing a

critique and suggesting next steps for Federal Partners regarding the UPI.

Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon C

Moderators: Lois Bell
Office of Family Assistance

Kent Peterson
Caliber Associates

12:15 PM to 2:00 PM

Closing Luncheon, Retirement of the Government Workforce, What Happens Now?
Minneapolis Grand Ballroom Salon B

This session will address the large number of retirements taking place within the Federal, state, and local governments and the impact to human service programs. In addition, the session will review current and future challenges to transitioning the institutional knowledge and history from retiring workers to new workers and innovative strategies for maintaining a continuity of program history, service delivery, and approaches for combating worker burnout, low morale, and low retention of human service workers.

Speaker: Pam Stewart (Invited)

Moderator: Lisa Washington-Thomas
Office of Family Assistance

APPENDIX B:

ACADEMY II PARTICIPANTS AND SPEAKERS

URBAN PARTNERSHIPS FOR WELFARE REFORM

ACADEMY SPEAKERS & FACILITATORS

Lois Bell
Division of State and Territory TANF Management
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L' Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-9317
(F) 202-205-5887
lbell@acf.hhs.gov

Brenda Benesch
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Ave. SW, Room 447D
Washington, DC 20201
(P) 202-260-0382
brenda.benesch@hhs.gov

Deborah Blanks
Social Development Commission
4041 North Richards Street
Milwaukee, WI 53212
(P) 414-906-2700
(F) 414-906-2719
dblanks@cr-sdc.org

Lien Bragg
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
braggl@calib.com

Joyce Bosscher
Michigan Family Independence Agency
5251 36th Street, SE
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49512
(P) 616-254-4128
(F) 616-975-4707
bosscherj@michigan.gov

Andrew S. Bush
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor East
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-9275
(F) 202-205-5887
abush@acf.hhs.gov

Grant E. Collins II
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-6953
(F) 202-205-5887
grcollins@acf.hhs.gov

Steven Everett
Income Maintenance Administration
DC Department of Human Services
645 H. Street, NE
Washington DC 20002
(P) 202-698-3919
steven.everett@dc.gov

Al M. Fleming
Division of State and Territory TANF Management
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-4977
afleming@acf.hhs.gov

URBAN PARTNERSHIPS FOR WELFARE REFORM

Andrew Freeberg
The Minneapolis FATHER Project
2901 North 2nd Street
Minneapolis, MN 55411
(P) 612-588-5935
afreeberg@fatherproject.org

Maria Gomez
Children & Family Services Administration
Minnesota Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, MN 55155
(P) 651-297-3209
(F) 651-215-5744
maria.gomez@state.mn.us

Jeanette Hercik
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
hercikj@calib.com

Doug Howard
Howard Strategic Consulting Group
2176 Woodleaf Street
Okemos, Michigan 48864
(P) 517-347-7553
doug@doughowardconsulting.com

Bob Hunter
Henepin County Community Corrections
C-2353 Government Center
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(P) 612-348-7137
(F) 612-348-6488
bob.hunter@co.hennepin.mn.us

Kate Jesberg
Income Maintenance Administration
DC Department of Human Services
645 H. Street, NE
Washington DC 20002
(P) 202-698-3900
(F) 202-724-2041
kate.jesberg@dc.gov

Anne Lafferty
Minnesota Family Investment Program Tier II
Lutheran Social Service
2414 Park Ave.
Minneapolis, MN 55404
(P) 612-879-5283
(F) 612-871-0354
alaffert@lssmn.org

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Caliber Associates
3050 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
dysonk@calib.com

Robert W. McCauley
Minneapolis Public Schools
1006 West Lake Street
Minneapolis, MN 55408
(P) 612-668-3820
mccauley@mpls.k12.mn.us

Ramon Martinez
South Florida Workforce
7300 NW 19th Street, Suite 500
Miami, FL 33126
(P) 305-594-7615 ext. 263
(F) 305-593-5632
rmartinez@jep-tec.org

URBAN PARTNERSHIPS FOR WELFARE REFORM

Mary Myrick
Public Strategies, Inc
301 Northwest 63rd, Suite 215
Oklahoma City, OK 73116
(P) 405-848-2171
mary@publicstrategies.com

Mary Nakashian
455 ½ B Arapahoe Avenue
Boulder, CO 80302
(P) 303-544-1632
(F) 303-544-1640
marynakashian@msn.com

Bruce Nauth
Hennepin County Training & Employment Assistance
300 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(P) 612-348-4138
bruce.nauth@co.hennepin.mn.us

Luanne Nyberg
Health and Community Initiatives Department
Hennepin County
1702 A Government Center
300 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(P) 612-596-7709
(F) 612-348-9077
luanne.nyberg@co.hennepin.mn.us

Jerry Patiuk
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Minneapolis Field Office
920 2nd Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(P) 612-370-3135 ext 2106
(F) 612-370-3003
jerry_patiuk@hud.gov

Kent Peterson
Caliber Associates
3500 Rainbow Drive, Suite 207
Kansas City, KS 66103
(P) 913-432-0585
(F) 913-432-0586
kentjpeterson@aol.com

Barbara Ramlow
University of Kentucky Institute on
Women and Substance Abuse
Center on Drug and Alcohol Research
1151 Red Mile Road, Suite 1B
Lexington, KY 40504
(P) 859-257-6441
(F) 859-257-8956
barbara.ramlow@uky.edu

Roberto Salazar
Food and Nutrition Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
3101 Park Center Drive, Room 906
Alexandria, VA 22302
(P) 703-305-2062
(F) 703-305-2908
Roberto.Salazar@fns.usda.gov

Stephanie Scott
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
scotts@calib.com

Rozario Slack
First Things First
701 Cherokee Blvd, Suite 230
Chattanooga, TN 37405
(P) 423-267-5383
(F) 423-267-8876
rozario@firstthings.org

URBAN PARTNERSHIPS FOR WELFARE REFORM

Pam Stewart
CPS Human Resource Services
241 Lathrop Way
Sacramento, CA 95815
(P) 916-263-3600

Joyce Thomas
Administration for Children and Families
Region V
233 North Michigan Ave., Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601-5519
(P) 312-353-4237
(F) 312-252-2194
jthomas@acf.hhs.gov

Lisa Washington-Thomas
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-5141
(F) 202-205-5887
lwashington@acf.hhs.gov

Nancy Weinberg
South Florida Workforce
7300 NW 19th Street, Suite 500
Miami, FL 33126
(P) 305-594-7615 ext.265
(F) 305-593-5632
nweinberg@southfloridaworkforce.com

Travis Zimmerman
Minnesota Family Investment Program
American Indian OIC
1845 Franklin Ave.
South Minneapolis, MN 55404
(P) 612-341-3358 ext.10
travisz@aioic.org

URBAN PARTNERSHIPS FOR WELFARE REFORM

ACADEMY RESOURCES

Allyn E. Foster
Family Financial Literacy, LLC
P.O. Box 36321
Rock Hill, SC 29732
(P) 803-328-2929
(F) 803-328-2988
FAMFINLITLLC@aol.com

José Rivera
Rivera, Sierra & Company
32 Court Street, #1200
Brooklyn, NY 11201-4440
(P) 718-858-0066
(F) 718-858-0551
jrivera@riverasierra.com

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

CITY PARTICIPANTS

ATLANTA

Burrell Billingslea
Fulton County Office of
Workforce Development
115 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, Suite 300
Atlanta, GA 30303
(P) 404-730-4796
(F) 404-730-6992
burrell.billingslea@co.fulton.ga.us

Wayne D. Casey*
Fulton County Department of
Families and Children's Services
230 Peachtree Street, NW, Suite 400
Atlanta, GA 30303
(P) 404-657-5091
(F) 404-651-8209
wdcasey@dhr.state.ga.us

William P. Cook
Fulton County Department of
Families and Children's Services
230 Peachtree Street, NW, Suite 400
Atlanta, GA 30303
(P) 404-651-8383
(F) 404-651-8209
wpcook@dhr.state.ga.us

Marie W. Elder
Employment Services Section
Fulton County Department of
Families and Children's Services
1249 Donald Lee Hollowell Pkwy, NW
Atlanta, GA 30318
(P) 404-206-5304
(F) 404-206-5630
mwelder@dhr.state.ga.us

Laura B. Robinson
Northwest Service Center
Fulton County Department of
Families and Children's Services
1249 Donald Lee Hollowell Pkwy, NW
Atlanta, GA 30318
(P) 404-206-5660
(F) 404-651-8209
laurobin@dhr.state.ga.us

Margaret Robinson
Atlanta One Stop Center
City of Atlanta Workforce
Development Agency
818 Pollard Boulevard, SW
Atlanta, GA 30315
(P) 404-658-7397
(F) 404-658-7091
mrobinson@AtlantaGa.Gov

Julius S. Wilson
Economic Support Program
Fulton County Department of
Families and Children's Services
515 Fairburn Road
Atlanta, GA 30331
(P) 404-505-3708
(F) 404-505-3787
jsw@gomail.doas.state.ga.us

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

BALTIMORE

Anne Clemson
Mayor's Office of Employment Development
100 West 23rd Street, 5th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21218
(P) 410-396-6392
(F) 410-396-6756
aclemson@oedworks.com

Karen Czapanskiy
University of Maryland, School of Law
500 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(P) 410-706-2516
(F) 410-706-5856
kczapanskiy@law.umaryland.edu

Daniel Hatcher
Maryland Legal Aid Review
500 East Lexington Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
(P) 410-951-7684
(F) 410-951-7778
dhatcher@mdlab.org

Charles Henry
Baltimore City Department of
Social Services
1510 Guilford Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21202
(P) 410-361-2211
(F) 410-361-4090
CHenry@dhr.state.md.us

Phillip Holmes
Career Development Services
Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake, Inc.
222 East Redwood Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
(P) 410-837-1800
(F) 410-837-8931
pholmes@goodwillches.org

Samuel B. Little
Housing Authority of Baltimore City
417 East Fayette Street, Suite 265
Baltimore, MD 21202
(P) 410-396-4281
(F) 410-396-4283
samuel.little@habc.org

Mark Millspaugh
Information Analysis & Reporting
Family Investment Administration
MD Department of Human Resources
311 West Saratoga Street, Room 719
Baltimore, MD 21201
(P) 410-767-8558
(F) 410-333-0832
mmillspa@dhr.state.md.us

Brenda Redding*
Baltimore City Department of Social Services
1510 Guilford Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21202
(P) 410-361-2099
(F) 410-361-2533
bredding@dhr.state.md.us

Leroy Smith
Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems, Inc
1 North Charles Street, Suite 1600
Baltimore, MD 21201
(P) 410-637-1900
(F) 410-637-1911
lsmith@bsasinc.org

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

DETROIT

Keith Armstrong
Detroit Housing Commission
1301 E. Jefferson Avenue
Detroit, MI 48207
(P) 313-877-8600
(F) 313-877-8659
armstrok@dhcpoz.ci.detroit.mi.us

Jennifer Davis
City of Detroit Employment and
Training Department
707 West Milwaukee Avenue
Detroit, MI 48202
(P) 313-664-5603
(F) 313-664-5505
jdavis@emptrain.ci.detroit.mi.us

Yvette Harris
Michigan Department of Career
Development
201 North Washington Square
5th Floor Victor Building
Lansing, MI 48913
(P) 517-241-0092
(F) 517-373-7794
Harrisy@michigan.gov

Janet Howard
Workforce Programs
Michigan Department of Career
Development
201 North Washington Square, 5th Floor
Lansing, MI 48913
(P) 517-335-5875
(F) 517-373-7794
Howardj1@michigan.gov

Cylenthia LaToye Miller, Esq.**
City of Detroit Employment and
Training Department
707 West Milwaukee Avenue, 5th Floor
Detroit, MI 48202
(P) 313-876-0674
(F) 313-664-5505
MillerC@emptrain.ci.detroit.mi.us

Donald C. Mussen
Family Support Services Division
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1307
Lansing, MI 48933
(P) 517-241-5502
(F) 517-335-7771
mussend@michigan.gov

Deborah Watson
City of Detroit Employment and
Training Department
1300 Rosa Parks Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48216
(P) 313-628-2202
(F) 313-961-4416
Deborah@emptrain.ci.detroit.mi.us

Clarence Willis, Jr.**
Wayne County Family Independence Agency
3040 West Grand Boulevard, Suite 5-650
Detroit, MI 48202
(P) 313-456-1024
(F) 313-456-1245
willisc@michigan.gov

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

GRAND PRAIRIE

Jo Aleshire
Work Advantage
Tarrant County Workforce Board
2601 Scott Street, Suite 400
Fort Worth, TX 76103
(P) 817-531-6780
(F) 817-531-5677
jo.aleshire@twc.state.tx.us

Jill Brown
ACS State and Local Solutions
7222 S Westmoreland, Suite 110
Dallas, TX 75237
(P) 972-283-9152 ext. 236
(F) 972-283-9249
jill.brown@twc.state.tx.us

Patricia Brown
Texas Department of Human Services
801 W. Freeway, Suite 700
Grand Prairie, TX 75051
(P) 972-337-6171
(F) 972-337-6298
patricia.a.brown@dhs.state.tx.us

Amy Cuellar*
Texas Department of Human Services
801 W. Freeway, Suite 700
Grand Prairie, TX 75051
(P) 972-337-6199
(F) 972-337-6298
amy.cuellar@dhs.state.tx.us

Debby Kratky
Work Advantage
Tarrant County Workforce Board
2601 Scott Street, Suite 400
Ft. Worth, TX 76103
(P) 817-531-6763
(F) 817-531-6754
debby.kratky@twc.state.tx.us

Marion Trapolino
Texas Workforce Commission
101 E. 15th Street, Room 458T
Austin, TX 78778-0001
(P) 512-936-3065
(F) 512-475-2176
marion.trapolino@twc.state.tx.us

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

MIAMI

Edith Humes-Newbold*
South Florida Employment and Training Consortium
7300 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
Miami, FL 33126
(P) 305-595-7615 ext. 269
(F) 305-593-5632
Ehumes@southfloridaworkforce.com

Jennifer Lange
Florida Department of
Children and Families
401 NW 2nd Avenue
Miami, FL 33128
(P) 305-377-7526
(F) 305-377-7543
jennifer_lange@dcf.state.fl.us

Ramon Martinez
Strategic Planning
South Florida Workforce Board
7300 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
Miami, FL 33126
(P) 305-594-7615 ext. 263
(F) 305-593-5632
Rmartinez@southfloridaworkforce.com

Jenni Lee Robins
Workforce Florida, Inc.
13 Bogey Drive
Winter Haven, FL 33881
(P) 863-325-0049
(F) 863-325-9809
jrobins@workforceflorida.com

Lawrence Suran
South Florida Workforce Board
7300 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
Miami, FL 33126
(P) 305-594-7615
lsuran@southfloridaworkforce.com

Nancy Weinberg
Policy and Planning
South Florida Workforce Board
7300 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
Miami, FL 33126
(P) 305-594-7615 x 265
(F) 305-593-5632
Nweinberg@southfloridaworkforce.com

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

MINNEAPOLIS

Phillip AuClaire
Hennepin County Department of
Training And Employment Assistance
First Level South Government Center
300 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487-0012
(P) 612-348-5805
(F) 612-348-3932
phil.auclaire@co.hennepin.mn.us

Bill Brumfield*
Hennepin County Training and
Employment Assistance
300 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487-0012
(P) 612-348-5203
(F) 612-348-3932
Bill.Brumfield@co.hennepin.mn.us

Saeed Fahia
Confederation of Somali Community in
Minnesota
420 15th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55454
(P) 612-338-5282

Jeff Hardin
7244 York Avenue South, Suite 327
Edina, MN 55435
(P) 612-578-1155
(F) 952-837-9992
Jeffhardin1@msn.com

Deborah Huskins
Hennepin County Department of
Economic Assistance
300 South Sixth Street
m/c 105
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(P) 612-348-7605
(F) 612-348-9908
Deborah.huskins@co.hennepin.mn.us

Randy Rennich
Transition to Economic Stability Division
MN Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, MN 55155
(P) 651-296-1834
(F) 651-215-1818
randy.rennich@state.mn.us

Chip Wells
Minneapolis Employment and Training
Program
105 5th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2593
(P) 612-673-5292
(F) 612-673-5299
Chip.Wells@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Sue Zuidema
Hennepin County Department of Children,
Family & Adult Services
525 Portland Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(P) 612-348-2102
(F) 612-348-6900
suzanne.zuidema@co.hennepin.mn.us

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

OAKLAND

Dorothy Galloway
Alameda County
Social Services Agency
6955 Foothill Boulevard, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94605-2401
(P) 510-577-7066
(F) 510-577-7070
dgallowa@co.alameda.ca.us

Brendalynn R. Goodall
Aging and Adult Services Division
City of Oakland, Department of
Human Services
150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4340
Oakland, CA 94612
(P) 510-238-6137
(F) 510-238-7207
bgoodall@oaklandnet.com

Paul A. Leonard*
Office of Policy and Strategic Planning
Alameda County Social Services Agency
1106 Madison Street, 4th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607
(P) 510- 267-9431
(F) 510-267-9468
Pleonard@co.alameda.ca.us

Marsha Murrington
The Unity Council
1900 Fruitvale Street, Suite 2A
Oakland, CA 94601
(P) 510-535-6913
(F) 510-534-7771
mgm@unitycouncil.org

Tse Ming Tam
Income, Assets and Jobs Division
National Economic Development and Law
Center
2201 Broadway, Suite 815
Oakland, CA 94612
(P) 510-251-2600 ext. 110
(F) 510-251-0600
tseming@nedlc.org

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

OMAHA

John G. Daniel
GBTUSA
Father Flanagan's Boys Home
13603 Flanagan Boulevard
Boys Town, NE 68010
(P) 402-498-1978
(F) 402-498-3261
jdaniel@boystown.org

Michael B. Harris
Nebraska Department of
Health and Human Services
301 Centennial Mall South
PO Box 944
Lincoln, NE 68509
(P) 402-471-9243
(F) 402-471-9597
Mike.Harris@hhss.state.ne.us

Tim Koehn*
Nebraska Health and Human Services
System
1313 Farnam Street, 3rd Floor
Omaha, NE 68102
(P) 402-595-2880
(F) 402-595-2872
tim.koehn@hhss.state.ne.us

Virgil F. Keller
Planning and Community Development
United Way of the Midlands
1805 Harney Street
Omaha, NE 68102
(P) 402-522-7959
(F) 402-522-7995
vkeller@uwmidlands.org

Linda Mack
Employment and Training
Goodwill Industries
111 South 41st Street
Omaha, NE 68105
(P) 402-231-1920
(F) 402-341-3061
lmack@goodwillomaha.com

Chris Rodgers
Mayor's Office
City of Omaha
1819 Farnam Street, Suite 300
Omaha, NE 68182-0300
(P) 402-444-5151
(F) 402-444-6059
crodgers@ci.omaha.ne.us

Dianne Stewart
Employment First
Nebraska Department of Health and
Human Services
1212 South 42nd Street
Omaha, NE 68123
(P) 402-595-3780
(F) 402-595-3325
dianne.stewart@hhss.state.ne.us

Dennis Womack
Urban League
3040 Lake Street
Omaha, NE 68110
(P) 402-451-1066
(F) 402-451-1342
dwomack@urbanleagueneb.org

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

SEATTLE

Helen Campbell
Community Services Division
Department of Social and Health Services
3600 South Graham Street
Seattle, WA 98118
(P) 206-760-2343
(F) 206-760-2345
campbhm@dshs.wa.gov

Frances Carr
Region IV Community Services Division
Department of Social and Health Services
400 Mercer Street, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98109
(P) 206-272-2178
(F) 206-298-4601
carrfx@dshs.wa.gov

Sandy Clark
Workforce Development Council of
Seattle/King County
2003 Western Avenue, Suite 250
Seattle, WA 98121
(P) 206-448-0474
(F) 206-448-0484
sclark@seakingwdc.org

James L. Hays
Department of Employment Security
1700 East Cherry Street
Seattle, WA 98122
(P) 206-568-5744
(F) 206-720-3383
jhays@esd.wa.gov

Greta Kaas-Lent*
Region IV, Community Services Division
Department of Social and Health Services
400 Mercer Street, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98109
(P) 206-272-2145
(F) 206-298-4601
lentgf@dshs.wa.gov

Jeff Kibler
Refugee and Immigrant Program
Department of Social and Health Services
10801 Woodley Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98178
(P) 206-227-2655
(F) 206-298-4601
kiblersea@comcast.net

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

ST. LOUIS

Mary Bell
St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment
1017 Olive
St. Louis, MO 63101
(P) 314-552-7656
(F) 314-622-3553
bellm@slate.works.state.mo.us

Sandra Cole
Missouri Division of Family Services
St. Louis City Office
3545 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63103
(P) 314-340-5506
(F) 314-340-5071
scole@mail.dss.state.mo.us

Karla Frye*
Income Maintenance
Missouri Family Support Division, St. Louis
3545 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63103
(P) 314-340-5060
(F) 314-340-5071
karla.frye@dss.mo.gov

Tom Jones
St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment
1017 Olive Street
St. Louis, MO 63101
(P) 314-589-8101
(F) 314-641-8440
tjones@slate.works.state.mo.us

Carolyn Seward
Business Development and Administration
Better Family Life, Inc.
6347 Plymouth Avenue, Suite 100
St. Louis, MO 63133
(P) 314-746-0750
(F) 314-746-0751
CSeward@stlcc.edu

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

Federal Participants

Lois Bell
Division of State and Territory TANF Management
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L' Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-9317
(F) 202-205-5887
lbell@acf.hhs.gov

Brenda Benesch
Child and Youth Policy Division
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Ave. SW, Room 447D
Washington, DC 20201
(P) 202-260-0382
brenda.benesch@hhs.gov

Andrew S. Bush
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor East
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-9275
(F) 202-205-5887
abush@acf.hhs.gov

Grant E. Collins II
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-6953
(F) 202-205-5887
grcollins@acf.hhs.gov

Al M. Fleming
Division of State & Territory TANF Management
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-4977
afleming@acf.hhs.gov

Jim Gatz
Office of Community Services
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor East
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-5284
(F) 202-401-5718
jgatz@acf.hhs.gov

Dan Houlahan
TANF
Region VII
601 East 12th Street, Suite 276
Kansas City, MO 64106
(P) 816-426-3981 ext. 195
(F) 816-426-2888
dhoulahan@acf.hhs.gov

Jerry Patiuk
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Minneapolis Field Office
920 2nd Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(P) 612-370-3135 ext 2106
(F) 612-370-3003
jerry_patiuk@hud.gov

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

Roberto Salazar
Food and Nutrition Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
3101 Park Center Drive, Room 906
Alexandria, VA 22302
(P) 703-305-2062
(F) 703-305-2908
roberto.salazar@fns.usda.gov

Joyce Thomas
Administration for Children and Families
Region V
233 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601-5519
(P) 312-353-4237
(F) 312-252-2194
jthomas@acf.hhs.gov

Lisa Washington-Thomas
Division of State and Territory Management
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20447
(P) 202-401-5141
(F) 202-205-5887
lwashington@acf.hhs.gov

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

Urban Partnerships for Welfare Reform

CONTRACT STAFF

Lien Bragg
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
braggl@calib.com

Karen Lynn-Dyson
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
dysonk@calib.com

Leslie Fain
Caliber Associates
4016 Simms Drive
Kensington, MD 20895
(P) 301-942-5579
(F) 301-933-5718
leslie@faingroup.com

Jeanette Hercik
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
hercikj@calib.com

Courtney Kakuska
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
kakuskac@calib.com

Bradley Myles
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
mylesb@calib.com

Kent Peterson
Caliber Associates
3500 Rainbow Drive, Suite 207
Kansas City, KS 66103
(P) 913-432-0585
(F) 913-432-0586
kentjpeterson@aol.com

Lindsay Ritter
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
ritterl@calib.com

Stephanie Scott
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
scotts@calib.com

Stephanie Wofford
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
(P) 703-385-3200
(F) 703-385-3206
woffords@calib.com

***denotes team leader**
****denotes co-team leader**

APPENDIX C:

EVALUATION SUMMARY

APPENDIX C: EVALUATION SUMMARY

At the conclusion of Academy II, participants were asked to evaluate the various aspects of the event. This section presents the results of those evaluations, for the overall academy and each of the three days (Monday-Wednesday) when evaluated sessions were held. The section concludes with a table that summarizes the evaluation results from all of the sessions.

EVALUATION SCORING

Participants were asked to use a four-point scale for all evaluations. In all instances, 4.0 is the highest score possible. Unfortunately, the rate of response on evaluations was relatively low, thus creating possible doubt regarding the accuracy of some of the scores. Despite this challenge, however, the evaluations are generally positive. While some scores appear rather low at first, closer inspection of these scores reveals that an average score of 2.7 for any given session indicates that attendees found the session at least "somewhat helpful."

Overall Academy

Statement	Average Score
1. The Academy successfully met my needs.	3.0
2. The speakers were knowledgeable about the topics in their presentations.	3.4
3. The preparation, arrangements, and scheduling of Academy II were handled in a timely, courteous, and competent manner.	3.4

Participants were presented three statements about the overall Academy and asked to rate them on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Those statements and the average score received are:

In addition, participants were given the opportunity to respond to three questions and to provide any additional comments.

4. Describe what was most useful about the Academy. Please describe both immediate benefits and anticipated long-term benefits.

Most Useful

- City-to-city dialogue
- Information from DHHS on the Healthy Marriage Initiative
- The ability to exchange information with other cities
- City-to-city information exchange
- The inclusion of many partners in the Initiative
- How to identify and tailor services for customers with significant learning disabilities and/or behavioral health issues
- Better understanding of how marriage initiatives could fit into other service delivery structures
- Exchange with other partner cities
- Site visits
- Information provided by local programs, the Partnership, and the cities
- Brainstorming and best practices sessions with other cities

Benefits

- We'll be better prepared to formulate a proactive approach to the Healthy Marriage Initiative
- Improved services to TANF clients (e.g. access to jobs, customer service, case management)
- Illustrated need for additional technical assistance
- Basis for initiative planning and implementation
- Maintain and improve working collaborations with partner agencies

5. What issues or topic areas would you like to have had greater discussion about during this Academy?

    - More information on quantitative/qualitative data and developing measurement systems
    - Next steps and how HHS will work with other Federal partners regarding expectations and timelines for completion and implementation of plan.
    - Available resources to support implementation
    - Client asset development
    - Learning from the experiences of other cities in planning and implementation
    - Interface with other Federal systems

6. How will the information you received at this Academy assist you in moving forward with welfare reform efforts in your State/community?

    - Our agency can be a more active partner in the Initiative.
    - Strengthened healthy families initiative
    - The new approaches learned will make our efforts more efficient and a little less complicated
    - Insight about how to complete strategic plans
    - Identified Federal resources
    - Pursuit of new hire data
    - Data imaging for case files

7. Additional Comments

    - Great conference
    - Kent Peterson is a wonderful facilitator
    - Overall, this Academy was a significant improvement over the first. The fact that the Federal partners listened and revised the format to meet our needs is much appreciated.
    - The Academy concept in general has been very helpful to our city. We have invested in a process that, in all likelihood, would not have been implemented if we had not been chosen for the Initiative.
    - Very good work
    - Information sharing among teams was excellent

Academy Sessions
Monday, October 27

In addition to evaluating the overall Academy, participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the individual Academy sessions on the scale 1 (not helpful) to 4 (very helpful) for each of the three days. The table below presents the average scores given to each session held on Monday, October 27. Following the table are the qualitative comments submitted.

Session	Average Score
Dialogue with Federal Partners	2.7
Strategic Plan Updates	3.3
Academy Luncheon	2.8
Effectively Using the New Hire Registry	3.3
Teen Parenting	3.3
Case Management Tips and Techniques	3.1
Workplace and Employer Support Strategies	3.3
Academy Dinner Keynote Speaker	3.2

- Well-structured day
- Informative and enjoyable
- This day was a very good use of our time
- It is apparent that a lot of thought went into the planning of the Academy
- Excellent exchange between the cities on their approaches to dealing with different issues
- Dialogue with Federal partners was very helpful because they responded to our issues
- A very valuable day
- Useful information and lots of time to dialogue with peers
- Labor was sorely missed. Insufficient time for Q&A.
- Strategic plan updates were very useful, but the quality of the presentations was uneven
- PowerPoints should be provided to all participants after the Academy
- The keynote speaker was insightful, but would have been better on Tuesday
- A fact sheet regarding State TANF policies would have been helpful for the strategic plan updates (e.g., State administered, locally supervised, sanction policy)

Academy Sessions
Tuesday, October 28

In addition to evaluating the overall Academy, participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the individual Academy sessions on the scale 1 (not helpful) to 4 (very helpful) for each of the three days. The table below presents the average scores given to each session held on Tuesday, October 28. Following the table are the qualitative comments submitted.

Session	Average Score
Site Visit: MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center	3.3
Site Visit: Rise, Inc.	3.4
Site Visit: Employment Action Center	4.0
Site Visit Report Out	3.4
Innovative Approaches to Promote Healthy Marriages	2.8
Academy Luncheon: The Healthy Marriage Initiative	2.8
Specialized Service Program Strategies	2.3
Non-custodial Parents	4.0
Strategic Planning: Defining the Optimal Workforce System	3.0
Strategies to Meeting the 20 percent Limit	3.0
City Team Building Session	3.8

- Site visit was excellent
- Good information provided verbally and through handouts at site visit
- The one-stop site visit would have been better in an urban setting rather than a suburban business park
- The research capacity of Miami was very impressive
- Too much emphasis on the Healthy Marriage Initiative
- Workshops were very useful
- City team-building time was very helpful in moving process forward. Would have been useful to have our Caliber facilitator with us during team building.
- Content was useful, varied, and relevant to the issues we face
- The site visit was helpful, but more time should have been allowed to tour the facility and ask questions

Academy Sessions
Wednesday, October 29
In addition to evaluating the overall Academy, participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the individual Academy sessions on the scale 1 (not helpful) to 4 (very helpful) for each of the three days. The table below presents the average scores given to each session held on Wednesday, October 29. Following the table are the qualitative comments submitted.

Session	Average Score
City-to-city Dialogue	3.1
Next Steps	3.5
Closing Luncheon: Retirement of the Government Workforce, What Happens Now?	2.6

- The city-to-city dialogue was a great idea. We needed to have everyone closer together.
- Would like to continue conference calls – subject matter conference calls are a method to receive and provide information between the cities and the Federal partners

CONCLUSION

As evidenced by the evaluation results, the cities found Academy II useful and informative. In addition to the organized presentations and sessions, the teams especially valued the time to interact with their peers from other cities, the site visits, and the time devoted to team building. The comments submitted by the Academy II participants indicate a strong approval for the content, organization, and management of the event. They also provide some insightful suggestions for future conferences of this type.

Table 1, on the following page, summarizes the evaluation scores from Academy II:

Table 1 Academy II Evaluation Summary	
	Average Score
Overall Academy	
The Academy successfully met my needs.	3.0
The speakers were knowledgeable about the topics in their presentations.	3.4
The preparation, arrangements, and scheduling of Academy II were handled in a timely, courteous, and competent manner.	3.4
Academy Sessions – Monday October 27	
Dialogue with Federal Partners	2.7
Strategic Plan Updates	3.3
Academy Luncheon	2.8
Effectively Using the New Hire Registry	3.3
Teen Parenting	3.3
Case Management Tips and Techniques	3.1
Workplace and Employer Support Strategies	3.3
Academy Dinner Keynote Speaker	3.2
Academy Sessions – Tuesday October 28	
Site Visit: MDES Hennepin North Workforce Center	3.3
Site Visit: Rise, Inc.	3.4
Site Visit: Employment Action Center	4.0
Site Visit Report Out	3.4
Innovative Approaches to Promote Healthy Marriages	2.8
Academy Luncheon: The Healthy Marriage Initiative	2.8
Specialized Service Program Strategies	2.3
Non-custodial Parents	4.0
Strategic Planning: Defining the Optimal Workforce System	3.0
Strategies to Meeting the 20 percent Limit	3.0
Academy Sessions – Wednesday October 29	
City-Team Building Session	3.8
City-to-city Dialogue	3.1
Next Steps	3.5
Closing Luncheon: Retirement of the Government Workforce, What Happens Now?	2.6

APPENDIX D:

REMAINING QUESTIONS

APPENDIX D: REMAINING QUESTIONS

Due to issues of time, there were numerous questions that remained unanswered in the time allotted to the Federal panel discussion (see section 2.2). Those questions are listed here, organized by presenter:

Questions to Mr. Roberto Salazar

- What successful models are in effect to remove the stigma for Food Stamp participation and to increase participation?
- Are there any programs that the Department of Agriculture is doing to fund public markets that are promoting healthy food in low-income communities and that can link with OCS to create jobs?
- What is the status of transitional Food Stamps for TANF leavers?
- Our government proposed to discontinue use of Food Stamps for junk food. What is the Federal response to such a proposal?
- What about combining WIC and Food Stamps? It would reduce administrative/bureaucracy.
- What are waivers that States can get to reduce complexity and increase access. QC is still too complex.
- How can we make better use of EBT – to issue child support, swipe system to monitor transportation?
- Do the people in the 59 percent of those eligible for Food Stamps who use Food Stamps have different characteristics from those in the remaining 41 percent (e.g. age, employment status, immigration status)? What are the implications for increasing market penetration?
- For FNS, how do they determine eligibility guidelines? Is there a way to gradually reduce benefits as clients become employed?
- How can Food Stamps be marketed differently to change the image of participation? Can Food Stamps be outsourced? Is this being done anywhere?
- What is the possibility of placing kiosks in malls to make Food Stamps benefits more accessible?

- **Questions to Mr. Grant E. Collins II**

- Why is participation only limited to work-like activities when some clients require other activities such as mental health treatment or drug programs before entering a work-like activity?
- Family strengthening is a proper focus but this is contradictory to focus on getting them employed. Presence in home is key element of strong family. How can we reconcile these two concepts?
- Child care cost is greater than the pay for employment. How can we place clients in employment that pays a sufficient level?
- Any examples of taking advantage of Annie E. Casey Foundation Family Strengthening Program?

- Who determines what a healthy marriage is?
- Is a healthy marriage more important than helping a client with four children obtain employment?
- With the emphasis on engagement and work participation, how do cities that have large numbers of customers with barriers (disabilities, cultural backgrounds, substance abuse, non-traditional families) leverage resources to help those leaving welfare but who are still poor?
- How can we get more programs for working poor to increase skill levels and get out of poverty?
- What incentives will be offered to promote strengthening families and healthy marriages?
- Are efforts being made at the Federal level to create consistency between programs funded by various departments to eliminate conflicts on allowable services, timelines, etc.?
- Child care: what's going on with it? What is the Administration's intent to do with child care? No child care = no ability to work.
- What is Administration's view on quality child care?
- Is the current Administration willing to be realistic in the definition of work or work-related activities?
- What is the relationship between child care and reauthorization of the TANF program?
- What percentage of families are in the healthy families initiative?
- Why aren't we raising minimum benefits for the elderly?
- Would the Feds entertain simplification of the FSET exemption and sanction policy to mirror the State's policy for TANF eligibles?
- Are there plans to expand available activities for able-bodied adults ages 18-49 to help them get into the labor market?
- What incentives will be offered to promote strengthening families and healthy marriages?
- How can you get more programs for working poor to increase skill levels and get out of poverty?

- **Questions to Mr. Jerry Patiuk**

- What is HUD going to do to create affordable housing options for people engaged in welfare reform?
- Many localities find it difficult to access/use HUD programs. Has HUD developed new strategies to facilitate easier access for localities in utilizing your program?
- What are your observations or remarks on HUD's goals for Federal paid development of housing?
- Housing Authorities seem to administer their service programs independently of other welfare efforts. How can these efforts be better coordinated?
- One big problem for housing is that there are so few resources available. What's the best way to help those who are making programs but don't have housing assistance?
- If better outcomes are achieved through IDA's, can HUD escrow funds be transferred to the IDA?

- How can we find a way to target TANF recipients with section 8 to participate in escrow program?
- How can HUD increase services to clients with 1 strike records due to criminal offenses?
- Why isn't section 8 being expanded? There are more certified participants than available houses.
- Why isn't more transitional housing available for homeless families?